



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2019

No. 52

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Ever-present and ever-gracious God, touch the hearts of our lawmakers today with the warmth and wonder of Your wisdom and grace. Infuse their lives with an exemplary integrity that illuminates the darkness of cynicism, division, and despair. May our Senators see beyond baffling events to the power of Your prevailing providence, providing them with a vision of a better nation and world. Lord, use our legislators with such power that they may honor their calling by faithfully serving You and country.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRIDGET S. BADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the Senate voted to advance the nomination of Bridget Bade of Arizona, the latest of President Trump's qualified judicial nominees. Today we will vote on her confirmation as a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Ms. Bade's nomination comes with the bipartisan support of our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and a "well qualified" rating from the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary.

Given that 77 Senators voted yesterday to advance this nomination, it is obviously clear to the vast majority of us that the President has made yet another excellent choice to the Federal bench. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting for Ms. Bade later today.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, on another matter entirely, this afternoon the Senate is going to vote on the far-left wish list that many of our Democratic colleagues have rushed to embrace—the so-called Green New Deal.

For a relatively sparse resolution, this proposal has already traveled quite a fascinating path in Congress. It originated with the most radical, farthest left Members of the new House Democratic majority. The Speaker of the House quickly praised its "enthusiasm."

Its principal sponsor rolled out the first version of the plan alongside an extensive background document that laid out the policy's true goals in can-

did detail but which Democrats then rushed to hastily scrub off the internet.

It is not exactly an auspicious start, but, nevertheless, a number of our Democratic colleagues here in the Senate rushed to embrace it as well. Every Democratic Senator who is currently running for President has embraced the Green New Deal.

The energy, the momentum, and the defining new voices in today's Democratic Party seem to be all in for the Green New Deal. "It is ambitious. It captures your imagination," said one current Presidential candidate.

"I'm in all the way," said one of our Senate colleagues, who is also running.

When asked if the proposal might go too far, another of our Senate colleagues running for President replied on this issue: "You cannot go far enough."

So just how far does the proposal go? What exactly is in this thing? What is it?

For starters, the proposal addresses the small matter of eliminating—listen to this—the use of all fossil fuels nationwide over 10 years—get rid of it all. This might sound like a neat idea in places like San Francisco or New York—the places that the Democratic Party seems totally focused on these days—but, frankly, the communities everywhere else would be absolutely crushed by this.

It is killing off entire domestic industries, winding down millions of jobs, and, basically, outlawing the only sources of energy that working-class and middle-class families can actually afford. By one rough estimate, these steps could lead to a spike in household electricity bills of \$300 a month—that much increase in your utility bill. Keep in mind that this is just a warmup act.

While they are at it, our friends on the far left also propose a federally mandated overhaul of every building in America—every building in America. No family home or small business

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1949

would be safe until it meets Washington bureaucrats' standards of greenness. But if you can believe it, other aspects of this proposal make these things sound downright practical, by comparison.

The resolution also includes a far broader socialist wish list that gestures toward a new government-run healthcare insurance system, a new system for government-guaranteed housing, and a new government system to guarantee everyone—everyone—“economic security.”

The last point is a little vague, but, helpfully, before it was scrubbed off the internet, the original sponsor's background document made the long-term goal perfectly clear—listen to this: “economic security to all those who are unable or unwilling to work.”

That is the background document they rushed to delete. The Democrats' long-term vision is taking hard-working people's taxpayer dollars to pay those who choose not get off their couch day after day simply because they are unwilling to work.

So my Democratic colleagues' brilliant new idea—their rallying cry—is snatching away the energy sources that middle-class families use, shuttering the industries that provide many of those families with their livelihoods, and changing the homes they live in, the cars they drive, and the healthcare plans they rely on.

Remember what our colleague said: “You cannot go too far.” Our colleagues are certainly putting that to the test.

I haven't even gotten to what American families would have to pay—to pay—for the privilege of being lab rats for all of this far-left social engineering—for being lab rats for all of this social engineering. My Democratic colleagues have been fairly quiet on that subject. I guess it is a lot more fun ordering off the menu than taking a look at the check.

Families would almost certainly be faced with much higher utility bills. Then, there is the cost to replace appliances. Presumably, electric cars would have to be purchased. Then, there is the Federal tax burden.

Just how much of other people's money are Democrats proposing to burn in this effort to turn the country into a far-left fiction novel?

One initial rough estimate found that all of the pieces of the Green New Deal might add up to as much as \$93 trillion.

That is just over the first decade. That is quite a tab. It exceeds the annual GDP of the entire world—the annual GDP of the entire world as of 2017. It would mean historic tax increases, historic new debt, and even that would only begin to scratch the surface. Bear in mind, the sticker price doesn't even begin to capture the full national cost of the economic wound this plan would inflict on our country while all our competitors would be roaring on by.

My colleagues want to pull the emergency brake on the U.S. economy be-

cause it isn't “green” enough, but global carbon emissions are a global problem. We only produce about 15 percent of the global total. China has already soared past us. They are the world's largest emitter. In recent years, while U.S. emissions have actually been declining, China's share has been growing fast.

We will certainly get to test their new economic security payments for those unable or unwilling to work after the Green New Deal drives all of our domestic manufacturing jobs over to China, India, and our other competitors, who will gladly gobble up our jobs and continue to emit with reckless ambition.

My Democratic colleagues have settled on quite an interesting strategy—maximum pain for American families, with no meaningful change in global carbon emissions.

Since I announced last month that Senators will actually have the opportunity to go on record and vote on this socialist wish list, a funny thing has happened. I am not sure I have ever seen the self-professed supporters of a piece of legislation more angry or irritated that they will actually have to vote on it. They are angry and irritated that they will actually have to vote on it.

Merely bringing their own plan up for a vote—a plan they had characterized as “an amazing step forward”—is now declared to be a “diversion” and a “sham.” By one colleague's assessment, by getting their proposal a floor vote, I was creating “a ploy to try to undermine the Green New Deal by calling a vote.”

I have to say, it is remarkable enough to see a major political party coalesce around a proposal to forcibly remake the entire country according to what is fashionable in Brooklyn and San Francisco, but it is even more stunning to see my colleagues so angry and upset at the opportunity to back up their new philosophy with their votes. What an outrage, to actually vote on something we say we are for.

Well, later today, we will see—the American people will see which of their Senators can do the commonsense thing and vote no on this destructive, socialist daydream, and they will see which Senators are so fully committed to radical, leftwing ideology that they can't even vote no on self-inflicted economic ruin that would take a sledgehammer to America's middle class.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, President Trump's Justice Department issued a letter to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals calling for the elimination of healthcare coverage for tens of millions of Americans.

Up until last night, the Trump administration had said one aspect of the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional, but last night, the Department of Justice declared that the entire law and all of its vital healthcare protections must go.

Make no mistake about it—this is an escalation of the Trump administration's and Republicans' attacks on protections for people with preexisting conditions. All the protestations for keeping preexisting conditions—President Trump said it as recently as this past campaign—out the window. This court case says get rid of preexisting conditions, and the Trump administration is pursuing the case. What are they saying to the 52 million Americans who are dependent on protections for preexisting conditions? What are President Trump and his Justice Department saying to a mom whose son or daughter has cancer and the insurance company says “We are not covering it” and they have to watch their child suffer because they can't afford it?

The move by the Trump administration is a slap in the face to American families, a devastating blow to Republicans who promised to protect people with preexisting conditions. How many of our Republican colleagues will go to the floor today and condemn the Trump administration? I will bet, not one. I will bet, not one. I hope I am wrong, but I will bet, not one.

In two short sentences, the Trump administration crystalized its position that the healthcare coverage enjoyed by nearly 20 million people, as well as the protections for tens of millions more with preexisting conditions, should be annihilated. That is now the official position, full stop. And the Trump position ties a 2-year anchor around the neck of every Republican for the next 2 years. Yet again, they will be forced to defend the indefensible. It is a stark reminder of the difference between our two parties. Democrats are fighting to expand and improve healthcare coverage and lower costs, while Republicans are trying to take it all away and raise costs.

The bottom line: From the moment this administration and this Republican majority came to power, they waged a wholesale attack on our healthcare system. They have pushed policies that would rip away people's healthcare coverage, spike their premiums and prescription drugs costs, slap older Americans with an age tax, and reverse protections for people with preexisting conditions like cancer, asthma, and diabetes.

Democrats condemn, in the strongest possible terms, this attack against the American people and demand we take action to protect our healthcare.

I know that the administration is very happy with the Mueller report, and so are our Republican friends. This move by the Trump administration to take away healthcare will prove far more detrimental to the administration and the Republican Party than any gains they might have made by the issuance of Mr. Barr's letter. Mark my words. It is far more important to the American people—far more important to the American people—because it involves their lives and the lives of their families. The Trump administration is hurting them badly.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, on another matter, today, Leader McConnell will follow through on one of his specialties, "gotcha" politics, by forcing a vote of the Republicans' version of the Green New Deal.

Make no mistake—Republicans want to force this political stunt to distract from the fact that they neither have a plan nor a sense of urgency to deal with the threat of climate change. With this exercise, the Republican majority has made a mockery of the legislative process. It is a political act, a political stunt.

Everyone here knows it is a stunt, including the majority leader himself, who will put something on the floor and then vote no. What is the point of that, other than showing how hypocritical this act is?

With this exercise, they have also elevated the issue in a way, I am sure, they never intended, and, for that, I want to thank them because now we are finally talking about climate change.

For 5 years, the leader hasn't brought one bill to the floor that will deal with the issue of climate change. He may not agree with what some people are for. What is his plan? What is his plan?

Leader McConnell and every Republican, with one exception, has refused to sponsor a resolution.

Leader McConnell has refused to answer these questions, which he has been repeatedly asked. One, is climate change real? Do you believe that, Leader McConnell? Do you believe that, Republican Members?

Two, climate change is caused by humans. Do you believe that? Say it. Come to the floor and do something about it.

And this is three: Congress must act on climate change. This is a simple resolution. Every Democrat is for it. Will Leader McConnell sign it? Will any other Republican sign it? No. It shows where the party is.

We are going to continue asking these questions over and over again because our Republican colleagues want to play a stunt and vote no on another bill, but they don't want to say what they are for.

The scientific consensus is clear. Disasters are getting stronger and stronger. The great irony here is that right after this bill goes down and the McConnell stunt bill goes down, we are going to vote on disaster relief.

Do you know what has made disaster relief so much more necessary and so much more expensive? Climate change. The warmer the air, the warmer the globe and the wilder the weather gets, as the people in Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas have just experienced.

So this idea that we are voting for disaster relief after a stunt, a sham vote on climate change—and the Republican leader and the Republican Senators have nothing to say on climate change—reveals in bright lights their ostrichlike behavior, putting their head in the sand, ignoring reality, doing nothing about it, and playing games.

Every single Democrat and a few of our Republican colleagues have joined in the resolution that says these three simple things. We will not rest until we have most every Republican joining because the public is on our side, science is on our side, and the need to help protect America—farmers, urban dwellers, suburban dwellers—from the devastating changes that climate is bringing upon us is very real.

Let's stop the nonsense. Let's get serious. Our children's future depends upon it. Our planet depends upon it.

MUELLER REPORT

Madam President, now there is one final matter. Yesterday, I came to the floor and asked unanimous consent on a very simple matter—that the report completed by Special Counsel Mueller and all of the corresponding evidence and documentation be made publicly available for the American people.

There was a request, above all, to achieve the greatest level of transparency possible into the very serious matters of Russian interference in our elections. Transparency—that is all we want.

I am hardly alone. It is the same resolution that passed the House unanimously, with the President's strongest defenders voting for it. They want transparency.

Why has Leader McConnell objected to making the report public? What in the world is he hiding? He got up and objected when we asked to make it public. If he had not gotten up, it would have passed.

President Trump has called for the report to be made public. So why is the leader, the Republican leader, blocking all attempts at transparency? There is no conceivable reason for the Mueller report to remain hidden from public view. It is a shame—a darn shame—that Leader McConnell thinks otherwise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I thank you for your hard work on the sometimes powerful Senate Agriculture Committee. I would have liked to respond to the leader—but I know he is busy, and he is leaving the floor—just to say that I think all Republicans understand there is climate change,

and all Republicans know that human activity does contribute to it, and, yes, we ought to do something. The point I am trying to make here is we don't want to do the wrong thing and cause a great deal of disruption in the process.

I also thank Senator Thune for allowing me to speak out of order. I know this is a hardship on his schedule, but he has been very kind to let this happen.

I thank the sponsors of the Green New Deal for enabling all Senators the opportunity to discuss the practical challenges this resolution actually presents. For me, as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, it allows me to discuss the real stewards of our land—our farmers, ranchers, growers—and how this legislation will affect them and their ability not only to feed this country but a troubled and hungry world as well.

Those of us who represent farm country are grateful for the opportunity to underscore something that too many take for granted. Farmers, ranchers, and growers in the United States now grow the safest, most affordable and abundant food supply in the world. As I just said, we know that it is a troubled and hungry world that needs farmers, ranchers, growers, and their protection to help feed and clothe the world's increasing population. Yes, and I think it will probably go longer than 12 years.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am proud of our bipartisan record on behalf of American agriculture and, in turn, our record of respecting our Nation's natural resources. These things go hand in hand. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle on the Agriculture Committee and those privileged to work in agriculture have always sought to grow and raise more, using as few resources as possible.

The men and women who make their living off the land have an imperative and keen interest in the responsible use and management of our natural resources. Show me a farmer who does not practice conservation or does not have access to precision agriculture or the latest technology, and I will show you a farmer who is really in trouble.

In short, within agriculture, there is nothing new with the Green New Deal. It calls for "working collaboratively with farmers, ranchers, and growers in the United States to eliminate pollution, greenhouse gases, and emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible"—that is the language—"by supporting family farming"—that is also in the language—"investing in sustainable farming and land use practices that increase soil health," and "building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food." That is in the resolution, the legislation over in the House.

Check, check, and check. We have been doing this already, and we continue to look ahead to create thoughtful, well-considered policies. I do not question the intent of the authors of the Green New Deal, but they don't know what they don't know, especially about agriculture. They need to catch up with the Agriculture Committee and with the farm country in general.

In fact, we on the Agriculture Committee are so forward-looking that we have embraced innovative methods of investing in agriculture research with the creation of the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research—something new.

The Foundation leverages public and private dollars to bring together experts to identify and investigate the researchable questions whose answers have the potential to enhance the economic and environmental resilience of our food supply and the environment.

I encourage the Senator from Massachusetts and the leader and other cosponsors to simply ask for a briefing from the folks at FFAR. I would say the same to vocal colleagues on the House side who helped author—and pardon the acronym—the GND, Green New Deal. But given their unfortunate focus on our livestock industry, I simply do not have time, I don't think, to fully discuss emissions emitted from all livestock or, for that matter, for Congress. Maybe that would be a better answer—perhaps later, after riding point on the herd and getting the cows milked.

What is worth our time and what is worth their time is a defense of American agriculture, the best in the world, from attacks by those who are either uninformed or misinformed regarding organic, processed, and precision agriculture—all modern miracles and all sustainable with regard to our environment.

America's farmers, ranchers, and others in rural America are constantly working to produce their crops and to raise their livestock in order to feed a growing world and to do so with constant challenges presented to them from other nations.

The distinguished minority leader just mentioned the floods we are experiencing in Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa. This seems to have happened about every 10 years. I am not sure it has happened because of global warming, but at least it has with regard to climate change. We are doing everything possible to bring aid and help to those folks who find their farmland underwater.

Farmers are natural stewards of the land, and they must be good at problem-solving. They identify the issues or the trend, find ways to adjust their business and respond to that issue, and improve their way of operating. They would like to do that under a Green New Deal. If they don't adjust to address those challenges and simply do the right thing, their farm or ranch and their livelihood will not be sustainable.

It is pretty simple. Every living, breathing person on this Earth needs food in order to survive. Obviously, we cannot and do not produce food in the same manner that our grandparents did because those methods were not sustainable and, today, would not produce food at the scope and scale our troubled and hungry world demands.

American farmers and ranchers, who live by the concept of continuous improvement, sound science, and voluntary-based conservation, are a model for other industries and other countries on how to address problems like climate change in a very practical way.

America's farmers and ranchers raise the same amount of beef as they did in the 1970s, but they do so with 33 percent fewer cattle. Over the last 50 years, American farmers have reduced water use in pork production by 41 percent, and the list goes on. These are real success stories that speak to how farmers are already managing natural resources responsibly and voluntarily making contributions to address the issue of climate change. Examples like these abound in agriculture.

The American farmer, through continuous improvement, embracing sound science, implementing new technologies, such as biotechnology and no-till farming, and being conservation-minded, has achieved unprecedented success that I do not believe the proponents of GND—i.e., the Green New Deal—realize.

In the recent farm bill, which passed Congress with overwhelming margins, we strengthened the conservation programs, increased investments in agriculture research, supported risk management tools that will benefit producers of all crops in all regions, and provided additional authorities to address animal health concerns. This legislative package bolsters the sustainability of U.S. farmers, ranchers, and others in rural America while being environmentally sound.

Unfortunately, vague proposals or resolutions, such as the Green New Deal, which contain no real details or no metrics are not going to solve the issue of climate change in any meaningful way. Regulating American farmers and ranchers out of business will only result in food and fiber production being outsourced to countries that do not have the same conservation-minded producers that we have here in the United States.

Let's face it: Nobody—no one I know of—likes being told what to do, what to drive, or what to eat. Consumers value free choice. They also expect access to reasonably priced food and nutritious food.

In fact, consumers will surely continue to demand the choice of animal protein here in the United States, and so any reasonable discussion on the agriculture sector's contributions to solutions on climate change must begin with this acknowledgment.

These policy decisions must recognize the complexity of the agriculture

and food value chain of growers, input suppliers, processors, handlers, consumers, and the list goes on. They must be based in reality to facilitate a genuine conversation between rural and urban constituencies.

I know. I understand. I realize. I get it. There are those who think the Green New Deal is a moral imperative, and it may well be, but farmers continuing to feed the world is also a moral imperative. Too many go hungry each day in America, and ending this is also a moral imperative. Too many people go hungry in a troubled and hungry world as well. In restricting American agriculture in any way, whether it is in resolution form or legislative form, the Green New Deal does not match up with these moral responsibilities.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for allowing me to step in front of him. That doesn't happen very often. So, Coop, you are up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Kansas, the chairman of the Senate Ag committee, who was incredibly instrumental in getting that last Farm Bill passed. I have the privilege of serving on his committee, and we do a lot of important work for our farmers and ranchers in this country. As he very aptly pointed out, one of the things that could undo a lot of the good work we hope will improve the economic outlook for farmers and ranchers, which today is a very difficult one—something that could really undo that is passage of something like this Green New Deal. It could do irreparable harm to the Ag economy in this country and would be disastrous for farmers and ranchers.

This afternoon, Senate Democrats will have a chance to vote on the Green New Deal, and the American people will have a chance to see just how many Democrats embrace this new government expansion.

The Green New Deal, as the name suggests, is largely about energy policy, but there is a lot more to unpack. The Green New Deal is a comprehensive socialist fantasy that would put the government in charge of everything from healthcare to the way you heat your house.

Do you like your car? With the Green New Deal you almost certainly will not be able to keep it. The Green New Deal also wants to eliminate fossil fuels, which means the engine that currently powers your car will likely be illegal. It also means, roughly, 3.5 million American truckdrivers will be out of a job.

Presumably airplanes would also be grounded, drying up the aviation sector and the travel, tourism, and business it supports.

Do you like your house? That may not matter if the government decides your house doesn't meet the Green New Deal's guidelines. Enjoy rebuilding your home according to plans provided by Washington.

Do you like your job? The Green New Deal will eliminate millions of current energy jobs, but that is not all. The energy industry in this country powers the American economy. Our supply of reliable, affordable energy allows businesses to flourish. So what happens when the Green New Deal drives up the price of energy or when businesses are hit with Green New Deal taxes or when American manufacturers can't meet the Green New Deal's stringent emissions goal? Well, I will tell you what will happen: American jobs will be lost or move overseas.

I mentioned Green New Deal taxes. That is because paying for this plan would require massive tax hikes on just about everybody. One think tank has released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost, and the answer is between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years. That is almost an incomprehensible amount of money. Ninety-three trillion dollars is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history. That is right. Since 1789, when the Constitution went into effect, the Federal Government has spent a total of \$83.2 trillion. In other words, it has taken us 230 years to spend the amount of money Democrats want to spend in 10.

How do Democrats plan to pay for this? Well, they don't actually have a plan. The Green New Deal resolution itself refers vaguely to "community grants, public banks, and other public financing." That is all very well, but unless the Democrats' plan is to just print a lot of money, that public financing has to come from somewhere, and since the government is not currently sitting on a spare \$9.3 trillion a year, that money is likely going to come from taxes—new and heavy taxes on just about every American.

Let me be very clear. This is not a plan that can be paid for with Democrats' favorite solution of taxing the rich. Taxing every millionaire in the United States at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would only bring in a tiny fraction of \$93 trillion. In fact, there aren't enough millionaires in the entire world to cover \$93 trillion. In 2017, the combined wealth of all the millionaires in the world was \$70.2 trillion. So you could confiscate—you could literally confiscate all the money from all the millionaires in the entire world, and you still wouldn't have \$93 trillion. The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for by taxing the rich. This massive government expansion would be paid for on the backs of working families.

The energy industry has been a bright spot for American families over the past few years. Between 2007 and 2017, as the price of healthcare soared and education and food costs increased, household energy costs decreased. That is a big deal for working families, but that progress would go away under the Green New Deal. Energy costs would go up, not down, and the price of a lot of

other items would likely rise sharply as well, as everyone from farmers to manufacturers would struggle under the Green New Deal's mandates and taxes. Needless to say, families' paychecks would shrink by a lot.

The size of the tax hikes that would be required to even begin to finance the Green New Deal would usher in a new era of diminished prosperity for American families. Gone would be the American dream of giving your children a better life than you have enjoyed. Under the Green New Deal, American families could look forward to permanently narrowed horizons.

So this afternoon, my Democratic colleagues face a choice. They can double down on their socialist fantasies and vote for the Green New Deal resolution—perhaps the most costly resolution ever to come before the Senate—or they can reject this green nightmare and resolve to work with Republicans to advance clean energy in a way that will not devastate the livelihoods of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about the urgent need for the United States to take action to confront climate change. I think it is pretty clear from the evidence and from the science right now that the following is true: climate change is real, and it is a threat to human life; second, that climate change is caused by human activity; and third, we must take action against it by reducing substantially greenhouse gas emissions.

We have an obligation, all of us—in both Houses of Congress and in both parties and in both branches of government, the legislative and executive branches—we all have an obligation to care for and protect God's creation. We don't have time. We don't have time for cynical political games. We need to be serious about this challenge.

According to the World Food Program, over 120 million people face "crisis-level food insecurity" worldwide. Too often we don't focus on that challenge.

Developing countries across Africa, Asia, and Latin America have been hardest hit by frequent and intense floods, droughts, and storms. These climate events can quickly spiral into full-blown food and nutrition crises.

The U.S. intelligence community, the intelligence agencies of the United States of America, have linked global food insecurity to instability that can lead to a rise in violent extremism and international crime that puts the United States at risk. The January 2014 "Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community" reported that the "lack of adequate food will be a destabilizing factor in countries important to United States national security."

We know the following is true: Climate change leads to humanitarian crises; humanitarian crises lead to hun-

ger, death, and insecurity; hunger, death, and insecurity lead to desperation, instability, extremism, and terrorism. Inaction on this issue predicated on denial or indifference will result in millions around the world suffering extreme hunger resulting from climate-related disasters, which in turn leads to a rise in extremism and terrorism. Ignoring climate change undermines U.S. national security.

Similarly, failure to address climate change will have negative consequences here at home. In one example—among many—a 2015 paper titled "Growing Stronger: Toward a Climate-Ready Philadelphia" reports that since 2010, Philadelphia has experienced the following: the snowiest winter on record, the two warmest summers on record, the wettest day on record, the 2 wettest years on record, and two hurricanes. That is just in 5 years, in one city, in one State.

The same paper projects:

Philadelphia may experience four to 10 times as many days per year above 95 degrees, and as many as 16 days a year above 100 degrees by the end of the century. Up from the 1950 [to] 1999 average of fewer than one.

Fewer than one.

All of these changes have negative consequences for local economies and for the well-being of all of our constituents. Increased heavy rainfall can lead to more flooding in communities along, just for example, the Delaware River and the Schuylkill River in my home State, which places additional stress on our already outdated wastewater infrastructure.

Older Americans and lower income American families are particularly hard hit by heat waves. We know nearly one-quarter of the children in Philadelphia suffer from asthma, a condition that is exacerbated by ground-level ozone, which is made worse by hot weather.

So as Americans we have a duty to develop a strategy and to take action to confront climate change. We must also provide robust assistance, training, and support for workers who may be adversely impacted by the steps we take, but we don't have time to waste. We need a serious bipartisan effort to develop a strategy to take action to prevent the horror that results from inaction on climate change. Everyone knows that today's vote will do nothing to help us deal with this grave crisis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant 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.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, you either believe it or you don't believe it.

Is there such a thing as climate change? Are we going through some change on our planet today? I think so, and 98 percent of the scientists who report on the subject believe the same thing. The evidence is everywhere, isn't it? The extreme weather events that we are seeing are, I think, an indication that something is happening on this Earth that we call home.

The obvious question is this: Do we have anything to do with it? Does the fact that we are alive, functioning, building things, and dealing with traveling by plane and other means have anything to do with what is happening to our planet? I think so.

Can we do something about it? Sure, we know we can. If we are dealing with greenhouse gas emissions that somehow in the atmosphere are raising the temperature of planet Earth, what can we do about those greenhouse gases? We know there are a lot of very simple and obvious things.

I can remember a debate on this floor when we talked about making cars and trucks more fuel efficient and when the folks in Detroit, who are the smartest people running the automobile companies, said: Impossible. You can't do it. Americans will never buy those cars. It just will not work.

Thank goodness we ignored them. We established standards and regulations. Do you know what? Like it or not, we drive more fuel-efficient cars and trucks today, and, frankly, I like it. It was a step in the right direction. It took governmental, congressional prodding to take place, and it made this a cleaner, safer place to live in the United States.

There are other things we can do as well, but, first, we need a basic agreement that there is a problem, that human conduct—the way we live, the way we work, and the way we produce things—has something to do with it, and that we are committed to changing it.

How many nations in the world have agreed with that conclusion? All of them. Wait. All of them except one—this country, this President, who decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. It is a universal, global decision by every nation on Earth except the United States that we do have a climate problem, that we are the cause of some part of it, at least, and that we should do something to change it. This President says he doesn't buy it and doesn't think the science proves it. He and he alone, on behalf of this country, stepped away from this agreement. I think that was a serious mistake.

I am happy to report that Governors across the United States—at least the Democratic Governors—have said they are going to ignore the President when it comes to this, and they are going to set up their own policies. I salute my own Governor, J.B. Pritzker, in Illinois. He is not part of this denial camp that is trying to ignore the problem. He is trying to do in our State, as others are, something to make sure that

this planet is more livable, more habitable.

Isn't it amazing that this has become such a partisan issue? There was a time on the floor of this Senate when it was not. I remember when the late Senator John McCain, whom I still honor to this day not only for his service in the Senate but for his service to this country, teamed up with Democratic Senator Joe Lieberman and started proposing ideas to deal with climate change—bipartisan proposals, bipartisan votes. Not anymore, no. We have a big wall down the middle of this Chamber—on that side, climate denial and, on this side, a belief that we should be doing something about it.

We could do something today, couldn't we? Couldn't we take the latest climate assessment from the Federal Government, which spells out the problem and spells out the challenge, and come up with at least a reasonable, bipartisan approach with which to deal with the clear scientific evidence that has been produced by this government as required by law? Of course, we could, but we are not going to. Instead, the Republican Senate leader has decided he wants to make a political move. He wants to put the Democrats on the spot, not to solve the problem but to have something he can talk about in the next campaign.

A group came together and proposed, as they call it, the Green New Deal. I have taken a look at it. I went to Senator ED MARKEY of Massachusetts, who is one of the sponsors, and I asked him about it because he is one of the authors. I know ED MARKEY. I served with him in the House, and I serve with him in the Senate. He has established credentials when it comes to this issue. He truly cares and has done many, many things to show that caring.

So I asked him: What is this Green New Deal? It is not a law. I mean, it is not a bill that will become a law. It is simply a resolution, which is kind of a statement of purpose, a statement of position. He said to me that it was aspirational—in other words, that the Green New Deal sets out aspirations, targets, and values.

I said to him: ED, that is a good idea, but I want something that is not aspirational. I want something that is legislative. That is what we do here, right? I am sure he will come up with those specifics.

Yet Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican Senate leader, has decided that we are going to put the Democrats on the spot. Take it or leave it in its entirety—the Green New Deal. Be on the record and vote this afternoon.

I will make it clear to you right now that I think there are parts of that Green New Deal that are excellent and some that I disagree with. At this point in time, I am going to be voting present this afternoon because I believe we should be legislative, and I believe we should be bipartisan.

I have said this on the floor many times, and I will say it again: The only

major political party in the world today that denies climate change is the Republican Party of the United States of America. Now, I have waited for some Republican to come to the floor and say: Oh, no, that is not true, Senator DURBIN. There are other major political parties that have the same position as we do. Yet no one has come to the floor.

A few months back, one Republican Senator in an elevator quietly said: I think there is a party in Australia that denies climate change.

Maybe that is true, but why in the world have we reached a point at which this is such a partisan issue? Don't we all see what is happening with the weather? Can't we see what is happening in terms of the temperature of this Earth that we live on as it is consistently, year after year, continuing to rise? Don't we realize that it has an impact on this Earth that we live on? Don't we realize that if it continues unabated, the Earth that I am leaving to my children and grandchildren will be a much different place and a much more challenging place? Can't we see the flooding in the streets down in Miami in Florida? Can't we see the melting of the glaciers? Isn't that proof positive that something is happening?

In my part of the world, the Midwest, I grew up with tornadoes. They are so common where I live, we even named sports teams after the tornadoes. When I was a kid—this happened half a dozen times, and I will never forget it—in the middle of the night, Mom and Dad would wake me up and say: The tornado sirens are blaring. Get in the basement right now. Grab your covers and pillow and get downstairs.

We would head down to the basement and wait for the all-clear signal.

Tornadoes were part of our lives, but they were usually confined to the spring and summer months. Just this last December, we had a tornado in Taylorville, IL, 30 miles away from where I live. It wasn't supposed to come this time of year.

Unusual things just like that are happening all over the place, and they are devastating. Don't take my word for it; talk to the people in the property and casualty insurance industry. They make a living trying to guess what the weather is going to be. If they see some horrible weather condition coming, they know it will not be good for their bottom line. I have talked to them. There are some States in which they are unwilling to write property and casualty insurance because of the vulnerability to hurricanes, tornadoes, and extreme weather events. They are making a conscious profit-and-loss business decision based on the evidence before them that something is happening to weather in the United States. They are not in denial. They embrace the concept every day when they decide whether to write insurance and what premiums to charge.

So if the people who do this for a living, who have to show a profit in their

company, have come to the conclusion that climate change is for real, why haven't we in the Senate? Why do we instead engage in this political theater we are going to have this afternoon? Why aren't we instead, on a bipartisan basis, sitting down and saying: What can we do? What can we do in terms of conserving energy, in terms of being more fuel efficient, and in terms of being more sensitive to this environment? What can we do?

There are a handful of Republican Senators who have stepped up and said "We should. We can see climate change where we live," but I wish they would become a force to lead their leadership forward into taking this up on a serious basis. This afternoon's vote is just part of a political stunt. It is not a serious effort to deal with climate change. We better do that pretty soon. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, thank you.

I am sorry I didn't hear all of the remarks from my friend from Illinois because at the end, he pointed out that there are some on my side of the aisle who acknowledge that we are dealing with a changing climate and that those impacts are real. Well, this Senator is one of them.

I come from a State where we see it. It is real. It is tangible. It impacts not only the land and the water but also the people. We see that in the Arctic. I am one who is approaching this from the perspective of pragmatism and practical solutions we can move forward with.

While I like aspirations, and we all have to have goals, I want us to make sure we are not setting ourselves up for a situation where the expectations are not realistic.

The Senator mentioned the vote we will have later this afternoon. I have suggested that it is important for us around here to make sure that we don't distract from those pragmatic and practical solutions and that we don't amp up the rhetoric so high that we can't get ourselves to a place where we can work cooperatively and collaboratively to get to these solutions. If we are going to address it in a meaningful way, it must be bipartisan, it must be enduring, it must move from one administration to another, and, again, it has to be something we can work toward with meaningful steps.

I would like to take just a couple of minutes today to speak to some of the things and some of the areas in which I think Congress can actually make some progress as we look to the issue of climate change.

I have refrained from speaking specifically to the Green New Deal as it has been laid down and introduced because I don't see it as a real and viable solution that has been fully considered as a proposal. There certainly is a lot of aspiration to it. There certainly is a lot of aspiration, but I have kind of re-

frained from piling on, if you will, despite my concerns about the costs of the deal. I think we can go back and forth in terms of how much it really costs individual Americans, what is the cost to society, and what is the cost of not doing something, but I think those are all kind of almost false in a sense because it is not that we are not doing anything. I think we need to establish that. If we were to enact and move forward with every aspect of the proposal as it has been laid out, is it possible? Is it possible?

It is certainly a worthy goal for us in this country to be transitioning to more renewable and cleaner sources of energy. We are doing that. We are certainly seeing that as the cost of solar is coming down and as we are seeing more wind being harnessed. I think we have great potential in more hydropower, more geothermal, and the technologies that could be coming our way when it comes to ocean energy.

Surely we need to be moving in that direction, but is it affordable? Is it possible to transition to 100 percent renewable energy and electric vehicles over the next 10 years? I don't believe it is physically possible for us to do it in 10 years. So are we setting something up so that young people, like the Senate pages who are listening to me, will say: Well, sure, you should be able to do that in 10 years. You say you can. So if you haven't done it, you have failed.

This is not a question of whether we succeeded or failed but whether every step we are taking is moving us in a more positive direction. Shouldn't it be a worthy goal to maximize our energy efficiencies within our buildings and how we access our power? Absolutely. But is it possible? Would we be able to physically retrofit every building in America to maximize energy and water efficiency over the next 10 years? I don't believe we can do that in 10 years.

Aspirations are good, and goals are good, but when you look at what has been specifically laid out in this Green New Deal, it is more than just transitioning to renewables or electric vehicles or greater energy efficiency. It calls for a Federal jobs guarantee. It focuses on healthcare, education, wages, trade, and a lot more. It suggests unprecedented levels of prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States. That is wonderful. I would love that. But how do we get there? What is the feasible mechanism for accomplishing this goal?

Let's be honest with where we are and recognize the potential cost of this Green New Deal. Whether you want to peg it in the price range of \$50 trillion to \$90 trillion over the next 10 years—I am not going to get caught up in those numbers because that is not going to happen. It is not going to happen.

What I really hope doesn't happen is that this discussion about the Green

New Deal or whatever you want to tag it—that we are not distracted from the necessary and important conversation we must have about climate change and the practical steps we can take to address it. Let's talk about that.

I mentioned to my friend from Illinois that we see it in Alaska. We say that we are ground zero for climate change. The Arctic is warming two to three times the rate of the rest of the world. We are seeing glaciers retreat. Permafrost is thawing. We are seeing sea levels rise. Wildlife migration patterns are changing. We are seeing different invasive species. With the water temperature, we are seeing ocean acidification. Villages are being threatened by coastal erosion and in need of relocation. For us, this is real. Climate change is real.

If you don't want to use the words "climate change," you don't have to use the words "climate change," but just come up and take a look, because something is happening. We are seeing it.

Engaging in rhetoric that is either fantasy or denial really doesn't help those who are facing this. I think there are some policies that both parties can support that I think can make a real difference in real time.

I want to first start off by acknowledging that we are not in a situation and a place where we are doing nothing. That is not the case. We are. We are working on policies, and over the course of years, we have put policies in place that are making a difference and will make a difference moving forward. It is not as though we are starting from scratch. Just look at where we were last year. We expanded the tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration, CCUS. We increased funding for the Department of Energy to research and develop cleaner technologies. We passed legislation to promote basic science, nuclear energy, hydropower, and more. Many of us support the production, use, and export of clean burning natural gas, which can substantially help reduce global emissions. That was just last year in terms of the policies we put in place that are moving us forward in the right direction.

You don't always hear about it, but we have a pretty decent story to tell here in this country. We are leading the world in greenhouse gas reductions. Despite an uptick we saw last year, in 2018, our emissions have fallen significantly over the past decade.

We have made progress, but we need to be making more progress and, in my view, more accelerated progress. What more can we do? That is a conversation we are having in the Energy Committee. I have been working with my ranking member, Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia. It is a conversation we have been having on both sides of the aisle. We had a hearing on the impact on the electric sector due to climate change. We had that hearing about 10 days or so ago. We are planning on having others. We are talking

with other colleagues who are not part of our committee about what more can be done.

Two or three weeks ago, I was in Houston attending the big oil and gas conference, the big global conference. It is kind of like the Davos of oil and gas. It was notable that throughout that week's conference with oil and gas producers, predominantly, the focus and the attention was on climate change and what we are doing with those technologies that will help us to reduce methane leakage, what we are doing to help share some of these environmental technologies, and what more we are doing to help facilitate these clean, lower carbon technologies. This is coming from an industry that is recognizing that innovation must happen.

It was fascinating. I sat down with a group of about 20 folks who were pretty high up within their sectors. I was thinking we were going to be talking about some of the latest technologies in oil and gas development. But about two-thirds of the people around the table were not from oil and gas companies; they were from high-tech companies. They were there because they see that the real difference in making a difference is going to come from these technologies, and they want to be a part of that conversation. That is a good conversation to have.

Within the Energy Committee, what we are doing is we are going to revive and refresh the bipartisan Energy bill that we moved out of committee and off this floor a couple of years ago with the help of Senator CANTWELL. We moved it out with the support of 85 Members. It may be that we have to move some smaller bills instead of everything all at once, but we have to update our policies.

We haven't updated an energy policy for 11 years now. Senator CANTWELL knows, when you think about where the industry has gone, where the energy sector has gone, and the fact that our policies have lagged, that is a drag. We need to address that.

I think there are areas where we can reach a bipartisan agreement on policies that support the innovation, break down the barriers, promote efficiency, and keep the markets well-supplied. There is a lot more we can be doing on nuclear energy. I am going to be introducing a bipartisan bill this week to promote advanced reactors. There is more we can be doing on carbon capture utilization and sequestration. This is a big priority of Senator MANCHIN's. We know that unlocking the key is going to be with storage and energy storage. We have to be advancing that. There is so much more room within hydropower, microgrids, to lower costs for energy in rural areas, to lower the cost of all renewables and make them more competitive, to ensure we are producing the minerals and materials we need for the technologies. I mentioned sharing environmental technologies.

It is not just the Energy Committee that is going to be working on this. All committees will have their own contribution to make, and I welcome that, but we have to have rational discussions.

I have said: Come to the Energy Committee, where there is a safe space if you want to talk about climate. If you are a Republican on this side who says I don't know that I want to go there, a Democrat on that side, let's sit down and have a rational conversation about how we are going to be working together across the aisle to agree on policies that will deliver cleaner and lower carbon technologies. They have to be pragmatic, they have to be durable, and they have to be bipartisan.

Senator MANCHIN and I had an op-ed that ran in the Washington Post a few weeks ago. It wasn't great, earth-shaking, brandnew, novel ideas on how to address climate change. What we said is, we have to join hands on this. We have to come together. We are both from producing States with very vulnerable populations. Take a look at the two of us and work with us to help advance some of these things.

We have gotten more shout-outs not for highlighting some new technology but the fact that we were talking together as Republicans and Democrats. That is going to be an important part of how we move forward.

I mentioned, I am from a producing State. You all know that. What many don't know is how Alaska is leading the way in what is possible for some of the innovation, the proving ground, for technologies. We have about every resource you can think of in great abundance, including sunshine. You don't think about solar for us, but we are putting it to good use. We have been pioneering when it comes to microgrids and these smaller scaled technologies. We have wind turbines out in St. Michael. We have energy-efficient refrigeration on Saint Paul Island. This is a little, tiny island out in the middle of the ocean. We have clean power generation in Kodiak. About 99 percent of that significant fishing community is renewable. We have an in-river system being installed in Igiugig. We have innovation happening all over the place, and it is happening because we are driven by necessity. It costs too much. It is not sustainable.

I don't want to be from a State where most of my off-road communities are powered by diesel. It is not good for them. It is not good for anybody. How do we get off that? Allow us to move forward and free up—some are going to be critical of me. They are going to say: You know what, LISA, you are talking about baby steps. You are talking wind turbines in St. Michael; you are talking about energy efficiency in St. Paul. Do you know what? When you are paying \$7, \$8, \$9 a gallon to keep the lights on, to keep something refrigerated—close to 80 cents a kilowatt hour—that is not sustainable. So for these communities, it is making a dif-

ference. You say: Well, we have a big globe out there. We do have a big globe out there, and we all have a responsibility there, but we have to start.

I want to share a quote from my friend, the former Secretary of Energy, Ernie Moniz. He was talking about some of the practical, pragmatic solutions. He said some are going to argue it is not enough. Some would argue, well, that will not get us there as fast as we need to go. I would argue that would get us there as fast as we can go.

We must—we must—move. We recognize that, but we have to know the only way we are going to be moving is if we move together. That is what we have to do in Congress. We have to take these policies that can keep us moving to lower emissions, to address the reality of climate change, to do so all the while recognizing we have an economy we need to keep strong, we have vulnerable people whom we need to protect, and we have an environment we all care about—Republicans and Democrats—and it is not just the environment in our States or our country, but it is our global environment.

So, moving forward, how we are working together on that is a priority, or should be a priority, for us all. My hope is, we get beyond the rhetoric, the high-fired rhetoric, and we get to practical, pragmatic, bipartisan solutions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Alaska to yield for 10 seconds.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will yield.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. She was the person I was thinking of when I said there are exceptions when it comes to the partisan divide between us. I stayed for her presentation because I knew what it was going to be, and I wanted it to be part of the RECORD.

I think Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL—whom we recognize on our side of the aisle as one of the real leaders on the subject—can show us the way in the Senate to find a bipartisan approach to deal with this challenge.

Thank you.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague for that.

I want to acknowledge the support and partnership I have had with Senator CANTWELL. She and I come from differing views on certain issues, but throughout our time as the chair and the ranking on the committee, we really did work to try to advance some of these solutions, where—I think we would both agree—there is common ground. Again, advancing that is important. It is important for the progress we are making. It is making a difference. It is helping to reduce the emissions. It is helping to move us toward greater efficiency.

So let's not pooh-pooh the small things. Let's acknowledge that building things together, you do elevate yourself—but we have to start. If we keep dividing ourselves, then we are not going to come together to build these bridges.

I thank my friend from Washington State who has worked hard on the committee to advance this and continues to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington State.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to join this debate. I thank my colleagues, the Senator from Illinois and certainly the Senator from Alaska for her comments because I think some of what I am going to say will probably overlap in the context of working together to get things done.

Why do I say that is so important? Because she and I worked on a bipartisan energy package that we passed out of the Senate over 2 years ago that had very important, what I would call implementation strategies, for allowing our businesses and our communities to be more cost-competitive when it comes to energy.

Certainly, in the State of Alaska, I can't imagine paying \$9 a gallon for fuel just to heat a home or to have your hospital or your school available for kids to go to play in after school or just meet the healthcare needs of a community.

Getting energy right not just in big urban cities like Seattle, which is a lot easier to do—we have net zero buildings, probably some of the best net zero buildings in the country—already establishing how you can create energy and sell it back to the grid and be more energy efficient, but we have to have solutions that are going to meet needs all across the United States of America.

So, good news to hear that the chairwoman of the Energy Committee is planning another energy bill. Hopefully, some of those provisions we worked on 2 years ago, like smart building strategies to help re-engineering of energy systems within our buildings to make them more energy efficient, would also go a long way. That is about 40 percent of America's energy use. Every dollar we help a business save in energy costs just gets plugged back into that business's competitiveness in today's economy. I thank her for that, and I look forward to seeing what she and the ranking member, Senator MANCHIN, push forward, and, certainly, I know we will have our ideas.

We are here to debate about energy policy and getting it right for our future prosperity and our competitiveness. I also agree with my colleague that getting things done is important because I think what we have proven over the last decade, maybe 15 years, is that we can transition to cleaner fuels; we can become more energy independent; we can become more energy efficient; and doing so actually creates new jobs that are higher wage jobs and help us in the future.

What Americans want to know is whether we can make it through this transition without doing great damage to our economy, and I think the results

of us working together to pass these legislative ideas in the last decade have proven to be very strong incentives.

First of all, let's talk about incentives writ large, tax incentives. We have been involved with the Finance Committee over the last several years to put in place tax credits that rebalanced our incentives towards the side of renewable energy and away from fossil fuels. In 2008 with my colleague, then-Senator Ensign of Nevada, we were able to work to make sure we were driving down the costs of solar, wind, and biofuels. This legislation, which was extended in the Recovery Act, now helps us with wind supplies to over 6 percent of the U.S. supply.

I know my colleagues in Iowa know how important this is because their State's electricity generates millions of dollars in economic activity. So the fact that we focused on renewables in our tax incentive policy has helped that industry grow and become a very big part of our system.

Today's grid economy is also being modernized, and we have worked to put R&D on the table and allow communities throughout the United States to invest in smart grid technology.

The Presiding Officer comes from a State where there are probably leaders in a lot of renewable energies. I know there are wind projects in the State of Washington from companies in his State that are showing just how efficient wind has become over a long period of time. Who would have originally thought, as I was talking about the Presiding Officer's State of Florida, that we would be talking about wind? You would think I was talking about solar. But this is to show you that the era of distributive generation—that energy can be created from a lot of different sources, put on the grid, moved around cost-effectively, in smart ways, to become more efficient—would help us move toward the future of giving people better opportunities rather than the pollution we see from carbon-intensive areas of the United States.

Even in areas around the United States that still do rely on coal, people are starting to see that renewables are becoming cheaper. The Northern Indiana Public Service Company found that building renewables is cheaper than keeping existing coal plants open. According to the company's 2018 Integrated Resource Plan filed in October, they can save their customers \$4 billion over the next 30 years by ramping down the amount of coal they use from two-thirds of their generation mix today, to 15 percent by 2023, to eliminating the use of coal entirely by 2028.

These aren't just places like my State of Washington, where we have, as I said, a lot of technology and a lot of efficiency, but also States that are making the transition off these fossil fuels, showing it is a good investment and is cheaper for their customers.

We know new wind power purchase agreements continue to set records for

the lowest cost power, putting downward pressure on electricity costs nationwide. I can't tell you how important that is. Coming from a State where we have had cheap hydropower for decades, decades, and decades, it has built our economy over and over again. I like to say it has helped us store apples. After you pick apples and want to store them for a while, guess what helps? Cheap electricity.

Now we store bits—actual software bits. There are data centers that want cheap electricity. So the very nature of cheap electricity keeps driving Washington's economy over and over.

I know that other States in the Nation would benefit from cheaper electricity sources too. It would help their businesses and it would help their consumers. So today, despite the fact that over 94 percent of all electricity generating capacity added over the past century has been in the renewable area or natural gas, consumers are paying 4 percent less per kilowatt hour for electricity than they did a decade ago. So this diversification off of fossil fuel and this investment in these cleaner sources of energy are helping to lower rates for consumers, and that is why we need to keep going in this direction.

There is a reason that Fortune 500 companies are among the largest renewable energy investors in the country. According to the Wall Street Journal, corporations as diverse as Budweiser, The Gap, and MGM International have invested over \$16 billion in wind and solar in 2018, and that is expected to double in 2019. Even the utility industry is waking up to this new reality. The CEO of NextEra, the largest U.S. electricity company in the world by market capitalization, recently told investors that solar and wind, plus storage, will be cheaper than coal, oil, or nuclear.

So this is something that we need to realize. Specifically, he said that the subsidy for wind generation costs will be 2 to 2.5 percent per kilowatt, and large scale solar will only be a little higher than that. Adding storage to this will help us to get those prices down even more.

That is why getting the R&D budget right for the Department of Energy right now and ARPA-E is so critical. We can't cut these programs. We need to make sure that we are continuing to make an investment so that our Nation's electricity sector provides not only more affordable and more reliable energy, but also cleaner energy that will help our atmosphere.

We already now have 3.2 million people working in the clean energy sector. That is nearly three times as many jobs as in the fossil fuel industry. Yet people continue to act like this is an economic debate only about one sector over the other. It is about how we make the transition and how we skill and train people for these future opportunities that support millions of jobs here in the United States of America.

Now, why do I want to continue on that route? Because I want the United

States to be a leader in clean energy technology. I don't want to leave this up to our competitors in other countries for them to reap the benefit of better technology and higher wage jobs. I want us to reap these benefits. I have seen many companies that have made their transition in the energy sector from a fossil fuel focus to renewables, and I hope that will continue to happen.

There is another area that we have incented over the last 10 years that has, I think, proven to be a good investment. Senator Hatch and I teamed up in 2007 to introduce legislation providing a \$7,500 tax credit for plug-in electric vehicles.

Now, I know that at the time people thought: Well, what is this electric vehicle market all about? But I think we can look here in 2019 and see exactly what it is about. Consumers have more choices, there are more competitors in the market, and we are reducing our dependence on fossil fuel. That is why we need to fight President Trump's budget request to take away those tax incentives for people who buy electric vehicles. We need to continue to move forward on driving down the cost.

Another area that we made progress on in the last decade was fuel efficiency for automobiles. I can tell you what that fight was like in 2007 as we struggled here to move forward. Fuel-efficiency economy increases will result in oil savings in 2030 of about 3 million barrels per day—more than we import from the Persian Gulf and Venezuela combined. So we should not roll back fuel efficiency standards for automobiles. I believe this is a red herring.

We know that fuel efficiency helps consumers to drive to work every day and to afford to fill up in a more economic way. If the Trump administration does roll back these fuel efficiency gains, owners of an average model vehicle from the year 2025 will have to fill up their gas tanks 66 times more and cost drivers over \$1,620 more than what they currently pay. So why roll them back?

Another great area of success was establishing a renewable fuel standard back in 2007 in that same bipartisan energy package that was worked on by so many Members of this institution and successfully by so many Members in this institution.

So, to me, it stands in stark contrast to where we are today in this debate, because all of the people working together—our colleagues, the late Senator Ted Stevens, and the late Senator Danny Inoué—played key roles as chairman and ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the EPW Committee, and the Energy Committee. They all added to that legislation in 2007. This bipartisan increase in expansion of the renewable fuel standard was a great way to look at homegrown fuels for the future and making up a larger source of that supply today from renewable clean energy.

So all of these show that we have made progress working together over

the last decade or so in a bipartisan way to demonstrate that this transition is necessary, that this transition can be made, that we can make it successfully without hurting our economy, and that we can drive down costs for businesses and consumers and better protect our environment. That is so, so critical.

I am so concerned about the cost of extreme weather and the impact of climate change that I asked my colleague, Senator COLLINS, to request with me, from the Government Accountability Office, what the costs of these impacts were. Why did I want that information? Because, in the Northwest we are already seeing more damage from fires that have become a constant threat every summer. We have seen a shellfish industry that has basically been threatened by warmer waters. We have seen our challenges to our coastline and changing sea levels. So we wanted that information.

The result of the study showed that current estimates for the impacts as a result of climate change would exceed \$1 trillion by 2039. These are costs that we are going to pay in response, mitigation and adaptation. I would rather get about the task of diversifying now and reducing those costs that are going to be paid out by the American taxpayer. We can do better.

So moving toward a cleaner economy off of fossil fuels is what we need to do. With today's energy infrastructure turning over every three or four decades anyways, which will take an investment of \$25 to \$30 million, making the right choices from the private sector, is with whom we need to partner.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on that, working with my colleague from the Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, and my colleague Senator MANCHIN, and all the other colleagues on that committee to help us get these strategies right.

We know the answer to this question. Moving forward on cleaner sources is better for our environment and we have made great strides in the last decade in doing so and driving better economic opportunity for both the consumers and the future energy workers of the United States.

I thank the President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, fear has become an all too prevalent quality in America's political discourse, and, unfortunately, fear is unavoidable when debating the substance of the resolution before this body today; that is, climate change, socialism, and the Green New Deal.

On entering this debate, I have a little fear in my heart as well. My fear at this moment may be just a little different than that of some of my colleagues. Unlike some of my colleagues, I am not immediately afraid of what carbon emissions unaddressed might do to our environment in the near term

future or our civilization or our planet in the next few years. Unlike others, I am not immediately afraid of what the Green New Deal will do to our economy and our government. After all, this isn't going to pass—not today, not anytime soon, certainly.

Rather, after reading the Green New Deal, I am mostly afraid of not being able to get through this speech with a straight face. I rise today to consider the Green New Deal with the seriousness it deserves. This is, of course, a picture of former President Ronald Reagan naturally firing a machine gun while riding on the back of a dinosaur. You will notice a couple of important features here.

First of all, the rocket launcher is strapped to President Reagan's back, and then the stirring unmistakable patriotism of the velociraptor holding up a tattered American flag, a symbol of all it means to be an American.

Now, critics might quibble with this depiction of the climactic battle of the Cold War because, while awesome, in real life there was no climactic battle. There was no battle with or without velociraptors. The Cold War, as we all know, was won without firing a shot. But that quibble actually serves our purposes here today because this image has as much to do with overcoming communism in the 20th century as the Green New Deal has to do with overcoming climate change in the 21st century.

The aspirations of the proposal have been called radical. They have been called extreme, but, mostly, they are ridiculous. There isn't a single serious idea here—not one. To illustrate, let me highlight two of the most prominent goals produced by the plan's authors.

Goal No. 1, the Green New Deal calls essentially for the elimination of airplanes. Now, this might seem merely ambitious for politicians who represent the densely populated northeastern United States, but how is it supposed to work for our fellow citizens who don't live somewhere between Washington, DC, and Boston? In a future without air travel, how are we supposed to get around the vast expanses of, say, Alaska during the winter? Well, I will tell you how.

Tauntauns is that beloved species of reptile mammals native to the ice planet of Hoth. Now, while perhaps not as efficient in some ways as airplanes or as snowmobiles, these hairy bipedal species of space lizards offer their own unique benefits. Not only are tauntauns carbon neutral, but according to a report a long time ago and issued far, far away, they may even be fully recyclable and useable for their warmth, especially on a cold night.

What about Hawaii? Isolated, 2,000 miles out into the Pacific Ocean, under the Green New Deal's effective airplane prohibition, how are people there supposed to get to and from the mainland and how are they supposed to maintain that significant portion of their economy that is based on tourism?

At that distance, swimming would, of course, be out of the question, and jet skis are notorious gas guzzlers. No, all residents of Hawaii would be left with is this. This is a picture of Aquaman, a superhero from the undersea kingdom of Atlantis but, notably here, a founding member of the Super Friends.

I draw your attention to the 20-foot impressive seahorse he is riding. Under the Green New Deal, this is probably Hawaii's best bet. Now, I am the first to admit that a massive fleet of giant, highly trained seahorses would be cool and it would be really, really awesome, but we have to consider a few things. We have no idea about scalability or domestic capacity in this sector. The last thing we want is to ban all airplanes and only then find out that China or Russia may have already established strategic hippocampus programs designed to cut the United States out of the global market. We must not allow and cannot tolerate a giant seahorse gap.

For goal No. 2, the Green New Deal anticipates the elimination of all cows. Talking points released by the sponsors of the resolution the day it was introduced cited the goal of "fully get[ting] rid of"—and I will paraphrase a little bit here—"flatulating cows."

Now, I share their concern, but honestly, I think you have to remember that if the cows smell bad, just wait until they get a whiff of the seahorses.

Back to the cattle, I have a chart to illustrate this trend. As you can see on the left, these little cows represent the bovine population of America today. On the right is the future population under the Green New Deal. We would go from about 94 million cows to zero cows—no more milk, no more cheese, no more steak, and no more hamburgers.

Over the State work period last week, I visited some farms to find out for myself what Utah's own bovine community might think about the Green New Deal. Every cow I spoke to said the same thing: Boo.

The authors of this proposal would protest that these goals are not actually part of the Green New Deal but were merely included in supporting documents accidentally sent out by the office of the lead sponsor in the House of Representatives. This only makes my point. The supporters of the Green New Deal want Americans to trust them to reorganize our entire society and our entire economy, to restructure our very way of life, and they couldn't even figure out how to send out the right press release.

The Green New Deal is not a serious policy document because it is not a policy document at all; it is, in fact, an aesthetic one. The resolution is not an agenda of solutions; it is a token of elite tribal identity, and endorsing it, a public act of piety for the chic and woke. And on those embarrassing terms, it is already a resounding success. As Speaker PELOSI herself put it, "The green dream or whatever they

call it, nobody knows what it is, but they're for it, right?" Right.

Critics will no doubt chastise me for not taking climate change seriously, but, please, nothing could be further from the truth. No Utahn needs to hear pious lectures about the gravity of climate change from politicians from other States, for it was only in 2016, as viewers of the Syfy network will well remember, when climate change hit home in Utah, when our own State was struck not simply by a tornado but by a tornado with sharks in it.

These images are from the indispensable documentary film "Sharknado 4." They captured the precise moment when one of the tornado sharks crashed through the window of Utah's Governor, Gary Herbert. A true Utah hero and a fine American, Governor Herbert—who, by the way, is an incredible athlete and expert tennis player—bravely fought off the animal with the tennis racket that he keeps by his desk precisely for occasions such as these.

So let's be real clear. Climate change is no joke, but the Green New Deal is a joke. It is the legislative equivalent of Austin Powers' Dr. Evil demanding sharks with "frickin' lasers" on their heads.

The Green New Deal is not the solution to climate change. It is not even part of the solution. In fact, it is part of the problem. The solution to climate change won't be found in political posturing or virtue signaling like this. It won't be found in the Federal Government at all. Do you know where the solution can be found? In churches, in wedding chapels, and in maternity wards across the country and around the world. This is the real solution to climate change: babies.

Climate change is an engineering problem—not social engineering but the real kind. It is a challenge of creativity, ingenuity, and most of all, technical innovation. Problems of human imagination are not solved by more laws; they are solved by more humans, more people, meaning bigger markets for innovation. More babies will mean more forward-looking adults, the sort we need to tackle long-term, large-scale problems.

American babies in particular are likely going to be wealthier, better educated, and more conservation-minded than children raised in still industrializing countries. As economist Tyler Cowen recently wrote on this very point, addressing this very topic, "by having more children, you are making your nation more populous—thus boosting its capacity to solve [climate change]."

Finally, children are a mark of the kind of personal, communal, and societal optimism that is the true prerequisite for meeting national and global challenges together.

The courage needed to solve climate change is nothing compared with the courage needed to start a family. The true heroes of this story aren't politicians, and they aren't social media ac-

tivists; they are moms and dads and the little boys and girls whom they are at this very moment putting down for naps or helping with their homework, building tree houses, and teaching them how to tie their shoes.

The planet does not need for us to think globally and act locally so much as it needs us to think family and act personally. The solution to climate change is not this unserious resolution that we are considering this week in the Senate but, rather, the serious business of human flourishing. The solution to so many of our problems at all times and in all places is to fall in love, get married, and have some kids.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues in lifting up the voices of countless people in my home State of Washington and around the Nation who are calling out for Congress to truly address the climate change crisis.

I am glad the Republicans have decided to take at least a short break from their hurried ideological campaign to pack our Federal courts with as many conservative judges as possible. It is inexcusable that they are now choosing to play silly political games instead of working with us to make progress on the many challenges our constituents are facing right now.

Let me be clear. Democrats welcome a robust, fact-based discussion on the Senate floor about what we as a nation must do to combat climate change. That is not what today's vote is, nor what it was meant to be. From the beginning, this vote was scheduled by Republicans to throw red meat to their rightwing base and an extra bone to Big Oil and Gas. But, if anything, what today's vote makes painfully obvious is that while Democrats are here at the table ready to get to work to tackle one of the most urgent issues of our time, Republicans don't have a vision, much less any solution for how we are going to reverse the course of climate change and prevent future damage to our planet. On the contrary, many Republicans won't even admit this is a problem, even after the Trump administration itself released its own report detailing how climate change has damaged our planet and will continue to do so if unaddressed.

Democrats are all on the same page. We believe in the science, we believe climate change is one of our planet's most urgent crises, and we all believe that now is the time to take action before our planet suffers even more irreparable harm. Democrats have long recognized climate change is a threat not just to our environment but to our economy, our community, our health, and even our way of life.

As a voice for Washington State, whose residents are being threatened summer after summer with ever-worsening wildfires that destroy more property and cost more money to contain

and prevent every year, and as a grandmother who wants to leave a better world for the next generation, this is personal to me. But it is not just me or Senate Democrats; our families back in our States understand the risk of climate change, too, and they are very eager for their government to take action against the immediate threat that it poses.

I was back home last week meeting with leaders in our State capital of Olympia. They are working on a suite of progressive policies aimed at tackling climate change. Every day, I hear from young people all over my State about how they want to inherit a clean, healthy planet. The only way we can ensure that happens is by listening to the science and working to do something now while we still can make a difference.

I am inspired by my constituents—especially the students. I understand why they are so passionate. They get it. They know how serious climate change is for today and tomorrow, and they get that we don't have any time to waste. But they cannot do it alone, and neither can Washington State. It is going to take a national effort, a Federal effort to give this issue the attention it deserves, and Congress should play a major role in making sure it is treated like the emergency it is.

Unfortunately, when I turn to my Republican friends in moments like this, when we could be having a real conversation about what we should be doing today to tackle climate change, I am reminded that this isn't a debate made in good faith. If Republicans were truly interested in addressing climate change, they would have stood against President Trump's reckless efforts to roll back clean air standards or, even better, stopped him from pulling the United States out of the Paris climate agreement and weakening our leadership in the global fight against climate change. And those are just a few things.

Now we have some Democrats and Republicans coming together to protect our environment. The recent passage of the public lands package is a good example. But when it comes to the issue of climate change and having a discussion about what it would take to really address it with the seriousness and the urgency it deserves, Republicans apparently only have time for partisan political games, which is so unfortunate because it is long past time for them to recognize that climate change is an urgent and serious issue. It is going to take all of us working together to prevent future generations from suffering the worst of its impact.

Democrats are ready and willing to debate Republicans on the facts, about the risks of not tackling climate change as aggressively as possible, and I can only urge Republicans to drop these games. Listen to your constituents. Listen to the facts. Do the right thing and work with us to address this

critical issue before it truly is too late. Thank you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the recess: VAN HOLLEN, CARDIN, STABENOW, SCHATZ, MARKEY, and HEINRICH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am on the floor today with a very simple question: What is the Republican agenda for tackling many of the major challenges we face today in the United States of America?

We know what our Republican colleagues are against. In fact, just yesterday, the Trump administration asked a Federal court of appeals to strike down the entire Affordable Care Act, which would eliminate affordable healthcare for tens of millions of Americans and strip away protections for people with preexisting conditions.

So that is what Republicans are against, the Affordable Care Act. What are they for? Since January of this year, the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has already passed major legislation on some important issues for our country. They passed a major bill to protect and strengthen the integrity of our election system and the health of our democracy. It includes lots of provisions, including one to get rid of secret money in politics, because, like the American public, we believe that Americans have a right to know who is spending tens of millions of dollars to try to influence their votes.

Why not get rid of secret money and dark money in politics? That is what the House bill does. That bill is right here in the Senate now, but are we going to get a chance to vote on that? We are asking the majority leader for a vote on that bill that is sitting right here in the Senate.

The House also passed sweeping legislation to address gun safety issues. Specifically, the legislation calls for a universal criminal background check to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people. This is overwhelmingly supported by the American public. Why would we want to keep a big loophole in the law that allows dangerous people to get guns and commit violent acts with those guns? That bill is also here in the Senate, but there is no sign that we are going to vote on that bill.

Instead, the Republican leader is bringing up the nonbinding resolution—the Green New Deal resolution—which calls for ambitious goals to tackle climate change, which has created a lot of important momentum in our country to address this issue. Yet our Republican colleagues are not bringing up this bill because they want to do something about climate change;

they are bringing it up with the express purpose of defeating it and playing political games.

It is a very simple question. We know what you are against. You are against the Green New Deal resolution. But what are you for when it comes to addressing climate change? The science is overwhelming. It mounts every day. Americans can see what is happening with their own eyes in the form of extreme weather events.

Former Senator Bob Kerrey from Nebraska just wrote over the weekend:

The disastrous flooding this month in Nebraska and much of the upper Midwest is a reminder of several important truths. First, weather and climate are not the same thing. Climate affects weather, not the other way around.

If our Republican colleagues don't agree with our own American scientists at NASA and NOAA, scientists throughout the country and around the world, my goodness, I would hope they would believe our military leaders who just last year put out a report. I am reading from a release that says: "New Pentagon Survey: Climate Change-Related Risks to 50% of Military Infrastructure."

The folks at the Pentagon seem to recognize the costs and harm of climate change. Yet our Republican colleagues do nothing but play games with this issue.

Ironically, this week we are going to be taking up a disaster relief bill. I think the pricetag for that bill is \$13 billion to \$14 billion. This is just one of many disaster relief bills we will handle.

We all know that we will always have natural disasters, but we also know from the science that they are more intense, more extreme, and more costly because of climate change, and they happen more often because of climate change.

Our Republican colleagues are happy to ask taxpayers to shell out more and more money to pay for the harm and damage of climate change through extreme weather events, but they are not willing to consider any legislation on this floor to actually do something about it and stop the rising costs, harm, and damage.

If you don't like the nonbinding resolution of the Green New Deal, why not support another nonbinding resolution put forth by Senator CARPER and every Democrat? It is very simple. No. 1, climate change is real; No. 2, human activity is the dominant cause; and No. 3, Congress should take immediate action to do something about it. That must be a really radical proposal for our Republican colleagues, but only one Republican Senator has signed on, which just shows the incredible hypocrisy of this entire exercise.

The Republican leader is bringing up a measure that calls for ambitious goals. I think those are good goals. I support it, but he wants to defeat it. Yet he has not a single idea of his own to address this issue.

This week, I intend, along with Congressman DON BEYER in the House, to reintroduce a bill called the cap and dividend bill. It is very simple: The polluter pays, just as we have handled environmental issues in the past. We will put a price on carbon pollution, and by doing so, we will create more incentives for investment in clean energy technology, renewable energy technology, energy efficiency. We propose to take the proceeds from that “polluter pays” fee and rebate the entire thing to the American people. As a result, according to the studies of the University of Massachusetts, 80 percent of the American people, at the end of the day, will actually see more money in their pocket than before, and we will begin to address the ravages of climate change.

I urge my colleagues to actually do something when it comes to climate change.

I yield the floor to Senator STABENOW from Michigan, who has been a leader on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Maryland for his powerful words, as well as all of my colleagues who are here for their leadership on this incredibly important issue.

Climate change is real. Carbon pollution is real. It is having a real effect in my State of Michigan. We can and must take real action to do something about it. It is not a time for playing political games. Frankly, the stakes are just plain too high. We should be coming together around a resolution that our entire Democratic caucus has put together that simply says this: Climate change is real; climate change is caused by humans; Congress must act on climate change. Let's start there. We can't even get bipartisan support for this, which is so basic. Let's start there and then take specific action.

I was very encouraged a few weeks ago when Chairwoman MURKOWSKI and Ranking Member MANCHIN on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on climate change. It was the first one since I have been on the committee. It may be the first one ever to talk about the incredibly disastrous impacts of what is happening in Alaska, as well as around our country. We should be working together across the aisle to solve this big problem and to come together with specific actions after the hearing. I am looking forward to that.

Instead, the Republican leader is playing “gotcha” politics with an issue that is hurting real people from Bristol Bay to the Missouri River Basin to the Great Lakes. Frankly, it is insulting, and the people who are having their livelihoods upended deserve better.

You don't have to spend much time in Michigan to see the effects, unfortunately. The Great Lakes Basin has warmed more over the last 30 years than the rest of the contiguous United

States. That is not a position we want to be in.

Precipitation is up 11 percent since 1900. That means more flooding. Flooding is worse. Between 2040 and 2060—which actually is not that far away, particularly when we are looking at our children and grandchildren—Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula could see 500 percent more 100-year floods.

Heat waves in Michigan have tripled compared to the long-term average. It is estimated that by 2040 the dangerously hot days could cause 760 people in the Detroit metro area alone to die each year when they otherwise wouldn't. Rising energy demands will require more than \$6 billion in infrastructure improvements. Cold water fish species could simply die off, threatening our \$5 billion per year sport fishing industry.

Agricultural productivity could fall to 1980 levels by 2050. Keep in mind that by then, our planet's population will be double what it was in 1980. If agricultural productivity is falling at that point, that will be a disaster, not only for the United States and our people but for around the world.

These changes are already hurting our people in Michigan and our economy. Just talk to a cherry grower who has lost an entire crop because of warm weather in February—which causes his trees to bloom too early, and then the freeze comes and wipes out all the cherry trees—or a family whose fishing and boating business is threatened by invasive species and toxic algal blooms or the family who lost their 12-year-old son when flooding caused the basement of their home to collapse.

Perhaps you are more motivated by the bottom line. If that is the case, you should just talk to insurance company executives. Their companies paid out a record \$135 billion from natural disasters in 2017 alone. That is nearly three times as much as the historic annual average. By the way, after we finish voting on this resolution that the Republican leader is bringing up, we are going to be asked to vote on a disaster package to help States and communities that have been impacted by carbon pollution and climate change. We will only see more of that if we don't take real action.

It is not time for words. It is time for action. It is time to focus like a laser on reducing carbon pollution, reversing the damage that has already been done and creating good jobs at home.

I am so pleased that Michigan right now is leading in green new jobs in the Midwest. We need to ensure that the United States—not China—is the global leader on advanced transportation technologies like electric and hydrogen vehicles. We need to invest more in renewable energy and the research that is making it more affordable all the time.

I realize my time is up. Let me just say, in closing, we can do something about this. We have done this before.

When we discovered acid rain about 40 years ago, we put together a market-based program and were able to fix that issue. CFCs, chemicals that break down into chlorine and eat away at the ozone layer—today, that hole in the ozone is closing because of actions we took together. Now is the time to take real action on carbon pollution, agree to these basic principles, and then move forward together on behalf of our children and grandchildren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I got my first taste of politics when I was 16 years old. I was worried that my favorite surf spot was going to be turned into condominiums, so I joined the Save Sandy Beach Coalition. Adults around me told me that I was too young to take action. They told me that the adults had it under control, but I didn't listen. It took several years, but with lots of grassroots energy, the Governor of the State of Hawaii eventually signed legislation that preserved the Sandy Beach coastline for generations.

America's proud history of social change is about young people who don't take no for an answer; they take action. Some of the most inspiring movements in our history have been led by young people. They were the ones who first refused to leave their seats in segregated lunch counters, who filled campus squares demanding an end to apartheid, who marched in the streets against police brutality, and staged walkouts to protest gun violence.

Once again, young people are standing up because the adults are blowing it. On March 15, tens of thousands of kids walked out of school in hundreds of cities and 130 countries demanding action on climate. This isn't a school project for them. It is a fight for the world they will inhabit. They see what is happening around the world. The climate is changing, and it is getting worse, and we need to take action.

In 2017, the United States experienced 16 disasters that cost \$1 billion or more: 9.8 million acres burned by wildfire; 30,000 people homeless; 200,000 homes and businesses damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Harvey; the Florida Keys devastated by Irma; thousands dead, and an entire island's infrastructure destroyed by Hurricane Maria. The year 2017 set a new record for the cost of extreme weather events.

Last year was not better. There were 14 separate disasters that cost \$1 billion or more, including the largest, deadliest wildfires that California has ever seen. According to NOAA, the wildfires did more than \$40 billion worth of damage. So in these two record-setting years, climate change has cost billions in personal property and taxpayer dollars. And they have cost lives.

Now the Midwest is flooding. I don't mean that as a political statement or a rhetorical flourish. The Midwest is

flooding. In another once-in-a-lifetime storm, which is happening more and more frequently, the levees and systems built to deal with flooding have failed because they were built for a climate that no longer exists. Communities are underwater, and people are stranded in their homes right now, at this very moment. In Nebraska alone, the damage is already more than \$1 billion. Livestock, crops, infrastructure have been destroyed. Soil that is needed not just for this season but for the future has been destroyed. This is the moment at which Congress should be examining the costs of climate change and what to do about it.

I have to say something about the senior Senator from Utah. That was appalling. I understand that we want to make jokes and that we want to be clever and that we want to have a clip to put on Facebook or Instagram or whatever, but that was appalling. This is the crisis of our generation, and it is not a joke. He spent time creating images not of what we ought to do—not of his conservative proposals around climate change—but in being consistent with what Leader MCCONNELL wants the Republican Party to do, which is to not engage in the substance and to turn this into a joke.

I have to say, on behalf of everybody in Hawaii, on behalf of the young people who care about this, and on behalf of the people across the planet who want climate action, this isn't funny. This requires the party in charge of the U.S. Senate to take it seriously.

The good news is, we are starting to have an engagement about climate change. I saw the senior Senator from Tennessee engage a bit and say we should have a Manhattan Project for solving climate change. Good enough. I saw Senator ISAKSON, 3 or 4 weeks ago, talk about how we ought to take climate action. I also know the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee cares about this issue. So there is an opportunity for engagement but not so long as Leader MCCONNELL thinks this whole thing is worthy of nothing more than being a joke.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, we don't have any more time to waste on political stunts, on climate denial or, for that matter, on climate "delay-al." Enough with the straw man arguments from my Republican colleagues about hamburgers and "Sharknado." Is that really the best they can do?

Climate change is real, and our pollution is causing its devastating impacts. Those are just facts.

As an engineer, I am certain our capacity to confront this challenge rests heavily on our ability to make policy that is actually driven by facts, by data, and by the best available science. That science provides us with clear and indisputable evidence that the destructive wildfires, hurricanes, and flooding we have seen are directly linked to human-caused climate change.

We are running out of time. It is past time for us to start implementing real solutions to eliminate our carbon pollution and mitigate the most devastating effects of climate change, and we must create a managed transition to an economy that is run on 100 percent clean energy. I encourage us to look to what just happened in my home State of New Mexico to see that this is possible, that it is not pie in the sky.

For more than a century, New Mexico has been a major part of our carbon-based economy—from coal, to oil, to gas. Yet, just last week, our new Governor, Michelle Lujan Grisham, signed into law sweeping legislation to move our State toward being a 100-percent carbon-free power sector by 2045. I am enormously proud of the hard work that has led to there being this landmark legislation. This major transition to clean energy will change our State and our economy for the better.

New Mexicans will save money in their monthly bills. Along the way, we will create thousands of new, high-paying jobs across our State, including in the communities that will be impacted by this transition. We are already seeing the massive economic potential of clean energy with the enormous wind farms and solar plants that are coming on line all across our State. Every new project brings new jobs and brings millions—sometimes billions—of dollars of investment.

That is the kind of action we need to take in the U.S. Senate. The United States can and must lead the way in this transition. That is why we are challenging Majority Leader MCCONNELL to put an end to the political stunts.

Leader MCCONNELL, bring your solutions to the floor. Let's get to work together.

I yield the remainder of my time to Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, who has been an incredible leader on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I will speak very briefly.

Rhode Island is a coastal State, and we are now looking at maps that our coastal agency, the local university, and the scientists at NOAA tell us will create a new face of Rhode Island in the decades ahead if we don't address climate change. We turn into an archipelago. We lose enormous amounts of waterfront, and as a small State, frankly, we don't have a lot to give back to the ocean. This is deadly serious for us.

I join in my colleague's sense of offense that the other side thinks this is something funny. This is not funny for Rhode Islanders; this is deadly real. You may disagree with us, but the one thing that, I think, we are owed on this subject is sincerity, but there is nothing sincere about the vote that is going to be held on the Green New Deal.

This is a vote that will be based on a cartoon version of the Green New Deal

that was cooked up by the Koch brothers, who have their oily hands all over this mess, and it was instructed by the fossil fuel mouthpiece of the Wall Street Journal's editorial page. It took only days for the majority leader to hop up and do the bidding of these farces.

We are owed better than this. If you disagree with our measures, fine. Have one of your own. We have five or six different bills and strategies that we are willing to work on. This is the time to be serious, to be sincere, and to quit mocking a concern that across the board is recognized as real. In fact, there is not a Republican here who can't go to his home State university and be told about the truth of climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Republican leader is bringing the Green New Deal resolution up for a vote on the floor of the Senate. What the Republican leader, however, is not doing is allowing us to have any hearings, any witnesses, any science, any evidence of the massive destruction in our country.

Just from fires and flooding over the last 2 years, there has been \$400 billion worth of damage. None of that will ever be heard out here. None of it was heard in a committee because the Republican leader is making a sham of this process. This is not the serious process this incredible issue deserves. The United Nations has made it clear that climate change is now an existential threat to our country and to the planet.

Notwithstanding the incredible damage that is being done to our planet, the Republicans' concern is that the Green New Deal is an existential threat to the Koch brothers, to ExxonMobil, and to all of those polluting companies that do not want to end business as usual. The Republican leader does not want a hearing at which we will learn that we now have 350,000 people who are in the wind and solar industries and that we have 350,000 blue-collar jobs—electricians, roofers, steelworkers—in our country. The Green New Deal would supercharge that even more to our having millions of clean energy jobs in our country.

We can save all of creation by engaging in massive job creation, which is the core of the Green New Deal, and we can do it in a way that ensures we protect people in our country. We have gone now from 80,000 solar jobs to 240,000 solar jobs in just the last 10 years. We have gone from 2,500 all-electric vehicles to 1 million all-electric vehicles in just 10 years. There have been 500,000 new electric vehicles sold this year in the United States—1 year—after only having 2,000 of them sold 10 years ago. We went from 1,000 megawatts of solar capacity to 65,000 megawatts in 2018. That is a revolution in 10 years. We have gone from 25,000

megawatts of wind to 98,000 megawatts of wind in 10 years.

That is the revolution the Koch brothers are afraid of, and that is the revolution the polluters want to stop because it is the existential threat to their business model. That is what the fight is all about out here—the Koch brothers v. the Green New Deal. It is one business model against another, and our business model is the job creation engine of this generation for blue-collar jobs.

Now, who paid for the Republican study that they all came out on the floor to use? It was paid for by the Koch brothers. They put together what they believe are the costs of the Green New Deal. This was not some private, independent group. The Koch brothers themselves paid for the study that the Republicans have used out here on the floor.

The hearings, if the majority leader had ever ordered them to have been conducted, would have just picked out some of the items regarding how much harm had been done to our planet and to our own country in the last 2 years—\$24 billion from western wildfires in 2018, \$24 billion from Hurricane Michael, \$24 billion from Hurricane Florence, \$18 billion from western wildfires in 2017, \$91 billion from Hurricane Maria, and on and on and on—Hurricane Harvey, \$127.5 billion.

This is all climate related. We pay the price for this. There is no exempting America from having to pick up the costs. Shouldn't we be investing in job creation? Shouldn't we be investing in this incredible change that is already taking place in our economy?

The Green New Deal is not just a resolution; it is a revolution that is taking place across our country. That is why people are rising up all across our country. It is because they know we can do this and because they know this is a job-creation engine that absolutely can create millions of jobs and that can absolutely begin the process of having America, once again, be the leader on this issue.

The denier in chief sits in the White House. The denier in chief addressed the United States at the State of the Union for an hour and 20 minutes just 7 weeks ago, but he did not mention climate change and did not mention clean energy jobs. That is why we are in this fight. We are in the fight because, if we don't lead, the rest of the world will not follow. You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You can't tell China and you can't tell India what to do if you yourself are not leading. We are the United States of America.

President Kennedy challenged our country to have a mission to the Moon. He said in his speech at Rice University that we would have to invent new metals, new alloys, and propulsion systems that did not exist. He said we would have to bring that mission safely back from the Moon through heat that was half the intensity of the Sun and

get it completed within 10 years. We did that as a nation. We can do this as well. We can deploy these technologies; we can invent new technologies; and we can create millions of jobs within our country because we are bold—because we are a country that can do it.

The President is, for all intents and purposes, John F. Kennedy in reverse. He says we can't do it. He says we should not accept this challenge. Ladies and gentlemen, the Green New Deal is our accepting the challenge, and we are looking forward to this debate today and every day until election day of 2020. We are going to inject this issue into the Presidential and congressional races of 2020 in a way that ensures that unlike in 2016, when Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton were not asked a single question about climate change, the candidates will be asked every day about what their plans are.

We say to the Republican leader: Do you believe in the science? Do you believe it is an existential threat? If you do, where is your plan? Where is the Republican plan to deal with the science of climate change?

If you do not believe it is a threat, then, say it. If you do not believe the science, then, say it. But if you do believe the science, then, all we say to you is this: Where is your plan to deal with this challenge?

President Kennedy responded to the challenge of the Soviet Union controlling outer space, and we succeeded. What is the plan of this Republican era to deal with the challenge of climate, an existential threat to our planet?

We thank you for your attention.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

S.J. RES. 9

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we shortly will be voting on cloture on a Senate resolution.

As I understand it, a Senate resolution in regards to a policy issue is basically trying to express the Senate's collective views on a policy issue without implementing the legislation itself. If we are going to take up such a resolution, we should take up one that can get broad consensus here in the Senate. Although the Green New Deal has support, it certainly will not have consensus in this body at this time.

Therefore, I urge the leader to bring up S.J. Res. 9, introduced by my colleague Senator CARPER, which deals with climate change with three specific issues that I think all of us should be able to agree on: one, that climate change is real and it is happening; second, that our conduct here on Earth is a major factor in accelerating climate change's activities, leading to the types of extreme weather we have seen

around the world; and, third, that it is urgent that we take action to mitigate the impact of climate change.

Climate change is real. I represent the State of Maryland, with 3,000 miles of shoreline in my State. I see it in flooding and shoreline erosion. I see the impact it has on the Chesapeake Bay, which is iconic to my State and to our economy. Climate change is having an impact—a negative impact. I see it in communities such as Ellicott City, which experienced two 100-year floods within 20 months, just recently, and cost loss of life and property. I see the impact it has on our environment and on our economy.

Clearly, our activities are having a significant impact on accelerating climate change. Carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and the use of fossil fuels have had an impact on accelerating that. We use too much energy, and we get too much of our energy from sources that are not friendly toward the issue of greenhouse gas emissions.

Third is the urgency. An October 2018 report from the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change made clear that it is urgent that we deal with climate change now and that science tells us that we can reverse the most extreme impact of climate change. We can mitigate the impact of climate change if we take action—if we act now—on this issue.

The Trump administration is an outlier in the global community in dealing with the realities of climate change. Every other nation in the world—every other nation in the world—has acknowledged that we need to act as a civilized world, that we need to work together, and that there is no geographical boundary as to dealing with climate change.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change met in December of 2015. I was there with 9 of my colleagues, in Paris, where 195 nations agreed to deal with climate change. I was proud to be part of the U.S. delegation. Now we have left those discussions, and we are alone.

This is too important and too urgent of an issue to play partisan games with, and that is exactly what the majority leader is trying to do today. We need to commit to work together, Democrats and Republicans, in the U.S. Senate to restore the U.S. leadership on this key issue, knowing full well that America's full leadership is desperately needed in order to deal with these issues, and we need to make sure that we take action.

More than passing a resolution, let's start with legislation that will really make a difference on climate change and commit much stronger to renewable energy, rather than using fossil fuels to the extent that we do today. Let's put a price on carbon to allow the U.S. market economy to figure out the solution for reducing the amount of fossil fuels. Let's commit to conservation in our buildings and the way we

deal with auto fuel efficiencies. That type of action will make a real difference and will follow in the best traditions of the U.S. Senate in providing leadership for the United States to work with the global community to solve a global problem.

I urge my colleagues: Let's work together on issues to make a difference and stop playing partisan politics.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and was reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bade nomination?

Mr. DAINES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Sinema
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Leahy	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	McSally	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Young

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Udall

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid

upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE A GREEN NEW DEAL—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session to resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last month our colleague, the Senator from New York, the Democratic leader, said:

So when the Republican leader says he wants to bring the Green New Deal resolution up for a vote, I say: Go for it. Bring it on.

Well, here we are. Senators will soon have a chance to vote on the Green New Deal, and we have already seen a lot of confusion and more than a little waffling from our friends on the other side of the aisle, some apparently confused on exactly what they should do on a resolution they themselves proposed.

When it was announced, the senior Senator from Massachusetts quickly pledged her support, as did the junior Senator from New Jersey. But I find it pretty curious that some of our colleagues who were among the first to join these Senators and voice their support for this proposal are now among those saying they will simply vote present—present.

Even more interesting is one of the bill's authors, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who called this vote "sabotage."

Ordinarily, when proposing a piece of legislation around here, one is tickled pink when the majority leader schedules it for a vote, but somehow some of our colleagues will vote present—neither yea nor nay—and others claim it is sabotage. As the vote approaches, we have seen many of our Democratic friends running for the hills, trying to provide space between them and this issue.

The Green New Deal is chock full of utopian ideas but completely devoid of concrete plans to implement any of its overreaching policies. Even the name is a little disorienting because the Green New Deal is not just a new radical environmental policy; it is that, but it is more. It encompasses much

more than that with Medicare for All, free college, and guaranteed jobs. I might add, parenthetically, you might as well throw in free beer and pizza too.

What has been billed as an economy invigorator and job innovator in order to lift up the middle class is really anything but. The bottom line of this proposal is a solution in search of a problem. It is about a message; it is not about finding solutions to real problems.

Maybe it is useful to take a step back to look at what we have already done in this Congress to help the middle class and to generate job growth. Over the last 2 years, we have worked to roll back burdensome regulations left over from the previous administration and make much needed reforms to our outdated Tax Code—the first time in 30 years.

My constituents in Texas have taken notice, and I have heard from many of them who have seen an increase in their take-home pay, thanks to the tax reform bill, for example. Small businesses in Texas have been able to help give their employees more benefits. For example, Village Foods and Pharmacy in Bryan, TX, said that because of the tax reform bill, they were able to provide employee bonuses and implement a 401(k) retirement program, something they were previously unable to do. In San Antonio, my hometown, Hinee Gourmet Coffee said they used their tax cut savings to give their employees raises, as well as to increase employee benefits and upgrade their equipment.

The unemployment rate in Texas remains at 3.8 percent, near its historic 43-year low and on par with the national average. The Lone Star State has added 268,000-plus jobs since February 2018. If you go to Midland, TX, and the Permian Basin, the unemployment rate is 2.1 percent. Labor is tight, and employers are looking for workers because the economy is booming, and they need good people to fill these unfilled jobs.

I think my State is proof positive that when the government gets out of the way, the economy can flourish. That is why we have seen so many people flooding into Texas to take advantage of the low taxes and abundant job opportunities. It is also why I find it so ironic that a few weeks ago one of the Green New Deal creators, the Congresswoman from New York, chose South by Southwest in Austin to peddle her socialist agenda, because if implemented, the Green New Deal would wipe out most of this prosperity. It would cut job growth; it would dramatically increase taxes and cripple our red-hot economy.

One group has estimated that in order to achieve just one portion of this radical agenda—a net-zero emissions transportation system—the annual cost to families would be about \$2,000. That is just for part of the Green New Deal.

Add in another Green New Deal proposal, and it gets more expensive—to

the tune of \$26,000. No, I am not talking about somebody's annual paycheck. I am talking about the estimated cost for families to implement their universal healthcare program that would wipe out all employer-provided coverage and bankrupt Medicare. Families in Texas and across the country would be on the hook for more than \$65,000 a year in order to finance the Green New Deal's expensive and extravagant promises.

Unfortunately, the list of expenses doesn't stop there. The Green New Deal calls for a move to 100-percent clean and renewable energy in just 10 years. Right now, Texas generates about 19 percent of our energy from renewables. We like renewables in Texas, but there needs to be a baseload that provides energy when the sun doesn't shine and the wind doesn't blow. The Green New Deal has no plan for how it expects States to actually scale up their number from the 19 percent Texas currently generates from renewables to this 100 percent—no plan at all.

Without a plan, Texans can forget about electricity that is affordable and reliable; instead, they need to ready themselves for electric bills that could jump to as high as \$3,800 a year.

Instead of focusing on a grab bag of government mandates and over-reaching regulations that we know would bankrupt our country, we need to follow existing models that point a way toward success. We know what works, and, if you will forgive me, I would suggest the Texas model is a good one. Our model values collaboration and partnership with the private sector in order to create affordable and cutting-edge solutions. We are all about innovation and experimentation. That is how we come up with better, smarter, more efficient, and more effective ideas to deal with problems. It is a model based on innovation that has been the backbone of our successful economy. The last thing we need is another Federal Government wet blanket that puts a damper on all of the great innovation and activity that has caused our economy to boom.

Texas is really the best example of this with companies like NET Power and NRG Energy, which are leading the way in innovation. NET Power, which has a plant in La Porte, outside of Houston, has developed a first-of-its-kind power system that generates affordable electricity from natural gas with zero emissions—zero emissions.

Our State is also proof positive that one can promote innovation while harnessing the traditional power of oil and gas development. In other words, we can be pro-energy, pro-innovation, pro-growth, and pro-environment. But if we implemented the Green New Deal, we wouldn't be talking only about the added costs and expenses to families; hundreds of thousands of people would lose their jobs and our export economy, which helps fuel our booming economy, would sharply decline. Our energy independence would evaporate, but our

need for and reliance on natural gas, coal, and oil would remain. It would focus our efforts back on being more dependent on foreign energy sources rather than generating them domestically. I am sure Russia, for example, would be happy about that.

Some have called the Green New Deal the road map for solving climate change, but to be a road map, you have to have clear points on how to get from point A to point B. You actually need to be clear-eyed about the problem you are trying to solve, and you need details in terms of how you actually hope to get to where you want to go. But this proposal is a pie-in-the-sky, unattainable end destination with no details of how to arrive there.

So as the Senate prepares to vote on the Green New Deal, I ask that we keep in mind that our constituents didn't send us here to Washington to vote present. That is a copout. Voting present? Give me a break. People ought to vote their conviction. They ought to vote yes or no. To hide behind some copout vote like present is just to take the easy way out, and it is sad that appears to be the road many of our friends across the aisle are about to take, rather than doing the job they have been sent here to do and working with us to come up with actual, tangible solutions that can become law. I know that if we just tried a little bit harder and avoided these sorts of ideological talking points, we could actually solve more of these problems and ours could remain a strong economy. We could create jobs. We can maintain our energy self-sufficiency here in America, and we can deal with environmental emissions concerns. We can find solutions to those problems, but one big power grab by the Federal Government that ruins the economy, bankrupts us, and, frankly, doesn't really make things better is a bad deal for Texans, and I believe a bad deal for Americans.

Unsurprisingly, I intend to vote no, and I hope my colleagues will join me in doing the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I stand today with my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to talk about the real impacts of climate change.

Climate change is real. It is happening in our communities, and it is harming our country. It is impacting our economy, and it is threatening the future of our kids.

You can see it clearly in my home State of Nevada. The last 4 years have

been the hottest ever on record, and we are on track to break that record again in 2019. In Nevada, we are seeing longer, more dangerous heat waves, prolonged droughts, and more severe wildfire seasons. Just this past year, more than 660,000 acres of private, Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Forest Service land burned in 138 fires starting in June of 2018. The biggest fire in our State's history and also one of the biggest in our country's history happened just this past year. The Martin Fire burned more than 439,000 acres. That is an area about five times the size of Las Vegas.

I have heard from Nevada ranchers who are facing the tough choice to abandon the land their families have worked for generations due to the cost of recovery and the threat of even worse fire seasons. I have met with parents in Las Vegas and Reno who are worried about the impact that worsening air quality, because of climate change and these wildfires, will have on the health of their children.

It is not happening just in Nevada; throughout our country, Americans are being displaced and communities are being ravaged by devastating hurricanes, tornadoes, wildfires, and floods that are causing millions of dollars in damage to homes, businesses, and local economies. Worldwide, carbon emissions levels reached a record high last year, increasing 3.1 percent in the United States alone, despite evidence that high emissions are driving changes in our climate and fueling extreme weather patterns. Yet this administration and the Republican leader have done nothing to act despite overwhelming support from Americans who want us to protect our planet and our communities.

In my home State, Nevadans know the stakes. In 2016, Colorado College polled voters in six Western States about their views on climate change. At the time, 58 percent of Nevadans expressed concerns that climate change was a serious problem. In January, Nevadans were polled again. This time, almost 75 percent of Nevadans expressed serious concerns about climate change. That is a 16-percent jump in 3 years and comes months after 60 percent of Nevadans supported a ballot initiative to expand Nevada's renewable energy portfolio to 50 percent by 2030.

Across the country, Americans are worried about the impacts of pollution and carbon emissions on our climate, health, and our economy. They have seen the harm it has caused just over the last decade, and they are afraid it is getting worse.

You don't have to look far to see that our climate is changing. It is already happening in our own backyards. We have the evidence. There is scientific consensus. This isn't a fringe theory or a hypothesis asking to be debunked; it is a serious crisis that must be met with serious action. It is clear to younger generations of Americans who

actually walked out of schools this month to demand climate action from their representatives in Washington.

Despite overwhelming evidence that climate change is currently threatening our country, Leader McConnell and this administration are sitting on their hands. This administration has repeatedly tried to scrub climate change information from Federal Agency websites, supported Agency officials with deep ties to fossil fuel industries, and pulled the United States out of a critical international agreement that we need to collectively work together to avert climate disaster.

In the Senate, instead of working to find bipartisan solutions to one of our country's greatest threats, Leader McConnell is setting up a vote designed to be nothing more than a political stunt. My Democratic colleagues and I take the threat of climate change seriously. We won't support the Republican leader's newest political game to address climate change. We call it a sham vote. This isn't a vote about legislation; it is a cynical attempt to distract from the challenge confronting our country.

The fact is, Democrats all agree that we need to take urgent action to protect our environment and avert climate catastrophe. Senate Democrats have put forth many new ideas on how to grow our economy and support American prosperity, while addressing our world's growing climate crisis. We would be happy to work with our colleagues to debate them on the floor.

From my seat on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I am continuing to fight for legislation to tackle climate change by supporting renewable energy production, protecting workers, and creating good-paying, green jobs in Nevada and across the country.

I call on Leader McConnell and my Republican colleagues: If you are serious about addressing climate change, then join us. Senate Democrats will continue to fight for commonsense policies that reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and combat climate change, and we will continue to call on our colleagues across the aisle to work with us to tackle this challenge in both the House and Senate.

Democrats are working every day to craft smart and effective policies that will help safeguard our planet and help grow our economy. By forcing a vote now, Senator McConnell is denying us all the chance to come together to craft bipartisan, comprehensive climate change legislation through the legislative process. The American people want action now.

I won't stand for Republican leaders using this vote in a cynical attempt to divide Democrats and stall progress. I intend to keep my promise to fight on this issue and to protect the most vulnerable and marginalized, who often bear the brunt of the effects of unchecked climate change.

The American people continue to speak out for action on climate change,

and Senate Democrats will keep fighting because our planet and our future depend on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Democrats on this side believe that climate change is a real and urgent problem. The Republican leader seems to believe it is not a problem at all.

The majority leader has scheduled votes today on a version of the Green New Deal. I was proud to be a cosponsor of that.

I want to make sure that nobody believes what is happening today on this floor is part of a serious debate. The fact is, it is a sham debate about the growing and urgent problem of climate change.

The Green New Deal is all about offering a mission statement—a statement of direction on the urgency of climate change. It is about recognizing the staggering threat and encouraging everybody to come forward to bring up good ways to tackle it. As the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, I will outline just one of them this afternoon. It is not a bill; it is a resolution. That is why it is a head-scratcher to hear all these far-fetched attacks on the Green New Deal in the media and here on this floor.

Let's be clear about what this resolution, the Green New Deal, says. Nobody is out there banning cheeseburgers. If you want to eat an ice cream sandwich and wash it down with a milkshake, nobody is going to be taking that milkshake out of your hands, either. I don't know what this anti-food legislation is that I keep hearing opponents talk about, but it certainly isn't the Green New Deal. I will tell you that my son, William Peter Wyden, age 11, is specifically going to make sure that his papa doesn't sign on to something like that. There is no building trains to Hawaii. Nobody is banning airplanes, and nobody is trying to take people's cars. The Green New Deal is about bringing good ideas to bear in the fight against climate change. That is what the American people are demanding action on.

I will tell you that this issue comes up at every townhall meeting I hold. Just over the last week, I was in rural counties where Donald Trump won by an enormous percentage, and people understood what climate change was all about because of the wildfires we had.

These are not your grandfather's wildfires; these are infernos. We have had them leap the Columbia River. They are more powerful. They are more dangerous. Fire season isn't for just a couple of months in the summer; it is almost year-round. In my home State, we have had to get used to what amounts to the idea of clean air refugees when fires burn near populated areas. This is where folks—particularly folks who are of modest income—have literally nowhere to go and can't go

outside. Anybody who hasn't been to the Columbia River Gorge should know that when a fire leaps the Columbia River, you are talking about something very different. Rivers have historically blocked the spread of wildfires but not anymore. Last year, dozens of people were killed and more than 10,000 structures destroyed by the Camp Fire, the most destructive fire in California history. These infernos are happening across the West—Washington, Nevada, Colorado, Montana, and elsewhere.

Climate change isn't just about fires; it drives extreme temperatures in both directions. Extreme cold is a danger to millions of people during the winter. Warmer temperatures in spring and summer bring more rain and more floods to so much of the country. Elsewhere, especially in the West, the threat of drought looms continuously. The hurricanes battering the east coast and the Gulf of Mexico are intensifying. It seems as if every week, another group of prominent scientists warns about mass-extinction events, ecological failures, and runaway temperature increases.

There are great economic impacts as a result of all this. When Americans face a future of extreme temperatures, bigger storms, and hotter fires, it will mean that it will cost more money to rebuild the city that has been flooded by a hurricane or burned in an inferno. We are going to see increases in insurance premiums when weather-related damage becomes more common. If you really want to know how serious this problem is, look at these private insurance premiums. The market is telling us how serious this problem is. It requires more energy to heat and cool homes and workplaces in extreme temperatures.

I want to make one last point because I think there is a little bit of confusion about the direction the Senate ought to go.

I had mentioned that the Green New Deal is really a mission statement, a resolution, a sense of urgency that we ought to be all about. I want to contrast that with the original new deal, which was actual legislation, something like 15 bills—certainly, more than a dozen major ones. My sense is that this is what Congress is going to have to do in the years ahead with respect to climate. Let me give an example.

We have talked about the mission of the resolution, where we would like to go. Here is an example of what we ought to work together on with respect to legislation. As the senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I pointed out that there were more than 40 separate tax breaks for energy on the Federal tax books—40 separate tax breaks for energy. In fact, the Tax Code, as it relates to energy, is essentially anchored in dirty energy tax relics of yesteryear.

Given the fact that taxpayers now write out big annual checks to the dirtiest energy companies, what I have

proposed is that we replace that. You can't stand up to climate change as long as you are ladling out all of those tax subsidies to dirty energy. What I have proposed is to take those 40-plus energy tax breaks and just basically throw them in the trash can—in effect, throw them into the trash can that is right next to our desks. For those 40 energy tax breaks that are disproportionately for dirty energy, we would then substitute three new ones—one for clean energy, one for clean transportation fuel, and one for energy efficiency.

I would like to think that the Democrats and Republicans who are playing off this idea are going to be able to say: Hey, we can find common ground on this because for companies all across the country, when they buy new pieces of equipment for their companies, they will invariably make sure they will be cleaner and more energy efficient than what will have been on their factory floors. So they would qualify for two out of the three new energy incentives I am talking about. That is something we could have a real debate about. That is not a sham debate. That is a real debate.

Yesterday, Senator ALEXANDER, our Republican colleague from the Presiding Officer's State, said he believed climate change was real. He said he believed it was caused by man, and he called for a new Manhattan Project for Clean Energy. I heard it. It sounded like he had plenty of ideas that could make for a real debate between Democrats and Republicans. Senator ALEXANDER sits right over there, not far from our colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST. He was talking about real ideas after acknowledging that climate change was a problem and that man contributed to it.

I hope some of my colleagues on the other side will follow Senator ALEXANDER's lead. This is a debate the Senate ought to have. It ought to have a debate about what Senator ALEXANDER was talking about. We ought to have a debate about throwing the 40 separate tax breaks for energy into the garbage and substituting for them three new ones that reflect our most current challenges. That is the way the Senate is supposed to function: You recognize a problem; you come forward with ideas in a serious debate; and you try to build common ground.

I see my colleague from Iowa is here. I am interested in working with her, and we have worked together on other issues. I am interested in working with all of my colleagues as I have with respect to this question of making the Tax Code neutral regarding energy sources. We are not doing that today. What we are doing is playing a political game.

I say to my colleagues that nobody ought to take part in this political game. You don't play political games when the consequences for the American people are so serious. Instead, you have a serious debate about what to do

about the serious problem. That is not what is going on today.

I close by saying that years into the future, our children and our grandchildren are going to deal with the consequences of inaction, and they are going to look at something like this so-called debate—because I call it a sham debate—and they are going to be angry. The American people deserve a lot better than this kind of fake debate that is being held on the Senate floor right now.

I want to make it clear: As the senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I am very interested in working with my colleagues on real and bipartisan approaches to deal with this staggering challenge. That is not what we are having today, and our country is going to regret it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FLOODING IN IOWA

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I rise to speak about the flooding that has devastated wide swaths of the Midwest in recent weeks.

A harsh winter, combined with unseasonably warm weather and heavy rains, created conditions that overwhelmed much of our flood mitigation infrastructure up and down the Missouri River and its tributaries. In Iowa alone, the flooding has caused an estimated \$1.6 billion in damages. Thousands of homes have been damaged or destroyed, and nearly 250 miles of levees will need to be repaired or rebuilt. Thousands of acres of farmland have been impacted, with there being losses to the ag sector in excess of \$200 million. Fremont County, which is our furthest southwest county in the State of Iowa, has lost \$7 million worth of grain.

I spent much of last week on the ground in Iowa, visiting hard-hit areas of the State and meeting with local, State, and Federal officials. In my years as a member of the Iowa National Guard, I was on the frontlines of several of our major flood events, including the 2008 Cedar Rapids flood and the 2011 Missouri River flood. I can tell you that what I witnessed in this flood event was the worst flooding and destruction that I have ever witnessed. The devastation is simply incomprehensible, with the most severe damage being concentrated in Iowa's western most counties.

I have spent most of my life in southwest Iowa. So this hits particularly close to home for me. When I toured the affected communities last week and this past Sunday, the folks I met with were not just Iowans and not just constituents. Many of them were friends whom I have known for a very long time. In this part of the State, down there in southwest Iowa, I am just as likely to be called "Joni" as I am "Senator Ernst." It was heartbreaking to see what these folks have gone through. Again, they are not just constituents. These people are family and friends to me.

It will take a lot of hard work and determination to get our communities back up on their feet. But do you know what, folks? Iowans are a resilient people, and I know they are up to the task. Since the first signs of trouble over a week ago, our State and local emergency response teams have been working together seamlessly, around the clock, to keep our Iowans safe.

I credit Governor Reynolds and her office for quickly gathering damage assessments from all around the State in order to make a strong case to the President that a Federal disaster declaration was warranted. I also thank President Trump for recognizing the gravity of the situation on the ground in Iowa and for swiftly approving our request. Nearly 60 of Iowa's counties will now have access to much needed Federal assistance.

In the near term, our focus is on recovery efforts, and I will do everything in my power to make sure Iowans have every bit of the help they need. We need to get our farms and small businesses back up and running as soon as possible so Iowans can do what they do best, and that is to work hard and take care of their families.

As we move forward, I intend to review the Army Corps of Engineers' policies and closely examine how they were applied throughout this flood event. It is important that we study and learn from events like this so that we can try to prevent these types of devastating events from happening again in our future.

Once again, I want to say what a heartbreaking and devastating event this has been for so many of our Iowa counties, our Iowa families, and our Iowa businesses. My thoughts and prayers are with each one of them as we move through this event.

God bless you all.

Of course, God bless our great State of Iowa and our great United States.

We are there for you. We are there with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I rise to discuss climate change, which is a great crisis currently facing our country and our planet.

Let me start with a statement that is sometimes controversial in this Chamber: I believe in science.

Here are three simple scientific facts: Climate change is real; it is caused by humans; and we are running out of time to fix our troubles.

Here are three more scientific facts: The ocean and the air are getting hotter; storms are getting stronger; and flooding is getting worse.

These facts are widely accepted throughout the world, but the President and Senate Republicans refuse to acknowledge these basic truths. Together, they routinely dismiss the impacts of climate change and deny the clear evidence that we must take action. They refuse even to say the words

“climate change.” That is not leadership.

Here is the thing about the facts: Refusing to believe them doesn't mean that they will go away. While a small handful—a tiny minority—of my colleagues across the aisle acknowledge that maybe climate change is real, they say that actually doing anything about it would just be too expensive, that the problem is too big to solve, and that we should just give up now—close our eyes and plug our ears again.

Yet ignoring our problems has a much bigger price tag than the commonsense solutions we should already be pursuing. Our coasts are threatened by ever-stronger storms that can destroy our homes and devastate our largest cities. Our food supplies and forests are threatened by an endless barrage of droughts and wildfires. Even our naval bases are under attack, not by enemy fleets but by rising sea levels.

To my Republican colleagues, I say that our biggest problems have to be our top priorities. Instead of protecting big fossil fuel companies that continue to guzzle the polluting fuels of the past, we need bold vision and forward-looking leadership. I support a green new deal that will aggressively tackle climate change, income inequality, and racial injustice. I thank my colleague and my friend and good partner, Senator MARKEY, for leading the fight on this issue.

This is not the first time America has faced a so-called impossible challenge. Over half a century ago, President Kennedy said: “No nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.” He added that “we mean to lead it.”

President Kennedy challenged our Nation to lead the space race, and less than 7 years later Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon. The impossible had become a reality, and America had led the way.

It is time not only to challenge our country to tackle climate change head-on but also to lead the world in doing so. If we do not lead, then others will. China and other countries will win the race to define the green economy of the future, and we will lose those jobs forever.

I don't accept the Republicans' argument that boldly addressing climate change and having the world's strongest economy are somehow incompatible. The exact opposite is true. Tackling our climate challenges will provide us with the opportunity to grow our economy and to protect public health. We can propel the United States to become the world leader in green innovation in the 21st century. We can address climate change and strengthen our economy by making major upgrades to our crumbling infrastructure, by building more resiliency along our coasts and rivers, by constructing more renewable energy, and by promoting policies that will spur

new innovative research. These investments will protect our planet and will create good jobs with living wages, strong benefits, and safe working conditions.

It is time for new ideas, not old ideology. It is time for innovative research, not tired rhetoric. It is time for groundbreaking science, not political stunts. It is time to roll up our sleeves and get to work on climate solutions because this crisis is upon us, and it is time to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

(The remarks of Senator HIRONO pertaining to the introduction of S. 868 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Ms. HIRONO. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 6 minutes, please.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S.J. RES. 9

Mr. CARPER. Thanks very much.

Madam President, I rise again today to speak on an upcoming vote later on the majority leader's Green New Deal resolution.

To my colleagues, I would just say that I think we have a serious choice to make. Either we can acknowledge the climate crisis that our planet faces and confront it head-on, or we can turn our backs to it and walk away. I think the clock is ticking, and we need to not walk away.

While it is clear that a majority of Americans are calling on Congress to work together to address climate change, a number of our Republican colleagues—not all—have chosen to devote their time to deriding the Green New Deal instead of acknowledging the 800-pound gorilla in the room and crafting an action plan to do something about it while we still have time.

Madam President, I will ask unanimous consent to offer a very simple resolution here in a few minutes. I think my friend from Wisconsin is probably here to reserve the right to object to that, which is his right.

It is a pretty simple resolution. There are three parts to it. The first part of the resolution that I will be offering is that climate change is real. The second part of the resolution is that we as human beings have a lot to do with this problem. The last part of it is that we ought to do something about it. “We” includes the U.S. Congress.

I have been asked a fair amount today: Well, what should we do about it? What should we do about it?

If you look at the Green New Deal, the first part of the Green New Deal—especially the findings—gives a pretty good roadmap that I think we ought to seriously consider. I would just suggest that some items that have come up be-

fore the Environment and Public Works Committee in recent weeks and months—hearings that we held—could also help us figure out what the Congress might want to do about it.

If you think climate change is real—and I do, and I think most of us do. It is becoming a more urgent matter, not a less urgent matter. What are some of the things we can do? I will mention a few.

I think most people believe that carbon dioxide contributes to climate change, and that is true. With respect to climate change, there are other pollutants that are a lot worse than carbon. I want to mention a couple of them.

One of them is black carbon. Where does black carbon come from? It comes from diesel engines—think of trucks, cars, locomotives, trains, and boats. If you have ever been at a traffic intersection and have seen those big diesel trucks that pull away from the traffic intersection and the huge plumes of black smoke that appear as they pull off, they include black carbon. Black carbon is more than 100 times more dangerous than regular carbon dioxide in terms of its climate potential.

We have American-made technology that can be used on diesel engines—all diesel engines; there are millions of them—to reduce those emissions by 90 percent.

We have a program called the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, which helps to fund and make monies available for States and local governments and private businesses to reduce their diesel emissions, especially black carbon. That is one.

Two, think about our National Highway System in this country. Through most of our National Highway System, we don't provide charging stations for electric vehicles that have batteries. We don't have fueling stations for vehicles that are powered by hydrogen in conjunction with fuel cells that create movement for all kinds of vehicles.

We need to put money into tax credits and grants for fueling stations for hydrogen and charging stations for electricity. We have an electric vehicle credit that has expired or is about to expire. It needs to be extended so that when people in this country are thinking about buying a vehicle, they will consider buying an electric vehicle, which doesn't put out any carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury, or CO₂.

Another thing we could do is provide an investment tax credit, which SUSAN COLLINS and I have proposed doing for some time, where, for the first 3,000 megawatts of offshore wind that is deployed, the business gets a 30-percent investment tax credit. That is one thing we can do.

The chairman of our Environment and Public Works Committee is here. He and I believe another good idea—and we are joined in this by Republicans and Democrats—is to develop technology, which we think is very promising, that would literally pull

carbon out of the air—not out of a smokestack but literally out of the air—and turn it into something more useful. That is something we can do.

We had a hearing on legislation called the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, the NEIC. Part of what we want to do is, instead of running nuclear powerplants and ending up with a whole lot of spent fuel, we want to have technology where, when the heat is so high, those nuclear plants would use most of the spent fuel. Instead of having it stacked up around the country, we use it up and we create electricity from it.

Two more things, and I am done. There are HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons, which replaced CFCs. CFCs put a hole in the ozone. They are a coolant. They are a refrigerant. CFCs put a hole in the ozone. They were replaced by HFCs. HFCs didn't put a hole in the ozone. They are better for the ozone layer but not good for climate change. Now we have a follow-on product, a successor to HFCs. They are good for the ozone layer and good for climate change. We ought to make sure that we pass a treaty here in this body so we can actually use that technology.

Finally, the last thing we can do is provide for our auto industry. It is something they are asking for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. CARPER. I ask for 30 more seconds, please, Madam President.

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

Mr. CARPER. Thank you.

The last thing we can do is—the auto industry has been saying, with respect to fuel efficiency standards, CAFE and so forth, that we ought to give them some near-term flexibility in terms of meeting more efficient fuel requirements, more efficient mileage requirements, and more stringent requirements going forward in the future. That is what they are asking for to provide certainty. It is a 50-State deal. California is at the table. We ought to do that.

Those are just a couple of things we can do in Congress to actually address this, and we ought to do them. While we successfully help do good things for our planet, we are also going to create jobs and economic opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. I think that is something the chairman of our committee and I might just agree on.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 9 and that the resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This resolution says that climate change is real; that as people on this

planet, we have something to do with it; and three, that Congress is part of the solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARPER. That is my resolution.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from my Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, many Democrats have called climate change the greatest challenge of our time.

House Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ is the Green New Deal's lead sponsor. She calls climate change "our World War II." She said: "The world is going to end in 12 years if we don't address climate change." Senator SCHUMER said that climate change is "an existential threat."

When the Green New Deal was introduced just last month, Democrats lined up to support it, to cosponsor it, and to agree with it. Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts called it "the kind of generational commitment that we need to transform our economy and our democracy." Every Democratic Senator running for President of the United States is a cosponsor—every single one.

When Leader MCCONNELL called for a vote on the Green New Deal, Senator SCHUMER said: "Go for it. Bring it on." He said it right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Presidential candidate Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota agreed, saying that she will vote yes. That is how she said she will vote—will vote yes. We will see what she does today.

Well, today, the Senate will vote on the Green New Deal. All Senators will have a chance to go on the record, a chance to show whether they support this radical approach. But rather than voting for the Green New Deal that they introduced and cosponsored, it sounds like some Democrats are trying to run away from a vote on something they previously embraced.

If so many Democratic Party leaders support the Green New Deal, why aren't they willing to vote for it and stand up behind it today? The answer is obvious: The Democrats are ducking the vote. But why? The answer is pretty simple: The Green New Deal is unaffordable, it is unworkable, and it is unpopular.

When you add up all of the costs and the 10-year price tag of \$93 trillion, that is enough to bankrupt America. The cost is astronomical. It would hit every American really hard—about \$65,000 per family per year. That would empty just about every bank account in America. I believe it would drive a stake right through the heart of our

strong and healthy and growing economy. The Green New Deal would massively increase the role of government in our lives and the size of government, the expense of government.

Let's be honest. The climate is changing. It continues to change. It requires a serious response—a serious response. The Green New Deal is not that response.

This plan would eliminate fossil fuels. It would require 100 percent renewable energy, carbon-free energy, in just 10 years. The goal is to meet all of our energy demands in the United States through "clean, renewable and zero-emission energy sources." We need more renewable energy, but the goal of going from where we are to where they want to be is absolutely impossible in the period of time outlined.

Robert Blohm from the North American Electric Reliability Corporation wrote in the Wall Street Journal: "An all-renewable power grid is destined to collapse."

America can't tolerate a collapsed power grid. Plus, it wouldn't solve the problem. Turning off America's economy will not lower global emissions. America is leading the way in reducing emissions—reducing emissions.

Since 2007, U.S. energy emissions have fallen by 14 percent, while global emissions continue to rise. In 2017 the United States produced just 13 percent of global emissions and China and India together produced over 33 percent. So emissions are going to continue to climb until these countries take action. Emissions in the United States continue to decline.

Shutting down our energy would also harm American workers. That is why major labor unions oppose the Green New Deal. The AFL-CIO labor union, which represents 12.5 million workers, says: "We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families." I agree.

Even former President Obama's Energy Secretary, Ernie Moniz, called the Green New Deal impractical. He said it would hurt American progress in reducing emissions. That progress came from innovation, not from massive government taxation and regulation.

Congress must continue to support technologies like nuclear power and carbon capture utilization—things that we know make a difference—and we have done this in a bipartisan way in these areas. I want to continue to work with Democrats to find real solutions. We have passed legislation in a bipartisan way for advanced nuclear powerplants, for carbon capture and sequestration, and for using the carbon in productive ways, whether it is for medication or whether it is for construction products.

The Green New Deal is not the solution for America. It is a big green bomb that will blow a hole in our strong, healthy, and growing economy. That is exactly why Democrats aren't voting for it. That is exactly why Democrats

are ducking and dodging and distancing themselves from this so-called Green New Deal, because it is a radical plan, and it is exactly why Democrats are running away—running away—from the Green New Deal. I think we are going to see it today—running away as fast as they can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, would my friend from Wyoming, who mentioned my name, yield for a question or three?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I know the vote is scheduled at 4 o'clock. I am happy to answer a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. My friend from Wyoming said I said: "Bring on the vote on the Green New Deal." I did, not because I think it is a smart thing to do—it is a stunt—but it will finally get us to talk about climate change, something the other side has not done.

I would ask my colleague three questions. I was gratified to see Leader MCCONNELL answer them for the first time in his press conference. Does the Senator from Wyoming believe climate change is real? Does he believe it is caused by human activity? And does he believe Congress ought to do something about it? Those are my three questions. I hope I can get a direct answer, since my name was invoked.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, as a matter of fact, I would say to my friend, the Senator from New York, that he asked me those three identical questions on this floor about 2 or 3 weeks ago, and my answer today is the same as it was then. You are welcome to go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommended this to the Senator from New York, and I bet I wrote in the New York Times in December that said: Yes, I do believe that climate change is real, and, yes, I believe that humans contribute to it, and, yes, I believe we have a responsibility to do something about it.

I highlighted the role of innovation, not taxation or regulation, in coming to those solutions. I highlighted legislation that has passed the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and was even signed into law by the President, something called the FUTURE Act, which works on capturing carbon dioxide and using it productively. We talked about a bill called the USE IT Act, which is now coming through the committee. We are working on it. It has bipartisan support, and it passed last session. It didn't get all the way to a signature. We talked about the future of nuclear power and the advanced nuclear powerplants that are being done, and we paved the way for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do things because nuclear power has zero emissions.

These are bipartisan pieces of legislation, passed with overwhelming support by the Senate and the House and signed by the President. These areas with carbon capture and nuclear power

works are things that actually President Obama's Secretary of Energy, Ernie Moniz, testified to the Senate Energy Committee are the two things that actually can work at scale. Anything else that the United States, I will tell you, does unilaterally, will not contribute to a solution because emissions from the United States are only 13 percent of all the emissions in the world.

I would once again recommend to the Senator from New York an op-ed that I had written about dealing with climate change through innovation, not regulation or taxation, and I hope, in that way, that I have answered the Senator's three questions.

I would say to the Senator from New York that if he is actually serious about discussing climate change on the floor of the Senate and looking for solutions, then, what he ought to do today is instruct his Members—and I believe he may have instructed them to vote present—to vote to get on the bill, to get on this to discuss it and to debate it. But it doesn't sound like even the cosponsors are willing to stand up and vote for something they have cosponsored. A dozen of them have done it.

Three of them were leading a rally outside the steps of the Capitol within the last couple of hours, with one Senator chanting: What about the Green New Deal and having a vote on it? When do we want it? And the crowd was chanting: Now.

It will be instructive to see how those Senators—and one of these was a candidate for President—vote when their name is called as the roll is called here on today's vote on the Green New Deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 97

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I thank my colleague from Wyoming. Now he knows why I said: "Bring it on." We are finally getting even people like the Senator from Wyoming to admit that climate change is real, that it is caused by human activity, and that we should do something about it.

If we could have an open debate on climate change, that would be great. That is not what is happening today. The Senator from Wyoming talked about the contradiction of the Senator outside. How about the contradictions of the Republican Party and the Senators here putting a bill on the floor that they are going to vote no on.

Let's put the bill that the Senator from Wyoming asked for and let there be an open amendment process and let's see where people fall. All we are asking for is not a sham vote where people who put the bill on the floor are voting no because they don't want to have a debate, but rather a real discussion, a real debate, and real amendments.

I would say this. Earlier today, even better than having the Senator from Wyoming finally admit that climate

change is real and caused by human activity, the Republican leader did, when asked by the press at his gathering.

The whole plan of the Republican leader here is backfiring.

We want a discussion on climate. We haven't had one major bill on the real issues of climate come to the floor led by the leader where we can have open debate—not one. So now we are finally beginning to debate. That is great. We are not going to stand for sham bills that the other side is all voting no on. They know what a trick and joke and sham that is. So do all the American people. We are finally talking about the issue, and that is great. Climate change is not a joke. It is not a hoax. It is a crisis. That is why we are doing these things.

So right now, here is something else we could do. Let's see where our Republican colleagues are if they want to have a real debate. I am calling for the creation of a Senate select committee on climate change. It is a crisis. Ask the farmers in Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas if they think it is a crisis. Ask the people who have been subjected to so many changes in the weather because the globe is heating up. They believe it is a crisis. The very least we can do is to do what the House did and set up a select committee on climate change that is bipartisan. The committee can be partnering with the House committee. We might actually get something done, not sham votes that everyone knows are a joke—a political joke.

I am hopeful that we can do that. The reason for the select committee is clear. If there ever were an issue that demanded focus from this Chamber, this is it. Climate change is an existential threat to our country and our planet. The last 4 years have been the warmest on record. Sea levels are rising and marine life and fishing communities are being destroyed. Record flooding is inundating parts of the country, most recently the Midwest, and more and more powerful hurricanes have buffeted our coasts. Over the next decade, climate change will continue to negatively impact every part of American life, our health, our economy, our national security, and even our geography, and the threats will only grow.

We can't run into our ideological corners anymore. I am gratified to hear a growing number of Republicans admit it is real, admit it is caused by human activity, and that we should do something about it. That is great news, but let's do something real. Let's do something real.

The Senator mentioned a few bills. I would be happy to look at them. I hope he will look at ours, and I hope he will ask his leader, the Republican leader, to allow an open debate on the floor with amendments. We would welcome that. We would welcome it. Some in the oil and gas industry will not like it. That is for sure. Some in the coal industry will not like it. That is for sure. But most Americans will.

So let's do it. The time for partisanship on this issue is long over. The time for one party to block any change and not offer anything that they believe in is over. We need to act quickly and boldly to confront this challenge before it is too late. It is time to stop the nonsense.

As I said, we welcome this debate because we are talking about climate change for the first time, and the hypocrisy of putting a bill on the floor and then voting against it is becoming so clear to the American people. But, as a byproduct, we are getting a debate and we are getting some of our colleagues for the first time to admit that climate change is real and caused by human activity and that we ought to do something about it. We welcome it. This committee will help bring the kind of bipartisan discussion that my good friend from Wyoming has asked for. So let's do it.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 97, a resolution establishing the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the resolution be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out to my friend and colleague that the statement I had made earlier about my belief goes back a long time—that the climate is changing—to the point that one of his colleagues, Jeff Bingaman, a Senator from New Mexico, chaired the Energy Committee when he and I cosponsored legislation dealing with carbon and carbon capture and putting together an XPRIZE-type program. This is something I have long spoken about and understand.

I also hear the Senator from New York essentially trying to strip the EPW Committee of the jurisdiction we have over climate change. That is the wrong approach when we have made real progress working together not just on bills but on bills signed into law that are making a difference today.

This resolution the minority leader just introduced is an attempt by the Democrats to once again duck and dodge and distance themselves from the Green New Deal vote this afternoon. The Democrats seem to think that adding a layer of bureaucracy is an answer to every problem. That is the same instinct that gave us the Green New Deal. That climate is changing and humans play a role in the changing climate, there is no question in my mind about that.

I am going to continue to work closely with the ranking member of the committee, Senator CARPER from Dela-

ware, to pass meaningful legislation to promote nuclear power, carbon capture technologies, and to reduce emissions.

So Democrats can't hide from the fact that every Democratic Senator running for President has cosponsored the Green New Deal.

Here we are today, and I will just state that we have been passing bipartisan legislation. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee recently held a hearing on climate change. We do not need another committee. We don't need the Green New Deal; we need real solutions. For this reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we be given 2 minutes so that the Senator from Rhode Island can ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished chairman on the Environmental Works Committee about carbon capture technology, and I am wondering what part of the carbon emissions problem he thinks carbon capture will solve, because leaders of the carbon capture technology sector have said it is their vision to capture 1 percent—1 percent—of carbon emissions.

What I conclude from that is that carbon capture technology is important, but to rely on it at the expense of the course of action that we really need is profoundly misguided.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I know that time has expired.

We had a hearing in the last couple of weeks. We had an expert in the specific area of carbon capture come to show how much more effective the technology has become. This is something I started working on 10 years ago. It is something researchers around the world are committed to because we are finding value in that carbon to create products that can be used either medically or for construction. The University of Wyoming has an integrated test center right next to a coal-fired powerplant, and the technology is there to take the carbon dioxide right from the stack and use it, some for enhanced oil recovery, some for production. They are continuing to work on the science of all of this.

Certainly, there are the climate alarmists who are out there, and it does seem that what they want to do is act immediately, drastically, and unilaterally in ways that will not solve the problem. It will hurt our country. It will hurt our economy. It will move the lifeblood of the U.S. economy to foreign countries, and I will do everything I can to make sure that doesn't happen.

Thank you. I know the time has expired.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am interested in the other 99 percent.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 0, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

NAYS—57

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	King	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—43

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Hirono	Shaheen
Brown	Kaine	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 0, the nays are 57, and 43 Senators responded present.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Susan M. Collins, Lisa Murkowski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 268, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Harris	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rounds
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Boozman	Hirono	Sasse
Brown	Hoeven	Schatz
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Sullivan
Cornyn	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Thune
Cotton	McSally	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Udall
Cruz	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Wyden
Fischer	Peters	Young

NAYS—10

Braun	Johnson	Risch
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Enzi	Lee	
Inhofe	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, nays are 10.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

FLOODING IN NEBRASKA

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the historic flooding that has devastated hundreds of communities throughout my home State of Nebraska.

After a long, cold, and snow-filled winter, the catastrophic storm known as a bomb cyclone struck Western Nebraska with extreme blizzard conditions, while the central and eastern portions of the State were ravaged by record-setting floods. What were small streams became raging rivers, pouring over the banks, and breaching levees to flood towns and farmland.

The floods, which carried car-sized blocks of ice in some areas, isolated entire communities and deposited sand, mud, and debris over large areas of our land.

Homes have been destroyed, roads and bridges ripped apart, businesses and schools forced to close for an uncertain period of time. It is with a heavy heart that I say that three Nebraskans have lost their lives as a result of this storm: James Wilke, a farmer from Columbus; Aleido Rojas Galan of Norfolk; and Betty Hamernik of Columbus. I send my sincere condolences to their families. Their loved ones will not be forgotten.

Cities like Fremont and farms across the State became islands, leaving people and livestock stranded. The bomb cyclone has demolished thousands of acres of family farmland and ranchland, resulting in a devastating number of livestock deaths and demolished farms, grain bins, hay supply, and farm equipment.

One farmer recorded that he lost 700 of his hogs after 7 feet of floodwater swept through his land within minutes. A top concern for our ag producers is how do we replace ruined feed and the countless miles of washed-out fences.

The Nebraska Department of Agriculture initially projects that the damages will total a loss of \$440 million in crop losses and another \$400 million in cattle losses. The devastation continues to grow as our farmers and ranchers across Nebraska assess lost land use and more livestock deaths.

I heard from ranchers in Central and Western Nebraska who fought through this blizzard during calving, and what I heard most was that even though they suffered losses, they knew of others who were worse off.

Farmers stood looking at once fertile land now covered with sand, mud, and unimaginably huge slabs and chunks of ice. They are worried what the future will bring.

I agree with Gov. Pete Ricketts, as he has called this catastrophic weather “the most widespread disaster we have had in our state’s history.”

Water from the Missouri River and Papio Creek has overwhelmed the southeastern side of Offutt Air Force Base and rendered some parts of the base as inoperable. I welcomed Secretary of the Air Force Heather Wilson to survey the flood damage at the base. Some buildings were filled with nearly 8 feet of water. Offutt leadership provided us with a preliminary damage assessment and discussed the response efforts that were successfully taken by the airmen.

At the flood’s peak levels, one-third of the base was affected, causing tens of millions of dollars in damages. I will continue to work closely with Secretary Wilson to ensure that Offutt receives the funding to meet the needs of the base and to restore one of America’s most important national security assets.

According to the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency, 81 of our 93 counties, 98 cities, and 5 Tribes have declared states of emergency. This covers over 59,000 square miles, which is about 76 percent of Nebraska.

To put this in perspective, well over 1.7 million Nebraskans are affected by this storm. That is more than 95 percent of our State’s population.

The Governor has estimated that more than 2,000 homes and 340 businesses are damaged or destroyed. Significant damage to Nebraska’s critical infrastructure is still being assessed at this time, but the Nebraska Department of Transportation released a preliminary estimate of \$200 million that is needed to reconstruct hundreds of miles of roads and to repair or replace 15 bridges throughout the State.

Nebraska is hurting. However, as our Nation has seen the sheer power of this storm, I want America to understand the courage, strength, and resiliency Nebraskans have shown in response. Overwhelming loss and grief have been met with stories of bravery and heroic efforts of our neighbors and first responders. Ordinary Nebraskans, without any prior training, grabbed their personal boats, jet skis, trucks, and planes to save their neighbors who experienced life-threatening situations.

There have been countless stories of heroes who disregarded personal risk to help their neighbors in need—Nebraskans helping Nebraskans, neighbors helping neighbors.

Hundreds of volunteers in Fremont stepped forward to fill sandbags and create barriers to protect the city from floodwater. Local pilots in affected cities across Nebraska have flown their personal planes to deliver and evacuate people who have been surrounded by water.

In Boyd County, firefighters continued to stay on the job and rescue those in need, even after their own homes were flooded.

In the Nebraska Panhandle, one State patrol officer even scaled a barbed-wire fence to rescue a calf that was frozen to the ground.

Last week, a staff sergeant with the Nebraska Guard was helping lead rescue efforts in Fremont, where the town was left without fresh food and water for 2 days because of the surrounding floodwater. She said:

As we approached the town, I saw people coming out of their houses, standing on street corners, waving and clapping their hands in joy. . . . As we began carrying bottled water into the store, an elderly lady, who had been waiting for hours hugged me and was overcome with emotion. . . . She was so thankful and relieved knowing that even in difficult and trying times, there are Nebraskans doing things “the Nebraska way” by watching out for our most vulnerable citizens.

That is who we are. These stories are inspiring, and they speak to the character and integrity of my fellow Nebraskans.

I have been traveling across Nebraska to see the impact of this disaster firsthand.

In Omaha, I joined Governor Ricketts at the Nebraska Strong phone-a-thon for relief and support for flood victims. The event, sponsored by the Nebraska Broadcasters Association, raised nearly a half million dollars to benefit the American Red Cross in Nebraska and Southwest Iowa.

In Winslow, I met with families and residents of the area who had been hit hard by the floods. Every structure in that town was flooded. I spoke to a mother of three who told me she had just 15 minutes to gather her children and her family's belongings before the floodwaters entered their home.

Winslow Volunteer Fire Chief Zachary Klein, informed me that his team was able to get boats to help with their recovery efforts. Chief Klein and his team saved 29 local residents from their flooded homes.

In Plattsmouth, the town's water treatment facility is currently powered down and inaccessible. Like many affected communities across Nebraska, their main concern is being able to gather the facts and to make decisions about how they can move forward with their lives.

In Valley, I toured the devastation in the community with Mayor Carroll Smith and Councilwoman Cindy Grove. Large piles of wreckage can be found everywhere in town as people begin that cleanup process, but the people of Valley are resilient. Residents have started a donation center where people in need can get clothes, equipment, and other supplies as needed. More than 150 people have signed up as volunteers.

I also spent some time with local residents and city and county personnel in North Bend. The community is understandably concerned about how their community will rebuild their

lives, but it also warmed my heart to listen to stories of how the town is pulling together to support one another.

Time and again, I heard of how proud the North Bend community is of their volunteers who are managing donations and distributing food and supplies to those in need.

I want all Nebraskans to know that my office stands ready to help in any way that we can. Recently, I led the Nebraska delegation in a letter to President Trump outlining the extent of damage to our State and the projected cost of recovery. I want to thank the President for his rapid approval of Governor Ricketts' expedited request for Federal disaster assistance.

Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue and I discussed the crisis that ag producers are facing. He assured me that USDA is committed to assisting our farmers and ranchers in any way they can. I also visited with Secretary of Transportation Elaine Chao by phone to share with her how this historic storm has damaged our critical infrastructure. The Secretary and the Department of Transportation, as a whole, are ready to help Nebraska.

I spoke with Major General Bohac to discuss the Nebraska National Guard's flood response, the ongoing state of emergency, and ways my office can assist with their relief efforts. In the coming days and weeks, I will continue to work closely alongside Governor Ricketts to assist in coordinating Federal relief efforts for our State. I have spoken to President Trump and shared with him the needs of our State as we recover. He reassured me that Nebraskans will receive the help we need.

I take great pride in the way our State has pulled together in this disaster. To know communities like Fremont, Plattsmouth, Columbus, Ashland, Norfolk, Spencer, or Niobrara is to know the definition of strength in unity and an unwavering pride in your State and country. Above the floodwaters, you will still see the American flag waving proudly in all of these communities. If you know Nebraska as I do, you know our State is filled with towns like these from one side to the other.

I am proud to represent our great State every day in the U.S. Senate. Though much is uncertain for the victims of this disaster, our communities are rallying to endure and recover from these historic weather conditions.

I close by offering my sincere thanks to our State and local officials, our emergency responders, and National Guard, who are working around the clock to provide lifesaving assistance to our citizens in need.

We have much work to do, but Nebraskans are resilient, we are tough, and we are compassionate. Hour by hour and day by day, we will get through this difficult chapter in our State's history, and we will remain Nebraska Strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The Senator from Iowa.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I appreciate the majority leader's bringing the Green New Deal to a vote today so that every Senator had an opportunity to go on record. I voted no.

Some of my Democratic colleagues may argue that a vote against the Green New Deal demonstrates an unwillingness to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and to tackle serious environmental issues of the day, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Contrary to popular belief, the United States is not a bad actor on the world stage. The United States has reduced its carbon emissions by 758 million metric tons per year since 2005. This is the largest decline of any country in the world.

Meanwhile, China's and India's carbon emissions have grown. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, U.S. consumption of biofuels and other renewable energy has more than doubled from 2000 to 2017. The United States will only continue to increase renewable energy consumption through 2050 as we see more investment in wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, and other alternative energies.

Let's be very clear. A “no” vote on the Green New Deal is a vote against a government takeover of our economy that would stifle economic growth, bankrupt our Nation, and endanger the prosperity of all Americans. A “no” vote is a vote in favor of continuing an open and free economy that has made America the richest country in the world. We find that the best way to make environmental improvements is to use the wealth of a nation to accomplish that goal, and as a nation becomes more wealthy, the more apt it is to have the ability to protect the environment.

The fact is that the Green New Deal is wholly unrealistic in its goal of obtaining net-zero carbon emissions within 10 years. We are not going to be successful at reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and lowering our carbon emissions through virtue signaling. That is all the Green New Deal boils down to—virtue signaling. It is all lofty goals and aspirations with no concrete plan or concern as to its feasibility.

It is easy to support a vaguely worded, nonbinding resolution calling on the Federal Government to accomplish certain goals, but guess what. That is us—we, in the Congress. Congress is part of the Federal Government with the responsibility under our Constitution to write the laws. If Members of Congress have concrete ideas about what the Federal Government should be doing, they should introduce real legislation detailing who should do what to accomplish these goals.

Instead of a “green dream,” as Speaker PELOSI called the Green New

Deal, we need to focus on common-sense, bipartisan approaches that have an actual shot at making a difference. In other words, a resolution is a resolution; it is not a law. It doesn't accomplish anything. It states these goals that we ought to seek, but nobody has come forth with a concrete plan to accomplish those goals.

Cutting taxes is an effective way to encourage positive, environmentally conscious ways to produce electricity and fuel. This is what I have sought to do as a leader on renewable and alternative energy production for decades now. I was the original author of the production tax credit for wind energy in 1992. It won me an award as the father of wind energy, and now, I suppose, 25 years later, I am the grandfather of the wind energy approach.

During my leadership on the Senate Finance Committee during the early 2000s, I oversaw the establishment, enhancement, and renewal of numerous tax incentives that promote clean energy from sources such as wind and solar to renewable fuels like biodiesel, to energy efficient buildings, homes, and appliances.

Unlike the aspirational goals of the Green New Deal, these proposals I have been a part of are real, proven, bipartisan actions that I helped shepherd into law to make the United States more energy independent and, at the same time, improve our environment.

Renewable energy is a very smart investment and the fastest growing source of electricity generation in our country. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, utility-scale solar power is expected to increase by 10 percent in 2019—that is in 1 year alone—while wind power is expected to surpass hydropower for the first time. As prices continue to fall, the economic benefits from these clean energy investments will obviously increase.

Already, Iowa leads the Nation for its share of renewable energy. Iowa's wind generates nearly 37 percent of the State's electricity from wind, and the State's largest utility in America is set to generate 100 percent of its electricity within just a few years. Iowa ranks first in the Nation in the production of ethanol and biodiesel. Iowa alone accounted for over 26 percent of the entire U.S. ethanol production and over 17 percent of the U.S. biodiesel production.

The solar industry in Iowa continues to mature and ranks 17th nationally. The bottom line is that renewable energy helps diversify Iowa's economy. It creates jobs in rural America and strengthens U.S. energy independence. As far as the jobs are concerned, I believe there are about 7,000 just for wind energy and 43,000 for biofuels.

Instead of trying to build on these and other proven policies, the authors of the Green New Deal are more concerned with trying to correct all the ills they see in the U.S. economic system and even our broader society.

So it is not just about environment. Here is a list of the grievances they want to attack in the name of an environmentally sustainable economy: life expectancy, wage stagnation, economic mobility, income inequality, systemic injustices, the oppression of indigenous people, the unhoused, and the list goes on and on and on. Just in case I might be taken as a person who doesn't care about all of those things I just listed—in other words, don't get me wrong; these are important issues that deserve our attention as a nation, but it is simply not realistic to believe that they can all be solved through a plan that targets environmental sustainability.

Of course, since no crisis should be allowed to go to waste, every aspect of the progressive agenda must be implemented to fend off the threat of climate change. According to an analysis by the American Action Forum, a portion of the so-called Green New Deal plan focuses on eliminating carbon emissions. That program, by itself, would cost between \$8.3 and \$12.3 trillion. Of course, that is assuming it is followed up with actual legislation that attempts to implement the goals it lays out, and I have pointed out that all of that legislation is not being brought forward.

Those figures account for only a fraction of the Green New Deal's cost. The portion of the progressive economic agenda that includes enacting universal healthcare, free college tuition, a Federal jobs guarantee program, and much more is estimated to cost somewhere between \$43 and \$81 trillion. So that would put the total cost of the Green New Deal at somewhere between \$51 and \$93 trillion over the first 10 years.

Now, \$93 trillion—that is kind of hard to imagine. Can you imagine that? That is more money than the U.S. Government has spent in its entire 230-year history. How would we even go about paying for it?

Several Democrats have floated ideas or introduced bills that have gone along the lines of taxing the wealthy. That, I assume, may make up some of their possibilities. Earlier this year, the House author of the Green New Deal suggested imposing tax rates of 70 percent or more on earnings over \$10 million. Here in the Senate, Senator WARREN has proposed an annual wealth tax of 2 percent on assets of \$50 million and 3 percent on assets of over \$1 billion. Not to be outdone, Senator SANDERS has introduced legislation to supercharge the death tax with rates as high as 77 percent of estates exceeding \$1 billion. More recently, Representative DEFAZIO reintroduced his proposal to tax securities transactions.

Think about this. Even if we assume that these proposals would not have detrimental economic or behavioral effects—and we all know they would—these taxes would not come anywhere close to covering the price tag of the Green New Deal. The Washington Post reported that a 70-percent tax rate on

incomes over \$10 million could theoretically raise \$720 billion over 10 years. Senator WARREN's own estimates suggest her annual wealth tax proposal could raise as much as \$2.75 trillion in a decade. According to Senator SANDERS, his death tax proposal would raise \$315 billion over a decade. Congressman DEFAZIO's transaction tax is estimated to bring in \$777 billion. So adding up all that, even under the rosiest assumptions, these Senators' proposals combined would only cover between 5 and 10 percent of the Green New Deal's cost.

The fact is, there are not enough millionaires and billionaires in the United States to cover the price tag, so eventually they start taxing the middle class. These socialist ideas remind me of former United Kingdom Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's wise observation that "the trouble with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money."

Many of the Green New Deal backers appear to realize this and have even suggested that offsetting its cost is unnecessary. According to these authors of the Green New Deal, it can be paid for simply by printing more money. Yes, you heard me right—printing more money. Their solution is the same as what has been tried by every bankrupt third world country around the world—just crank up the printing presses.

The poster child for this fantasy in the world today, at least, is Venezuela, a country rich with great economic vitality in the 1970s—probably even earlier than the 1970s—but that economy has been driven into the ground by socialist policies, financed in large measure by churning out currency, leading to multimillion percent inflation rates.

Now that Senators have had an opportunity to go on record in support or opposition to the resolution, I hope the nonsense that is the Green New Deal will be put to rest. Hopefully, we can all now rally around sensible, proven policy to secure our energy independence and to improve the environment. From my point of view, that is the United States continuing on the success we have already had but standing as an example for China, India, Indonesia, Brazil, and other countries.

Affordable, clean energy is key to moving the United States forward. A good starting point would be to enact tax extenders legislation that I introduced last month with Ranking Member WYDEN. This legislation would extend nearly a dozen separate practical and proven incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency. Investing in alternative forms of clean energy is good for the environment, good for national security and energy independence, and good for job creation, particularly in rural America. It is good for economic development and surely good for the taxpayers, and it is obviously good for attacking climate change.

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. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

H.R. 268

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise tonight to talk about something we don't see very often in this body. We saw a bipartisan effort today to move to regular order, to actually put a bill on this floor, to debate its merits, to make amendments to it, and to try to find a compromise position to do the right thing for the people across many States in our country that have been devastated by untoward disasters just in this last year.

As many of us know all too well, our country suffered a series of unprecedented natural disasters over the last year. Actually, it is a trend that has gone on over the last couple of years. We have had a series of unprecedented disasters.

In July, August, and November 2018 alone, wildfires in California displaced hundreds and even thousands of people and destroyed thousands of homes in a very short period of time. These fires were the deadliest and most destructive in California history.

In August 2018, Hurricane Lane dropped 52 inches of rain over 5 days, causing heavy flooding and mudslides. It ranks as the second wettest tropical cyclone in U.S. history, behind Hurricane Harvey in 2017.

In September of 2018, Hurricane Florence caused catastrophic damage in North and South Carolina. It flooded homes, schools, and businesses. A week after the hurricane, major highways were still underwater.

In November 2018, a 7.0 magnitude earthquake hit Alaska and damaged highways and buildings and displaced hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals.

Earlier this year, an EF-4 tornado flattened Lee County, AL, and took 23 lives, including 3 children, and injured hundreds of others.

Today, our friends in the Midwest are suffering from devastating flooding. Roads have been washed away, fields look like lakes, and many cattle have been drowned. As a matter of fact, this flood happened just at the wrong time—during calving—and we know that thousands of calves have been lost.

My home State of Georgia has not been immune and is indeed at this moment reeling from a natural disaster as well.

On October 10, 2018, Hurricane Michael made landfall on the Florida Panhandle with a category 4 hurricane. It was one of the strongest storms to ever hit the United States. Over the next few hours, Hurricane Michael barreled through Florida, tore through

southwest Georgia, and moved on to North Carolina and South Carolina, doing immense damage. In a matter of hours, homes were flattened, tracts of timber destroyed, crops were ruined, and people's lives were radically changed forever. This hurricane hit exactly at a time when most crops were ready to be harvested. Cotton, peanuts, pecans, timber—it was devastating. Nothing was spared.

Today, agriculture is Georgia's top industry and our No. 1 economic driver. Before the hurricane, farmers in my State were expecting a record harvest in many commodity categories. Instead, just at the time when harvesting was starting, Hurricane Michael hit, and crops were completely destroyed across most of our State.

Our farmers are resilient, however. They have weathered droughts before and low-yield harvests and poor farm economies. They suffered through several years of low commodity prices as well. But they never ever faced anything quite like this before. The strength and magnitude of this hurricane indeed was unprecedented.

Shortly after the hurricane hit, President Trump, Vice President PENCE, and the Secretary of Agriculture all came down to Georgia with Senator ISAKSON and me to view the damage. Together, we toured the State, saw the devastation, and heard directly from farmers about the tough road to recovery. It was interesting that these farmers were not asking for anything; they were actually praying for their brethren in other parts of the country who were also being ravaged by these disasters.

The scene we saw that day is something I personally will never forget. We visited one of the largest pecan farms in the world—certainly in Georgia—and saw the damage in their fields. At this one farm alone, these two brothers who started from nothing had 800 acres of beautiful pecan trees. These maturing pecan trees were completely uprooted at the very time when the heavy harvest was sitting right there on the trees. In fact, when I was there, you couldn't walk on the ground; it was just a solid carpet of pecans on the ground, literally ruined.

Crop insurance will help with this year's losses somewhat, but agriculture insurance only covers part of the loss. What it won't cover are the trees that were damaged, particularly in this 800-acre tract that we personally saw with the Vice President.

Here, there is no insurance. Today in the agriculture industry, there is no way to insure this machine called a pecan tree that produces pecans. You can insure part of the crop, but you can't insure the trees. It takes about 10 years—some varieties, a little less, but about 10 years to start getting a crop from those new trees. So you can see for them that this is truly a generational loss.

When they saw the devastation, the Trump administration told Georgia

farmers and other farmers around the Southeast from this particular hurricane that they would have their backs, and they have moved to do just that.

President Trump said: "Farmers really got hurt, especially in Georgia, but we're going to get it taken care of." Vice President PENCE said: "We will rebuild these crops and these communities. We will restore southwest Georgia. We will restore the Sunbelt region bigger and better than ever before." They have acted consistently since October of last year.

The State of Georgia immediately stepped up and offered tax credits, short-term financing, bridge loans, and other forms of direct assistance to those impacted. The Federal Government has been a little slower to act. It has been 5 months since Hurricane Michael ravaged the Southeast, and this Congress has done very little to help people who are barely hanging on right now. That is shameful. It is time to do something about it. This aid should have been funded as soon as we had an estimate of the damage, which was really a mere few weeks after the hurricane came through in October. Instead, disaster aid got caught up in a partisan spending battle here in the Senate, and in typical Washington fashion, Congress kicked the can down the road.

It is totally unacceptable that Washington's intransigence continues to threaten the livelihood of the very people who sent us here to represent them. If we don't help these people right now, they may lose their businesses, their farms, their livelihoods, and, in some cases, their families through no fault of their own. That is the reality we are facing here.

Every night, farmers in my State get on their knees and pray that help will soon come. They pray their lenders will show compassion when their bridge loans are maturing, as they are, literally, today. They pray they will not go bankrupt. They pray they will be able to provide for their families. And yes, they are praying for other people around the country who have been devastated just like they have.

Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON has been a workhorse in this entire effort. He and I, along with several other Senators from southeastern States, have introduced this stand-alone supplemental disaster relief bill that we just had a vote on merely an hour ago. This bill passed the motion to proceed 90 to 10. I am very proud to be a Member tonight of a body that has agreed to put this on the floor and to do what the Senate is supposed to do, and that is to debate a bill, amend it, and then vote on its passage.

This particular bill, among other things, for States like California and other parts of the country, includes \$3 billion for agriculture. This is specifically disaster relief for our farmers and ranchers around the country. These funds are for States like Georgia, Florida, Alabama, the Carolinas—that is

North Carolina and South Carolina—Alaska, Hawaii, California, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, which are all battling natural disasters right now and over the past year.

I would also add that our colleagues from the upper Midwest have really moved very quickly and have been very reasonable so that we can include in the language here flexibility to make sure their needs are met, as well.

I also want to take a moment to thank our colleagues here for being very reasonable about needs in other parts of our country.

I really think that what the President has done with Puerto Rico needs to be called out. The Trump administration has been resolute in their support of the people in Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria and Hurricane Irma hit the island. To date, \$40 billion has already been allocated, and another 50 is potentially going their way—depending on how things happen in the next 5 years or so—to help Puerto Rico recover from recent hurricanes. That is a potential of over \$90 billion.

To ensure Puerto Rico continues to have the resource it needs to recover, this disaster relief bill includes \$600 million in additional nutritional assistance for the most vulnerable families in Puerto Rico since that relief, that aid, actually runs out this week.

Some Members of this body argue we should allocate more funding for Puerto Rico. I would remind them that this is the same level of funding that they have previously supported. In addition, Puerto Rico's own representative in Congress, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, supports our bill. She said this "bill puts my constituents one step closer to receiving the assistance they need to continue the long path toward recovery, and I look forward to its swift passage."

This bipartisan disaster relief package is a win for our farmers. It is a win for families and businesses who were devastated by historical hurricanes in the Southeast and wildfires in the West. It is a win for the people in Puerto Rico, whom the President has previously helped.

Every day we continue debating this issue is a day that people across the country face crippling uncertainty. Today, I call on each of us to put our individual political interests aside and do the right thing for these people who are depending on us right now. Time is of the essence. People back home are counting on us to get this done.

In conclusion, this discussion reminds us of a bigger issue. The funding we are debating here today is, by definition, borrowed money. Because of Washington's intransigence over the last 4 years and its inability to get its financial House in order over the last few decades, coupled with this debt crisis we have today, we are losing the ability to do the right thing, whether it is medical research, infrastructure, education, or responding to national disasters. Moving forward, we will not

be able to continue dealing with these emergencies and crises if we don't have a functioning Federal Government that can pay its bills and keep its financial house in order. Today I ask each of my colleagues here for their individual support on this disaster relief package.

I also ask that going forward we have a serious debate about tackling this debt crisis and responsively funding the Federal Government on time every year so we can help the American people when they are counting on us the most.

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. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PERDUE. Madam 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam 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 the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-09 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Gov-

ernment of Morocco for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$3.787 billion. 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.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-09

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Morocco.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$2.987 billion.

Other \$.800 billion.

Total \$3.787 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-five (25) F-16C/D Block 72 Aircraft.

Twenty-nine (29) Engines (Pratt & Whitney F100-229 (includes 4 spares).

Twenty-six (26) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESAs) Radars (includes 1 spare).

Twenty-six (26) Modular Mission Computers (includes 1 spare).

Twenty-six (26) Link-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—JTRS (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and ESHI Terminals (includes 1 spare).

Twenty-six (26) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI) (includes 1 spare).

Forty (40) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS) (includes 5 spares).

Twenty-six (26) Improved Programmable Display Generators (IPDG) (includes 1 spare).

Thirty (30) M61 A1 Vulcan 20mm Guns (includes 5 spares).

Fifty (50) LAU-129 Multi-Purpose Launchers.

Forty (40) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Forty (40) AIM-120C-7 Guidance Sections.

Three (3) GBU-38/54 JDAM Tail Kits.

Fifty (50) MXU-650 Air Foil Group, GBU-49.

Fifty (50) MAU-210 Enhanced Computer Control Group (CCG), GBU-49, -50.

Thirty-six (36) FMU-139 D/B Fuzes.

Six (6) FMU-139 D/B (D-1) Inert Fuzes.

Two (2) GBU-39 (T-1) GTVs.

Sixty (60) GBU-39/B Small Diameter Bombs (SDB I).

Ten (10) MAU-I 69L/B Computer Control Group, GBU-10, -12, -16.

Ten (10) MXU-650C/B Air Foil Group, GBU-12.

Twelve (12) MK82 Bombs, Filled Inert.

Four (4) BLU-109 Practice Bombs.

Ten (10) MAU-169 CCG (D-2).

Twenty-six (26) AN/AAQ-33 Sniper Pods.

Non-MDE: Also included are twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems; twenty-six (26) Advanced Identification Friend/Foe; Secure Communications, Cryptographic Precision Navigation Equipment; one (1) Joint Mission Planning System; twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS; six (6) DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment, simulators; integration and test; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (MO-D-SAH).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: MO-D-SAY.

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

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 22, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Morocco—F-16 Block 72 New Purchase

The Government of Morocco has requested to buy twenty-five (25) F-16C/D Block 72 aircraft; twenty-nine (29) engines (Pratt & Whitney F100-229) (includes 4 spares); twenty-six (26) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESAs) radars (includes 1 spare); twenty-six (26) Modular Mission Computers (includes 1 spare); twenty-six (26) Link-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—JTRS (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and ESHI Terminals (includes 1 spare); twenty-six (26) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI) (includes 1 spare); forty (40) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS) (includes 5 spares); twenty-six (26) Improved Programmable Display Generators (iPDG) (includes 1 spare); thirty (30) M61 Al Vulcan 20mm Guns (includes 5 spares); fifty (50) LAU-129 Multi-Purpose Launchers; forty (40) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM); forty (40) AIM-120C-7 Guidance Sections; three (3) GBU-38/54 JDAM Tail Kits; fifty (50) MXU-650 Air Foil Group, GBU-49; fifty (50) MAU-210 Enhanced Computer Control Group (CCG), GBU-49, -50; thirty-six (36) FMU-139 D/B Fuzes; six (6) FMU-139 D/B (D-1) Inert Fuzes; two (2) GBU-39 (T-1) GTVs; sixty (60) GBU-39/B Small Diameter Bombs (SDB I); ten (10) MAU-169L/B Computer Control Group, GBU-10, -12, -16; ten (10) MXU-650C/B Air Foil Group, GBU-12; twelve (12) MK82 Bombs, Filled Inert; four (4) BLU-109 Practice Bombs; ten (10) MAU-169 CCG (D-2); and twenty-six (26) AN/AAQ-33 Sniper Pods. Also included are twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems; twenty-six (26) Advanced Identification Friend/Foe; Secure Communications, Cryptographic Precision Navigation Equipment; one (1) Joint Mission Planning System; twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS; six (6) DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment, simulators; integration and test; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$3.787 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major Non-NATO ally that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in North Africa.

The proposed sale will contribute to Morocco's self-defense capabilities. The purchase will improve interoperability with the United States and other regional allies and enhance Morocco's ability to undertake coalition operations, as it has done in the past in flying sorties against ISIS in Syria and Iraq. Morocco already operates an F-16 fleet and will have no difficulty absorbing this aircraft and services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Lockheed Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of 10 additional U.S. Government and approximately 75 contract representatives to Morocco.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-09

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to Morocco. The F-16C/D Block 72 weapon system is unclassified, except as noted below. The aircraft utilizes the F-16 airframe and features advanced avionics and systems. It will contain the Pratt & Whitney F100-PW-229 EEP engine, AN/APG-83 radar, digital flight control system, embedded internal global navigation system, Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS), internal and external electronic warfare equipment, Advanced IFF, LINK-16 datalink, operational flight trainer, and software computer programs.

2. Sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements of the proposed F-16 V include hardware, accessories, components, and associated software: Link 16 (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and ESHI Terminals, Multipurpose Launcher (LAU-129), AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems, Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF), Cryptographic Appliques (KIV-78), Dual-Band AN/ARC-238 UHF/VHF Radios, KY-58M COMSEC Secure Voice Processors, Joint Mission Planning System, F-16V Simulator, AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS Pods, Avionics I-Level Test Station, DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems, F-110 engine infrared signature, Sniper (AN/AAQ-33-33) targeting pods, and Advanced Interference Blanking Unit. Additional sensitive areas include operating manuals and maintenance technical orders containing performance information, operating and test procedures, and other information related to support operations and repair. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified to protect vulnerabilities, design and performance parameters and other similar critical information.

3. The AN/APG-83 is an Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESAs) radar upgrade or the F16. It includes higher processor power, higher transmission power, more sensitive receiver electronics, and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), which creates higher-resolution ground maps from a greater distance than existing mechanically scanned array radars (e.g., APG-68). The upgrade features an increase in detection range of air targets, increases in processing speed and memory, as well as significant improvements in all modes. The highest classification of the radar is SECRET.

4. The Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) is an advanced Link-16 command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) system incorporating high-capacity, jam-resistant, digital communication links for exchange of near real-time tactical information, including both data and voice, among air, ground, and sea elements. The MIDS terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

5. Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS II) is a modified HGU-55/P helmet that incorporates a visor-projected Heads-Up Display (HUD) to cue weapons and aircraft sensors to air and ground targets. This system projects visual targeting and aircraft performance information on the back of the helmet's visor, enabling the pilot to monitor this information without interrupting his field of view through the cockpit canopy. This provides improvement for close combat targeting and engagement. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED; technical data and documents are classified up to SECRET.

6. KY-58M is a lightweight terminal for secure voice and data communications. The KY-58M provides wideband/narrowband half duplex communication. The KY-58M provides flexible interface capability. Operating in tactical ground, marine and airborne applications, the KY-58M enables secure communication with a broad range of radio and satellite equipment.

7. Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) is a multi-platform PC based mission planning system. JMPS hardware is UNCLASSIFIED but the software is classified up to SECRET.

8. AN/ALQ-211 Airborne Integrated Defensive Electronic Warfare Suite (AIDEWS) provides passive radar warning, wide spectrum RF jamming, and control and management of the entire EW system. It is an externally mounted Electronic Warfare (EW) pod. The commercially developed system software and hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when loaded with a US derived EW database.

9. The DB-110 is a tactical airborne reconnaissance system. This capability permits reconnaissance missions to be conducted from very short range to long range by day or night. It is an under-the-weather, podded system that produces high resolution, dual-band electro-optical and infrared imagery. The DB-110 system is UNCLASSIFIED.

10. Embedded GPS-INS (EGI) LN-260 is a sensor that combines GPS and inertial sensor inputs to provide accurate location information for navigation and targeting. The EGI LN-260 is UNCLASSIFIED. The GPS cryptovariable keys needed for highest GPS accuracy are classified up to SECRET.

11. The AN/APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT) is a system capable of transmitting and interrogating Mode V. It is UNCLASSIFIED unless/until Mode IV and/or Mode V operational evaluator parameters are loaded into the equipment. Elements of the IFF system classified up to SECRET include software object code, operating characteristics, parameters, and technical data. Mode IV and Mode V anti jam performance specifications/data, software source code, algorithms, and tempest plans or reports will not be offered, released, discussed, or demonstrated.

12. The Modular Mission Computer (MMC) is the central aircraft computer of the F-16. It serves as the hub for all aircraft subsystems and avionics data transfer. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

13. The Improved Programmable Display Generator (iPDG) and color multifunction displays utilize ruggedized commercial liquid crystal display technology designed to withstand the harsh environment found in modern fighter cockpits. The display generator is the fifth generation graphics processor for the F-16. Through the use of state-of-the-art microprocessors and graphics engines, it provides orders of magnitude increases in throughput, memory, and graphics capabilities. The hardware and software are UNCLASSIFIED.

14. The KIV-78 is a crypto applique for Mode 5 IFF. The hardware is UNCLASSIFIED unless loaded with Mode 4 and/or Mode 5 classified elements.

15. The SNIPER (AN/AAQ-33) targeting system is UNCLASSIFIED and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in electro-optical clarity and haze, and low light targeting capability. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified CONFIDENTIAL. Overall system classification is SECRET.

16. The AN/ARC-238 radio with HAVE QUICK II is a voice communications radio system and considered UNCLASSIFIED without HAVE QUICK II. HAVE QUICK II employs cryptographic technology that is classified SECRET. Classified elements include operating characteristics, parameters, technical data, and keying material.

17. The LAU-129 Guided Missile Launcher is capable of launching a single AIM-9 (Sidewinder) family of missile or AIM-120 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM). The LAU-129 launcher provides mechanical and electrical interface between missile and aircraft. There are five versions produced strictly for foreign military sales. The only difference between these versions is the material they are coated with or the color of the coating. This device is UNCLASSIFIED.

18. The AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a supersonic, air launched, aerial intercept, guided missile featuring digital technology and microminiature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include lookdown/shootdown, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high- and low-flying maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM AUR is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technical data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

19. Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM) (General Overview) is a Joint Service weapon which uses an onboard GPS-aided Inertial Navigation System (INS) Guidance Set with a MK 82, MK 83, MK 84, BLU-109, BLU-110, BLU-111, BLU-117, BLU-126 (Navy) or BLU-129 warhead. The Guidance Set, when combined with a warhead and appropriate fuze, and tailkit forms a JDAM Guided Bomb Unit (GBU). The JDAM Guidance Set gives these bombs adverse weather capability with improved accuracy. The tail kit contains an Inertial Navigation System (INS) guidance/Global Positioning System (GPS) guidance to provide highly accurate weapon delivery in any "flyable" weather. The INS, using updates from the GPS, helps guide the bomb to the target via the use of movable tail fins. The JDAM weapon can be delivered from modest standoff ranges at high or low altitudes against a variety of land and surface targets during the day or night. After release, JDAM autonomously guides to a target, using the resident GPS-aided INS guidance system. JDAM is capable of receiving target coordinates via preplanned mission data from the delivery aircraft, by onboard aircraft sensors (i.e. FLIR, Radar, etc.) during captive carry, or from a third party source via manual or automated aircrew cockpit entry. The JDAM as an All Up Round is SECRET; technical data for JDAM is classified up to SECRET.

20. GBU-31/38 (JDAM) are 2,000 pound and 500 pound JDAMs respectively. The JDAM All Up Round (AUR) and all of its components are SECRET; technical data for JDAM is classified up to SECRET. The GBU-31/38 contain a GPS Receiver Card with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM).

21. GBU-54/56 (LIDAM) are 500 pound and 2,000 pound JDAM respectively, which incorporates all the capabilities of the JDAM and adds a precision laser guidance set. The Laser-JDAM (LIDAM) gives the weapon system an optional semi-active laser guidance in addition to the correct GPS/INS guidance which allows for striking moving targets. The LJDAM AUR and all of its components are SECRET; technical data for JDAM is classified up to SECRET. The GBU-54/56 contain a GPS Receiver Card with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM).

22. GBU-49 and GBU-50 Enhanced Paveway II (EP II) are 500lbs/2000lbs dual mode laser and GPS guided munitions respectively. Information revealing target designation tactics and associated aircraft maneuvers, the probability of destroying specific/peculiar targets, vulnerabilities regarding countermeasures and the electromagnetic environment is classified SECRET. Information revealing the probability of destroying common/unspecified targets, the number of simultaneous lasers the laser seeker head can discriminate, and data on the radar/infrared frequency is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

23. GBU-39 (250lb) Small Diameter Bomb (SDB-I) The Guided Bomb Unit-39 (GBU-39/B) small diameter bomb (SDB) is a 250-lb class precision guided munition that is intended to provide aircraft with an ability to carry a high number of bombs. The weapon offers day or night, adverse weather, precision engagement capability against pre-planned fixed or stationary soft, non-hardened, and hardened targets, and provides greater than 50 NM standoff range. Aircraft are able to carry four SDBs in place of one 2,000-lb bomb. The SDB is equipped with a GPS-aided inertial navigation system to attack fixed, stationary targets such as fuel depots and bunkers. The SDB and all of its components are SECRET; technical data is classified up to SECRET.

24. GBU-10/12/16/58 Paveway II (PWII), a Laser Guided Bomb (LGB), is a maneuverable, free-fall weapon that guides to a spot of laser energy reflected off of the target. The LGB is delivered like a normal general purpose (GP) warhead and the semi-active guidance corrects for many of the normal errors inherent in any delivery system. Laser designation for the LGB can be provided by a variety of laser target markers or designators. A LGB consists of a Computer Control Group (CCG) that is not warhead specific, and a warhead specific Air Foil Group (AFG) that attaches to the nose and tail of a GP bomb body. The PWII can use either the FMU-152 or FMU-139D/B fuzes. The overall weapon is CONFIDENTIAL. The GBU-10 is a 2,000lb (MK-84 or BLU-117 B/B) GP bomb body fitted with the MXU-651 AFG, and MAU-209CB or MAU-169 L/B CCG to guide to its laser designated target. The GBU-12 is a 500lb (MK-82 or BLU-111 B/B) GP bomb body fitted with the MXU-650 AFG, and MAU-209C/B or MAU-168L/B CCGs to guide to its laser designated target. The GBU-16 is a 1,000lb (BLU-110 B/B or MK-83) GP bomb body fitted with the MXU-650 airfoil and MAU-209C/B or MAU-168L/B CCGs to guide to its laser designated target. The GBU-58 is a 250lb (BLU-110 B/B or MK-83) GP bomb body fitted with the MXU-650 airfoil and MAU-209C/B or MAU-168L/B CCGs to guide to its laser designated target.

25. M61 20mm Vulcan Cannon: The 20mm Vulcan cannon is a six barreled automatic cannon chambered in 20x120mm with a cyclic rate of fire from 2,500-6,000 shots per minute. This weapon is a hydraulically powered air cooled Gatling gun used to damage/destroy aerial targets, suppress/incapacitate personnel targets and damage or destroy moving and stationary light materiel targets. The M61 and its components are UNCLASSIFIED.

26. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

27. A determination has been made that Morocco can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

28. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Morocco.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam 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 the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-27, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Belgium for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$600 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.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-27

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Belgium.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$275 million.
Other \$325 million.
Total \$600 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Four (4) MQ-9B, Remotely Piloted Aircraft.

Two (2) Fixed Certifiable Ground Control Stations.

Five (5) AN/DAS-4 Multi-Spectral Targeting Systems (4 installed, 1 spare).

Fifteen (15) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) (12 installed, 3 spares).

Five (5) AN/APY-8 Lynx Synthetic Aperture Radars (4 installed, 1 spare).

Five (5) Detect and Avoid Systems (4 installed, 1 spare).

Non-MDE: Also included are an Initial Spares Package (ISP) and Readiness Spares Package (RSP) to support a 5-year period of performance; communications equipment; Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) equipment; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (BE-D-SAE).

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

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

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 25, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Belgium—MQ-9B SkyGuardian Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA)

The Government of Belgium has requested to purchase four (4) MQ-9B, RPA; two (2) Fixed Certifiable Ground Control Stations; five (5) AN/DAS-4 Multi-Spectral Targeting Systems (4 installed, 1 spare); fifteen (15) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) (12 installed, 3 spares); five (5) AN/APY-8 Lynx Synthetic Aperture Radars (4 installed, 1 spare); and five (5) Detect and Avoid Systems (4 installed, 1 spare). Also included are an Initial Spares Package (ISP) and Readiness Spares Package (RSP) to support a 5-year period of performance; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$600 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist Belgium to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability. This potential sale enhances the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability of the Belgian military in support of national, NATO, United Nations-mandated, and other coalition operations. Commonality of ISR capabilities increases interoperability between the U.S. and Belgian military and peacekeeping forces.

Belgium intends to use these defense articles and services to provide for the defense of its deployed troops, regional security, domestic security, and interoperability with the U.S./NATO partners. The current fleet of Belgian Air Component aircraft have proven insufficient to support sustained and persistent ISR operations. The proposed sale will enable the Belgian Air Component to conduct persistent and wide area ISR, including target acquisition, target designation, providing precision coordinates for Global Positioning System (GPS)-aided munitions, battle damage assessment, signal in-

telligence, communication, and data relays. Belgium will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment and support into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, Inc., San Diego, California. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale may require multiple trips to Belgium and potentially a deployed location for U.S. contractor representatives to provide initial launch, recovery, and maintenance support.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-27

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MQ-9B SkyGuardian Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) is a weapons capable aircraft designed for Medium-Altitude Long-Endurance (MALE) Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) and Target Acquisition and strike missions. The MQ-9B SkyGuardian RPA is not a USAF program of record but has close ties to, and builds upon, the proven success of the MQ-9A Reaper. The MQ-9B RPA is a Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Category 1 system with a designed maximum payload of 4,800 pounds (800 pounds internal and 4,000 pounds external) and is capable of carrying multiple mission payloads aloft with a maximum range of greater than 5,500 nm. The MQ-9B provides up to 40 hours endurance, speeds up to 220 knots true air speed (KTAS) and a maximum altitude of 45,000 feet. The system is designed to be controlled by two operators within a Certifiable Ground Control Station (CGCS). The CGCS is designed to emulate a reconnaissance aircraft cockpit, giving users extensive means to operate both the aircraft and sensors. The MQ-9B is able to operate using a direct Line-of-Sight (LOS) datalink or Beyond Line-of-Sight (BLOS) through satellite communications (SATCOM). The design enables unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) control to be transferred between multiple CGCSs, thus allowing remote-split operations and centralized mission control with other assets. The MQ-9B system can be deployed from a single site that supports launch/recovery, mission control, and maintenance. The system also supports remote-split operations where launch/recovery and maintenance occur at a Forward Operating Base and mission control is conducted from another location or Main Operating Base (MOB). The basic MQ-9B Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) is UNCLASSIFIED. However, inclusion of various subsystems, capabilities, and potential weapons results in a maximum classification of SECRET.

2. The Belgian MQ-9B system will include the following components:

a. A secure Certifiable Ground Control Station (CGCS) with workstations that allow aircrew to operate the aircraft, execute the mission, and record/exploit downlinked payload data.

b. The AN/APY-8 Lynx He Block 20A Synthetic Aperture Radar and Ground Moving Target Indicator (SAR/GMTT) system provides an all-weather surveillance, tracking and targeting capability. The system operates in the Ku-band, using an offset-fed dish antenna mounted on a three-axis stabilized gimbal. It has a large field of regard, produces a strip map, and can image up to a

10km wide swath. Swaths from multiple passes can be combined for wide-area surveillance.

c. The AN/DAS-4 Multi-Spectral Targeting System (MTS-D) is a multi-use highly advanced EO/IR sensor providing long-range surveillance, high altitude, target acquisition, tracking, range finding, and laser designation developed and produced for use by the U.S. Air Force.

d. COMSEC is necessary for full functionality of the Embedded GPS-INS (EGI) and the AN/DPX-7 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF)/Transponder.

e. The Detect and Avoid System (DAAS) with Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Due Regard Radar (DRR) is a multi-sensor system that detects and tracks cooperative and non-cooperative air traffic, and enables an autopilot response for deconfliction maneuvers.

f. The Belgium MQ-9B is intended to be used in the near-term only for ISR-type missions. As such, the system is not requested to be armed, but is requested to preserve the option to arm the systems should the need arise at a later time. If weaponized, the system is capable of being equipped with the U.S. Army AGM-114 Hellfire missile and various guided and unguided bombs.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the enclosed Policy Justification. A determination has been made that Belgium can provide the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Belgium.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH, Madam 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 the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of

the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-10 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Morocco for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$985.2 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.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Morocco.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$252.9 million.

Other \$732.3 million.

Total \$985.2 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Morocco has requested to upgrade its existing 23 F-16 aircraft to F-16V configuration.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-six (26) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes 3 spares).

Twenty-six (26) Modular Mission Computers (includes 3 spares).

Twenty-six (26) Link-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution Systems—JTRS (MIDS—JTRS) with TACAN and ESHI Terminals (includes 3 spares).

Twenty-six (26) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI) (includes 3 spares).

Twenty-six (26) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems II (includes 3 spares).

Twenty-six (26) Improved Programmable Display Generators (iPDG) (includes 3 spares).

Fifty (50) LAU-129 Multi-Purpose Launchers.

Twenty-six (26) AN/AAQ-33 Sniper Pods.

Non-MDE: Also included are twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems; twenty-six (26) Advanced Identification Friend/Foe; Joint Mission Planning System; twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS; six (6) DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems; secure communications, cryptographic precision navigation equipment; spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment; simulators; integration and test; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (MO-D-QAL).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: MO-D-SAY.

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

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 22, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Morocco—F-16 Block 52+ Upgrade to F-16V Configuration

The Government of Morocco has requested to upgrade its existing twenty-three F-16 aircraft to the F-16V configuration. The requested buy includes twenty-six (26) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes 3 spares), twenty-six (26)

Modular Mission Computers (includes 3 spares), twenty-six (26) Link-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System—JTRS (MIDS—JTRS) with TACAN and ESHI Terminals (includes 3 spares), twenty-six (26) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI) (includes 3 spares), twenty-six (26) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems II (includes 3 spares), twenty-six (26) Improved Programmable Display Generators (iPDG) (includes 3 spares), fifty (50) LAU-129 Multi-Purpose Launchers; and twenty-six (26) AN/AAQ-33 Sniper Pods. Also included are twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems; twenty-six (26) Advanced Identification Friend/Foe; Joint Mission Planning System; twenty-six (26) AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS; six (6) DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems; secure communications, cryptographic precision navigation equipment; spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment; simulators; integration and test; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$985.2 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major Non-NATO ally that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in North Africa.

The proposed sale will contribute to Morocco's self-defense capabilities. The purchase will improve interoperability with the United States and enhance Morocco's ability to undertake coalition operations, as it has done in the past in flying sorties against ISIS in Syria and Iraq. Morocco already operates an F-16 fleet and will have no difficulty absorbing this aircraft and services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Lockheed Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of 10 additional U.S. Government and approximately 75 contract representatives to Morocco.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to Morocco. The F-16C/D Block 52 upgrade of Morocco's fleet to the "V" configuration of the weapon system is unclassified, except as noted below. The aircraft utilizes the F-16 airframe and features advanced avionics and systems. It contains the existing Pratt & Whitney F100-PW-229 EEP, and will be upgraded to include the following: AN/APG-83 radar, digital flight control system, internal and external electronic warfare equipment, Advanced IFF, LINK-16 datalink, operational flight trainer, and software computer programs.

2. Sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements of the proposed F-16 V include hardware, accessories, components, and associated software: APG-83 AESA Radars, Modular Mission Computers, Improved Programmable Display Generator (iPDG),

Link-16 MIDS—JTRS with TACAN and ESHI terminals, Embedded GPS—INS (EGI) LN-260, Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System II (JHMCS), Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF), Joint Mission Planning System, AN/ALQ-211 AIDEWS, DB-110 Advanced Reconnaissance Systems, Multi-Purpose Launchers LAU-129, Sniper (AN/AAQ-33) targeting pods, AN/ALQ-213 EW Management Systems, Secure Communications, Cryptographic Appliques, and Improved Programmable Display Generators. Additional sensitive items include operating manuals and maintenance technical orders containing performance information, operating and test procedures, and other information related to support operations and repair. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified to protect vulnerabilities, design and performance parameters and other similar critical information.

3. The AN/APG-83 is an Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade for the F-16. It includes higher processor power, higher transmission power, more sensitive receiver electronics, and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), which creates higher-resolution ground maps from a greater distance than existing mechanically scanned array radars (e.g., APG-68). The upgrade features an increase in detection range of air targets, increases in processing speed and memory, as well as significant improvements in all modes. The highest classification of the radar is SECRET.

4. Modular Mission Computer (MMC) is the central aircraft computer of the F-16. It serves as the hub for all aircraft subsystems and avionics data transfer. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

5. The Improved Programmable Display Generator (iPDG) and color multifunction displays utilize ruggedized commercial liquid crystal display technology that is designed to withstand the harsh environment found in modern fighter cockpits. The display generator is the fifth generation graphics processor for the F-16. Through the use of state-of-the-art microprocessors and graphics engines, it provided orders of magnitude increases in throughput, memory, and graphics capabilities. The hardware and software are UNCLASSIFIED.

6. Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) is an advanced Link-16 command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) system incorporating high-capacity, jam-resistant, digital communication links for exchange of near real-time tactical information, including both data and voice, among air, ground, and sea elements. The MIDS terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

7. Embedded GPS—INS (EGI) LN-260 is a sensor that combines GPS and inertial sensor inputs to provide accurate location information for navigation and targeting. The EGI LN-260 is UNCLASSIFIED. The GPS crypto variable keys needed for highest GPS accuracy are classified up to SECRET.

8. Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS II) is a modified HGU-55/P helmet that incorporates a visor-projected Heads-Up Display (HUD) to cue weapons and aircraft sensors to air and ground targets. This system projects visual targeting and aircraft performance information on the back of the helmet's visor, enabling the pilot to monitor this information without interrupting his field of view through the cockpit canopy.

This provides improvement for close combat targeting and engagement. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED; technical data and documents are classified up to SECRET.

9. The AN/APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT) is a system capable of transmitting and interrogating Mode V. It is UNCLASSIFIED unless/until Mode IV and/or Mode V operational evaluator parameters are loaded into the equipment. Elements of the IFF system classified up to SECRET include software object code, operating characteristics, parameters, and technical data. Mode IV and Mode V anti jam performance specifications/data, software source code, algorithms, and tempest plans or reports will not be offered, released, discussed, or demonstrated.

10. JMPS (Joint Mission Planning System) is a multi-platform PC based mission planning system. JMPS hardware is unclassified but the software is classified up to SECRET.

11. The AN/ALQ-211 Airborne Integrated Defensive Electronic Warfare Suite (AIDEWS) provides passive radar warning, wide spectrum RF jamming, and control and management of the entire EW system. It is an externally mounted Electronic Warfare (EW) pod. The commercially developed system software and hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when loaded with a US derived EW database.

12. DB-110 is a tactical airborne reconnaissance system. This capability permits reconnaissance missions to be conducted from very short range to long range by day or night. It is an under-the-weather, podded system that produces high resolution, dual-band electro-optical and infrared imagery. The DB-110 system is UNCLASSIFIED.

13. The LAU-129 Guided Missile Launcher is capable of launching a single AIM-9 (Sidewinder) family of missile or AIM-120 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM). The LAU-129 launcher provides mechanical and electrical interface between missile and aircraft. There are five versions produced strictly for foreign military sales. The only difference between these launchers is the material they are coated with or the color of the coating. This device is UNCLASSIFIED.

14. The SNIPER (AN/AAQ-33) targeting system is UNCLASSIFIED and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in electro-optical clarity and haze, and low light targeting capability. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified CONFIDENTIAL. Overall system classification is SECRET.

15. This sale will involve the release of sensitive and/or classified cryptographic elements for secure communications radios, cryptographic appliques and keying equipment, and precision navigation equipment. The hardware is UNCLASSIFIED except where systems are loaded with cryptographic software, which is classified up to SECRET.

16. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

17. A determination has been made that Morocco can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

18. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Morocco.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to join my colleagues in calling for legislation to resolve the climate crisis. The need for action could not be more urgent. Every day of inaction in the U.S. Senate brings new risks of irreversible harm to our communities, our environment and future generations.

Unfortunately, this week's vote is not really about climate change. The Senate has been asked to invoke cloture on a nonbinding resolution that raises but does not really answer a broad range of questions about climate change and our economy.

The Senate is not ready to end debate on these issues. We have hardly begun.

The Democratic Caucus is united in recognizing the realities of climate change and calling for effective solutions.

However, this constitutes a minority view in the U.S. Senate. For too many years, our calls for comprehensive climate change legislation have fallen on deaf ears.

The Green New Deal in all of its ambition and breadth should be recognized as a sign of the frustration that is mounting in this country as a result of Republican obstruction.

I do not agree with every aspect of this particular resolution. It addresses not only climate policy but also longstanding partisan disputes over healthcare, housing, jobs, and other economic policies.

These are important policy debates, but it is my view that the legislative effort to address climate change does not need to wait for agreement in these other areas. The need for action is too urgent.

But whatever our disagreements about policy approaches and nonbinding resolutions, it is long past time for us to set aside disagreements about the validity of climate science.

The scientific community has warned us about climate change for decades with increasing certainty and specificity, including in a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965, five assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change since 1990, and four national climate assessment reports of the U.S. Global Change Research Program since 2000.

Most recently, a special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change identified the disastrous consequences if we allow the world to warm by more than 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit above pre-industrial temperatures.

We are already at more than 1.8 degrees of warming. Sea levels have risen more than 8 inches. Ocean acidity has increased by 30 percent. Ice sheets in Antarctica and Greenland are melting into the sea at an accelerating pace of more than 400 gigatons per year.

Allowing the world to warm another degree, as we are on a course to do be-

tween 2030 and 2052, may well surpass our ability to adapt.

Continued warming will threaten rapid, widespread, and long-lasting increases in heatwaves, wildfire, disease, drought, crop failure, sea level rise, ocean acidification, mass extinction, collapsing food chains, mass population migrations, and human conflict.

To avoid warming in excess of 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit, the special report identified that we will need to cut emissions 45 percent below 2010 levels by 2030 and 100 percent by 2050.

That will require rapid transitions in all sectors at an unprecedented scale.

Unless the U.S. Senate can undertake the hard work of serious legislation soon, it is clear the world will be unable to meet that goal.

The good news is that there are a large number of good policy ideas the Senate can consider if my Republican colleagues agree to join with us in earnest.

There are bipartisan proposals for legislation to place a price on greenhouse gas emissions by placing a fee on fossil fuels.

We can even rebate the revenues to cover the costs for households and industry. These are good ideas that we should explore.

There are numerous examples of clean energy standards and other policy commitments at the State, local, and international level. These are also good ideas that we should explore.

My own State of California has demonstrated bold, creative new ideas for cutting emissions at the same time as it has grown to be the fifth largest economy in the world.

The State has mandated that 50 percent of its electricity must be from renewable sources by 2030.

We are actually ahead of schedule and are on track to reach that deadline by 2020, 10 years ahead of schedule.

From there, we are committed to be completely carbon neutral by 2045.

My State's policies work. From the low-carbon fuel standard to the zero-emission vehicle mandates to the economy-wide cap-and-trade system, each innovative policy approach makes it easier to meet our goals.

By harnessing the strength of the American economy to address climate change, we have an opportunity to create millions of new jobs while strengthening the infrastructure and industries that are critical to our future.

It is long past time for the Senate to move beyond show votes on nonbinding resolutions and move on to the hard work of actual legislation.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join us in this effort.

ENHANCING HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION IN ARMS SALES ACT OF 2019

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, today I rise to speak about the Enhancing Human Rights in Arms Sales Act of 2019, which I was proud to introduce on

Monday with my colleagues, Senators DICK DURBIN, RON WYDEN, and ED MARKEY. Senators JEFF MERKLEY, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and RAND PAUL also cosponsored the bill this week. Our bipartisan bill takes critical steps to ensure that U.S.-manufactured weapons are not used in the commission of heinous war crimes, the repression of human rights, or by terrorists who seek to do harm to Americans and innocent civilians abroad. We do not only have a moral obligation to ensure that U.S. weapons are used responsibly, but it is clearly in our national security interest.

As one may be aware, the United States is the world's leading arms supplier. According to data compiled by the Security Assistance Monitor, from 2002 to 2016, the United States has delivered more than \$286 billion worth of major conventional weapons and related military support to 200 recipients. The Cato Institute found that more than 40 percent of nations purchasing these arms are at high risk of instability, terror, or egregious human rights abuses.

There are far too many examples of what can happen when we sell or transfer arms without proper vetting. In Yemen, U.S. arms transferred to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and their coalition have been linked to more than 1,000 civilian casualties, according to a recent report from a coalition of local and international human rights NGOs.

In December 2017, the Trump administration lifted a freeze on weapons transfers to Nigeria to sell 12 Super Tucano A-29 aircraft and thousands of bombs and rockets worth \$593 million, according to a Reuters report. Earlier that same year, the BBC reported that at least 115 civilians were killed in a Nigerian military airstrike on an IDP camp. Twenty Red Cross humanitarian aid workers were among the casualties.

Reuters reports that, since 2000, the United States has provided close to \$1 billion worth of military equipment to the Philippines, ranging from surveillance planes, drones, and boats to small arms. Human Rights Watch estimates that at least 4,000 men, women, and children have been killed by some of the country's security forces in the government's anti-drug campaign. President Duterte has openly encouraged the security forces to engage in extrajudicial killings. Congress recently prevented the administration from selling small arms to the Philippines, but insufficient end use monitoring prevents us from knowing if U.S. weapons were used in the commission of these abuses.

In Guatemala, according to the Washington Post, authorities used U.S.-supplied armored J-8 Jeeps to intimidate U.S. Diplomats and international anticorruption investigators in August 2018. Just weeks later, the U.S. provided an additional shipment of similar jeeps to the Guatemalan Government. Just to repeat, our dip-

lomats were threatened by the weapons that we ourselves provided. This is far from the only threat American citizens and our partners face from American-made weapons. Numerous investigations found that the dispersion of American-supplied arms in Iraq made up a significant portion of ISIS's weapons supply in the country.

This legislation will help curb these dangerous practices by requiring the Secretary of State to make human rights certifications for certain arms sales and transfers, specifically those involving heavy weapons capable of causing mass casualties or destruction, such as attack aircraft and missile launchers. The bill also requires the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to develop a strategy to enhance human rights protections in the arms transfer process. Since we know abuses can take place years after weapons have been transferred, the bill amends the Arms Control Export act to ensure stringent end use monitoring with regard to human rights.

America's strength around the world is rooted in our values. Through this legislation, the Senate can send a strong message that the United States must not allow U.S. made arms to countries who abuse human rights, attack civilians, recruit child soldiers, or who are unable to keep weapons out of the hands of extremist groups. These commonsense measures ensure any arms transfers take place in a responsible manner that safeguards our security and protects human rights.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 116th Congress. Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

JURISDICTION

(Pursuant to Rule XXV, Standing Rules of the Senate)

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * * * *

(h)(1) Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Air pollution.
2. Construction and maintenance of highways.

3. Environmental aspects of Outer Continental Shelf lands.

4. Environmental effects of toxic substances, other than pesticides.

5. Environmental policy.

6. Environmental research and development.

7. Fisheries and wildlife.

8. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, including environmental aspects of deepwater ports.

9. Noise pollution.

10. Nonmilitary environmental regulation and control of nuclear energy.

11. Ocean dumping.

12. Public buildings and improved grounds for the United States generally, including Federal buildings in the District of Columbia.

13. Public works, bridges, and dams.

14. Regional economic development.

15. Solid waste disposal and recycling.

16. Water pollution.

17. Water resources.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to environmental protection and resource utilization and conservation, and report thereon from time to time.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1. Committee Meetings in General

(a) Regular Meeting Days: For purposes of complying with paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XXVI, the regular meeting day of the committee is the first and third Thursday of each month at 10:00 a.m. If there is no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

(b) Additional Meetings: The chair may call additional meetings, after consulting with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee chairs may call meetings, with the concurrence of the chair, after consulting with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the committee.

(c) Presiding Officer:

(1) The chair shall preside at all meetings of the committee. If the chair is not present, the ranking majority member shall preside.

(2) Subcommittee chairs shall preside at all meetings of their subcommittees. If the subcommittee chair is not present, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee shall preside.

(3) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by paragraphs (1) and (2), any member of the committee may preside at a hearing.

(d) Open Meetings: Meetings of the committee and subcommittees, including hearings and business meetings, are open to the public. A portion of a meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by roll call vote of a majority of the members present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken—

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

(2) relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of Senate Rule XXVI.

(e) Broadcasting:

(1) Public meetings of the committee or a subcommittee may be televised, broadcast, or recorded by a member of the Senate press gallery or an employee of the Senate.

(2) Any member of the Senate Press Gallery or employee of the Senate wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a committee meeting must notify the staff director or the staff director's designee by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

(3) During public meetings, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use

the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of committee members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

Rule 2. Quorums

(a) Business Meetings: At committee business meetings, and for the purpose of approving the issuance of a subpoena or approving a committee resolution, seven members of the committee, at least two of whom are members of the minority party, constitute a quorum, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) Subcommittee Meetings: At subcommittee business meetings, a majority of the subcommittee members, at least one of whom is a member of the minority party, constitutes a quorum for conducting business.

(c) Continuing Quorum: Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established, the committee or subcommittee may continue to conduct business.

(d) Reporting: No measure or matter may be reported to the Senate by the committee unless a majority of committee members cast votes in person.

(e) Hearings: One member constitutes a quorum for conducting a hearing.

Rule 3. Hearings

(a) Announcements: Before the committee or a subcommittee holds a hearing, the chair of the committee or subcommittee shall make a public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing. The announcement and notice shall be issued at least one week in advance of the hearing, unless the chair of the committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to provide a shorter period, in which event the announcement and notice shall be issued at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing.

(b) Statements of Witnesses:

(1) A witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall file 100 copies of the written testimony at least 48 hours before the hearing. If a witness fails to comply with this requirement, the presiding officer may preclude the witness' testimony. This rule may be waived for field hearings, except for witnesses from the Federal Government.

(2) Any witness planning to use at a hearing any exhibit such as a chart, graph, diagram, photo, map, slide, or model must submit one identical copy of the exhibit (or representation of the exhibit in the case of a model) and 100 copies reduced to letter or legal paper size at least 48 hours before the hearing. Any exhibit described above that is not provided to the committee at least 48 hours prior to the hearing cannot be used for purpose of presenting testimony to the committee and will not be included in the hearing record.

(3) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine the oral presentation to a summary of the written testimony.

(4) Notwithstanding a request that a document be embargoed, any document that is to be discussed at a hearing, including, but not limited to, those produced by the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Congressional Research Service, a Federal agency, an Inspector General, or a non-governmental entity, shall be provided to all members of the committee at least 72 hours before the hearing.

Rule 4. Business Meetings: Notice and Filing Requirements

(a) Notice: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee shall provide notice, the agenda of business to be discussed, and the

text of agenda items to members of the committee or subcommittee at least 72 hours before a business meeting. If the 72 hours falls over a weekend, all materials will be provided by close of business on Friday.

(b) Amendments: First-degree amendments must be filed with the chair of the committee or the subcommittee at least 24 hours before a business meeting. After the filing deadline, the chair shall promptly distribute all filed amendments to the members of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) Modifications: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee may modify the notice and filing requirements to meet special circumstances, with the concurrence of the ranking member of the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 5. Business Meetings: Voting

(a) Proxy Voting:

(1) Proxy voting is allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or other matters before the committee or a subcommittee.

(2) A member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, orally, or through personal instructions.

(3) A proxy given in writing is valid until revoked. A proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) Subsequent Voting: Members who were not present at a business meeting and were unable to cast their votes by proxy may record their votes later, so long as they do so that same business day and their vote does not change the outcome.

(c) Public Announcement:

(1) Whenever the committee conducts a rollcall vote, the chair shall announce the results of the vote, including a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast against the proposition by each member of the committee.

(2) Whenever the committee reports any measure or matter by rollcall vote, the report shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to the measure or matter by each member of the committee.

Rule 6. Subcommittees

(a) Regularly Established Subcommittees: The committee has four subcommittees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Clean Air and Nuclear Safety; Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight; and Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife.

(b) Membership: The committee chair, after consulting with the ranking minority member, shall select members of the subcommittees.

Rule 7. Statutory Responsibilities and Other Matters

(a) Environmental Impact Statements: No project or legislation proposed by any executive branch agency may be approved or otherwise acted upon unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

(b) Project Approvals:

(1) Whenever the committee authorizes a project under Public Law 89-298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965; Public Law 83-566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; or Public Law 86-249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; the chair-

man shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record, and the committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval, together with any dissenting or individual views.

(2) Proponents of a committee resolution shall submit appropriate evidence in favor of the resolution.

(c) Building Prospectuses:

(1) When the General Services Administration submits a prospectus, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition, the committee shall act with respect to the prospectus during the same session in which the prospectus is submitted.

A prospectus rejected by majority vote of the committee or not reported to the Senate during the session in which it was submitted shall be returned to the General Services Administration and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(2) A report of a building project survey submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, may not be considered by the committee as being a prospectus subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. A project described in the report may be considered for committee action only if it is submitted as a prospectus in accordance with section 7(a) and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this rule.

(d) Naming Public Facilities: The committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age, or Federal judges who are fully retired and over 75 years of age or have taken senior status and are over 75 years of age.

Rule 8. Amending the Rules

The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by vote of a majority of committee members at a business meeting if a quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JOSEPH L. VOTEL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I rise today to honor GEN Joseph L. Votel, of the U.S. Army and the Commander of United States Central Command. General Votel is one of our Nation's finest military officers, and he will retire from Active military duty on May 1, 2019, bringing to a close 39 years of distinguished service to our great Nation.

In 1980, General Votel was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the infantry upon graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point. He commanded units at every echelon, from platoon to theater, with duty in Germany, Italy, Sarajevo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United States. As a young officer, General Votel deployed with 75th Ranger Regiment in support of Operation Just Cause. He later commanded the 1st Ranger Battalion at Hunter Army Airfield in Georgia. General Votel commanded the 75th Ranger Regiment and

led them on deployments in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Later he served as deputy commanding general of the 82d Airborne Division in Operation Enduring Freedom.

As a general officer, he served in the Pentagon as the Director of the Army and Joint IED Defeat Task Force and subsequently as the Deputy Director of the Joint IED Defeat Organization established under the Deputy Secretary of Defense. He served as the Deputy Commanding General and then Commanding General of the Joint Special Operations Command headquartered at Fort Bragg, NC. He also served as the Commanding General of U.S. Special Operations Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida. Most recently General Votel has served as the Commanding General of U.S. Central Command.

At a time of great uncertainty in the world, General Votel has led an incredible combatant command that has an enormous influence and presence in some of the most volatile parts of the globe. He has led the way in strategic relationships with our partners and allies that have made our country safer. General Votel is an exceptional leader, an American patriot committed to our Armed Forces, our national security and our Nation, but most importantly, General Votel is a great man of character. It is for GEN Joe Votel, a soldier, leader, and selfless servant, whom we with profound admiration and deep respect pay tribute to for all he has done for the defense of our Nation for nearly four decades.

We thank General Votel, his wife Michele, and their two grown children, Scott and Nicholas, for their dedication and sacrifice, and we wish them well in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TONY BAZZIE

• Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant and proud West Virginian, Tony Bazzie, on the occasion of his retirement from the Raleigh County Housing Authority. Innumerable West Virginians have benefited from his tireless efforts to improve access to affordable housing in our great State and his advocacy for increased Housing and Urban Development funding. Tony has been a vocal champion for encouraging investment in section 8 housing and an advocate for a regulatory framework that balances the interests of tenants and property owners.

Tony started with the housing authority at its inception in 1979 and since then has worked hard to dispel the negative stereotypes regarding housing assistance. Currently, his office assists over 1,200 families in Raleigh County, as well as Braxton, Summers, Nicholas, Fayette, and Webster Counties. In fact, demand has been so

high that the housing authority has had to implement a waiting list to serve additional West Virginians.

Beyond the critical assistance that the housing authority provides to West Virginians in need, it also has a positive effect on the economy. Through section 8 subsidies, Tony and his staff have contributed over \$4.5 million in rental payments to local property owners. Supporting local economies is something I have worked for in the Senate and knowing that I have allies such as Tony in the State has made this journey all the more successful.

Tony has come before Congress to testify about the importance of housing authorities across West Virginia, and his insight informed the discourse regarding the Section Eight Housing Choice Voucher Reform Act, SEVRA. In his testimony, Tony highlighted the need for providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing to low-income families. His passion for and knowledge of housing policy were of great help to my colleagues, and I thank him for his service.

I would like to thank Tony for all his insight and advice over the years. His yearly visits to my DC office were always a highlight, and his input was invaluable when discussing housing issues, particularly in West Virginia. On a personal level, he was kind and helpful not only to me, but to my staff as well. They spoke highly of how attentive, patient, and nice he was to everyone he worked with. I am honored to call Tony my friend and fellow West Virginian, and I wish him well in this new phase of life. I wish him the very best during his well-deserved retirement, and I hope he can enjoy more time with loved ones. West Virginia owes Tony our gratitude, and I thank him for all his excellent work for so many years.●

TRIBUTE TO TERRY DUPREE

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Terry Dupree, a gentleman who has worked diligently serving the people of Oklahoma throughout his career with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for 38 years.

Terry began his career with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service performing work involving the conservation, propagation, management, protection, and administration of wildlife species. Terry dedicated his life to implementing and advancing practices necessary for the conservation and management of wildlife resources and habitats. His experience and expertise has proven invaluable to the fish and wildlife community throughout his career.

This hard work eventually led him to become a leader within the Partner for Fish and Wildlife Program, which provides technical and financial assistance for the restoration and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat on private lands. I am incredibly proud of the work he has put in over the years for

the people of our great State of Oklahoma.

I want to thank Terry Dupree on his years of service and wish him well in his retirement.

Well done, Terry.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL THOMAS VON ESCHENBACH

• Mr. JONES. Madam President, today I pay tribute to a great leader and an exceptional officer of the U.S. Army, COL Thomas von Eschenbach, now serving as the director, Capabilities Development and Integration Directorate at the U.S. Army Aviation Center of Excellence at Fort Rucker, AL, as he prepares to retire from military service on May 31, 2019.

COL Thomas von Eschenbach has served our Army and our Nation for more than 28 years. He has been a true professional; a dedicated soldier, leader, and officer. Throughout his career he has commanded our great soldiers at many levels; he has deployed to combat numerous times in defense of the Nation; and he has been assigned critical positions in our military. Colonel von Eschenbach has provided outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous issues of enduring importance to the Army, Congress, and this Nation.

A native of Alabama, Colonel von Eschenbach was commissioned a second lieutenant of aviation upon graduating from Auburn University ROTC as a Distinguished Military Graduate. His first assignment after flight school was at Fort Bragg, NC, where he served as a platoon leader, company executive officer, and battalion staff officer. He next served in Germany as a troop commander and division staff officer.

Upon his return from Germany, Colonel von Eschenbach served as a small group leader and later company commander in the Aviation Branch Captains' Career Course and Warrant Officer Advanced Courses at Fort Rucker, AL. As a field-grade officer he returned to Fort Bragg and served as the battalion executive officer and operations officer for an attack battalion, and later brigade operation officer in the 82nd Combat Aviation Brigade to include a deployment to Operation Iraqi Freedom.

After an assignment in Army Human Resources Command, Colonel von Eschenbach commanded an Air Cavalry Squadron Task Force during a deployment to Operation Enduring Freedom in Jalalabad, Afghanistan. After this command, he served on the Army staff as the Deputy Director for Army Aviation.

For the past 4 years, Colonel von Eschenbach has served as the director of the Capabilities Development and Integration Directorate at the U.S. Army Aviation Center of Excellence. In this role he was responsible to the development of future doctrine and concepts, force structure, and capability requirements for Army aviation to ensure our aviation forces and soldiers

have the right concepts and equipment to prevail in future conflicts.

On behalf of the State of Alabama, the 116th Congress, and the United States of America, I thank COL Thomas von Eschenbach, U.S. Army, and his entire family for their commitment, sacrifice, and contributions to this great Nation. I join my colleagues in wishing Colonel von Eschenbach future success as he transitions to other opportunities to serve the Army and our country.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13694 ON APRIL 1, 2015—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, as amended by Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2019.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of

the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694, as amended by Executive Order 13757, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 26, 2019.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 252. An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 854. An act to provide humanitarian assistance to the Venezuelan people, including Venezuelan migrants and refugees in the Americas and for other purposes.

H.R. 920. An act to restrict the transfer of defense articles, defense services, and crime control articles to any element of the security forces of Venezuela that is under the authority of a government of Venezuela that is not recognized as the legitimate government of Venezuela by the Government of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1477. An act to require a threat assessment and strategy to counter Russian influence in Venezuela, an assessment of foreign acquisition of CITGO assets in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1616. An act to prioritize the efforts of and enhance coordination among United States agencies to encourage countries in Europe and Eurasia to diversify their energy sources and supply routes, increase energy security in the region, and help the United States reach its global energy security goals, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1839. An act to amend title XIX to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, establish a State Medicaid option to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through health homes, prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the Medicaid drug rebate program, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was resolved, that the said resolution do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 854. An act to provide humanitarian assistance to the Venezuelan people, including Venezuelan migrants and refugees in the

Americas and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 920. An act to restrict the transfer of defense articles, defense services, and crime control articles to any element of the security forces of Venezuela that is under the authority of a government of Venezuela that is not recognized as the legitimate government of Venezuela by the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1477. An act to require a threat assessment and strategy to counter Russian influence in Venezuela, an assessment of foreign acquisition of CITGO assets in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1616. An act to prioritize the efforts of and enhance coordination among United States agencies to encourage countries in Europe and Eurasia to diversify their energy sources and supply routes, increase energy security in the region, and help the United States reach its global energy security goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 268, a bill to reauthorize the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and certain wildlife conservation funds, to establish prize competitions relating to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking, wildlife conservation, the management of invasive species, and the protection of endangered species, to amend the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 to modify the protections provided by that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-18).

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance:

Special Report entitled "Report on the Activities of the Committee on Finance During the 115th Congress" (Rept. No. 116-19).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Leonard F. Anderson IV and ending with Col. William E. Souza III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 15, 2019.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Peter G. Stamatopoulos, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Gayle D. Shaffer, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Kelly A. Aeschbach and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Frank D. Whitworth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Blake L. Converse and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Michael A. Wettlaufer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2019.

Navy nomination of Capt. Dean A. Vanderley, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Kenneth W. Epps, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Timothy H. Weber, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. James L. Hancock, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Nicholas M. Homan and ending with Capt. Michael J. Vernazza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2019.

Navy nomination of Capt. Charles W. Brown, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John B. Nowell, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Steven L. Basham, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Steven J. Butow, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Karen H. Gibson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) James P. Downey and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Francis D. Morley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Ronald A. Boxall, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Thomas L. Solhjelm, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Telita Crosland and ending with Brig. Gen. Dennis P. LeMaster, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 5, 2019.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Daniel R. Hokanson, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Leon N. Thurgood, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Walter E. Piatt, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James C. Slife, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Paul E. Funk II, to be General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Dee L. Mewbourne, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Jon A. Hill, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Stuart B. Munsch, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel M. Anderson and ending with Denise M. Zona, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 24, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Thomas D. Crimmins, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Shawn C. Bishop and ending with Christian L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michell A. Archebelle and ending with Shelley A. Shelton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Peter N. Fischer and ending with Jonathan H. Wade, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brian M. Alexander and ending with Jason C. Zumwalt, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Latoya D. Smith, to be lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Lisa Marie Ahaesy, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Julie Huygen and ending with Tom Posch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2019.

Army nomination of Matthew D. Colsia, to be Major.

Army nomination of Deven R. Gaston, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Adrian Acevedo and ending with G010477, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 6, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Benjamin T. Abel and ending with G010598, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 6, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Kwansah E. Ackah and ending with D014862, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 6, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Alan Adame and ending with D013619, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 6, 2019.

Army nomination of Elizabeth A. Fields, to be Major.

Army nomination of P. J. Fox, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Nathan M. Clayton, to be Major.

Army nomination of Adam P. James, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jason S. Baker and ending with Richard J. Zeigler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2019.

Army nomination of Shelia R. Day, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert D. Cope, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of William C. Mitchell, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Rubirosa B. Bago, to be Major.

Army nomination of Meghan C. Gerrity, to be Major.

Army nomination of Daniel M. Jansen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Randolph Powell, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael J. Prokos, to be Major.

Army nomination of Anthony Bellofigueroa, to be Major.

Army nomination of Sean R. Richardson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Kahtonna C. Allen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Angelo N. Catalano, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Charles J. Calais, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert T. Evans, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Paula I. Schasberger and ending with Jan E. Aldykiewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2019.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Steven M. Angeline and ending with Curtis E. Borjas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 24, 2019.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with David F. Hunley and ending with James P.

Stockwell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 24, 2019.

Marine Corps nomination of John C. Jarvis, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Nathaneal J. Hart, Jr. and ending with Dustin R. Heffel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 24, 2019.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Matthew J. Anderson and ending with Isaac K. Tibayan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 24, 2019.

Navy nomination of Edward M. Prendergast, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Thomas L. Hinnant III, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Sanjay Sharma, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Angela Tang, to be Commander.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on Finance.

*Gordon Hartogensis, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a term of five years.

*Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2025.

*Courtney Dunbar Jones, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 866. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 867. A bill to protect students of institutions of higher education and the taxpayer investment in institutions of higher education by improving oversight and accountability of institutions of higher education, particularly for-profit colleges, improving protections for students and borrowers, and ensuring the integrity of postsecondary education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 868. A bill to address the disparate impact of climate change on women and support the efforts of women globally to address climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 869. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 870. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules and consideration of the least burdensome regulatory alternative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 871. A bill to establish the White Sands National Park in the State of New Mexico as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 872. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign \$20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 873. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 874. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. JONES):

S. 875. A bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 876. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to prepare veterans for careers in the energy industry, including the solar, wind, cybersecurity, and other low-carbon emissions sectors or zero-emissions sectors of the energy industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 877. A bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 878. A bill to foster security in Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. REED, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 879. A bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 880. A bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 881. A bill to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 882. A bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 883. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by Win Oil Company, Inc., for purposes of economic development by removing the Federal reversionary interest in the land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 884. A bill to authorize a grant program that strengthens the capacity of community development financial institutions through alignment with national service participants; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 885. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand access to school-wide arts and music programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter

criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 187

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 187, a bill to require Senate confirmation of the Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 215

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to assist employers providing employment under special certificates issued under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to transform their business and program models, to support individuals with disabilities to transition to competitive integrated employment, to phase out the use of such special certificates, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 261, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

S. 272

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 272, a bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

S. 277

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend title XIX

of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home.

S. 323

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognition Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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.

S. 400

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 400, a bill to gather information about the illicit production of illicit fentanyl in foreign countries and to withhold bilateral assistance from countries that do not have emergency scheduling procedures for new illicit drugs, cannot prosecute criminals for the manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues, or do not require the registration of tabletting machine and encapsulating machines.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 555

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 555, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 565

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name 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 Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, supra.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 663

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 663, a bill to clarify the status and enhance the effectiveness of immigration courts, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 673

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 673, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 673, *supra*.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 703

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 703, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes.

S. 707

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 707, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices a section on reproductive rights, and for other purposes.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to limit experimentation on cats.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to combat international ex-

tremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes.

S. 771

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 771, a bill to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 775, a bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to require certain agencies to develop scientific integrity policies, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 827

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 861, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) 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.

S. RES. 118

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 118, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 868. A bill to address the disparate impact of climate change on women and support the efforts of women globally to address climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to denounce the majority leader's sham debate on the Green New Deal.

Let's be clear. The majority leader did not call up this resolution on a vote because he thinks climate change is an urgent threat to our country. In fact, he has opposed nearly every congressional effort to combat the climate crisis.

The Republican Party's political and financial ties to the fossil fuel industry are well known. This latest effort to attack Senators demanding action on climate change with cries of socialism is reminiscent of the Red Scare, in my view.

Give me a break. The Green New Deal is an aspirational plan to combat climate change, create high-paying jobs, and develop a more sustainable

economy that allows communities, families, and individuals to thrive. This isn't radical. This isn't socialism. This is basic common sense. The truly radical position is the majority leader's insistence that we stick our heads in the sand, follow the lead of corporate-backed interests funding Republican campaigns, and do nothing to tackle climate change.

The status quo might benefit the majority leader, the Republican Party, and their allies in the fossil fuel industry, but it is deeply dangerous for our country. Climate change is already impacting our lives and damaging our economy.

Annual weather-related natural disasters have more than tripled worldwide since the 1960s, when scientists at the Mauna Loa Observatory on the big island of Hawaii first confirmed that carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere were steadily rising due to the burning of fossil fuels. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, the United States has sustained 139 weather and climate disasters—beginning with Hurricane Katrina in 2005—where damages exceeded \$1 billion. The total cost of these 139 disasters? Nearly \$1.1 trillion.

Last year, in 2018, the United States experienced the fourth highest number of weather disasters in our history at the tremendous costs of 247 lives lost and \$91 billion in damages. In Hawaii last year, we registered recordbreaking flooding on Kauai and Oahu that resulted in more than \$125 million in damages. That storm generated the largest 24-hour rainfall accumulation in American history at nearly 50 inches on Kauai's North Shore in a very short period of rainfall time.

Residents of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands also felt the devastating impact of Typhoon Yutu—the worst storm to hit any part of the United States since 1935. It certainly isn't a coincidence that 2018 was also the fourth hottest year on record, surpassed only by 2016, 2015, and 2017.

We have already seen the devastating cost of climate-driven disasters in the first 3 months of 2019. Eleven days ago, Tropical Cyclone Idai devastated Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and Malawi, killing hundreds of people. It is already being called one of the worst weather-related disasters ever in the southern hemisphere.

Closer to home, the Missouri River has already set record levels of flooding in Nebraska, Iowa, and South Dakota. Under current estimates, this historic flooding in the Midwest will cost at least \$3 billion in damages to roads, farms, homes, and businesses. According to Texas A&M University climate scientist Andrew Dessler, climate change is exacerbating the flooding. He said: "You can think of climate change as steroids for these rain events."

More is on the way. According to the spring weather outlook NOAA released last Thursday, more than 200 million

Americans are at risk for some kind of flooding, with 13 million of them at risk of major inundation.

Given the increasing intensity and frequency of severe weather events, many more States and communities will need disaster relief, something we are about to vote on later this week. Disaster relief is something we cannot, and should not, play politics with. Every community impacted by natural disasters should receive assistance in the upcoming supplemental appropriations bill, including Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, and other territories.

While these extreme weather events will continue to impact local communities and the American economy, climate change also threatens our national security. Like a large majority of the American people, senior national security and Department of Defense officials understand we can't just follow the majority leader's example and stick our heads in the sand to avoid the painful truth of climate change.

In 2017, for example, then-Secretary of Defense James Mattis told the Senate Armed Services Committee: "Climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating." He also stated that "climate change is a challenge that requires a broader, whole-of-government response."

In February, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats issued a new worldwide threat assessment that concluded that climate hazards like extreme weather, wildfires, droughts, and acidifying oceans are "threatening infrastructure, health, and water and food security" around the world. This means there will be more threats to our national security in an increasingly unstable world environment.

Faced with a global problem that threatens our national security, President Trump, with the support of Republicans in Congress, announced he would withdraw the United States from the Paris climate accord. He has, in effect, abdicated America's global leadership role in the climate crisis, alienated our allies, and created new opportunities for near-peer competitors like China. At the same time as the United States embraced climate denial on the international stage under Donald Trump, China has stepped up to fill the diplomatic void.

After the latest round of international climate talks in November, Canada's Minister of Environment, Catherine McKenna said:

When the U.S. stepped back, China decided to step up. The role China plays around the negotiating table can't be underestimated.

In addition to its diplomatic efforts, China has made significant policy changes to reduce its coal use from its 2013 peak and to scale up low carbon alternatives. China is now the world's leading producer, exporter, and installer of solar panels, wind turbines, batteries, and electric vehicles.

China isn't the only country on the global stage acknowledging the reality

of climate change and taking steps to combat it. German Chancellor Angela Merkel, for example, has said: "Climate action is a matter of both ecological necessity and economic rationality."

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has said:

The effects of climate change are everywhere, and they are a constant reminder of the need to act now. While climate change is the biggest challenge of this generation, it also provides the opportunity to do better while growing the economy.

Under the previous 2 years of their unified control of the White House and Congress, Republicans have repeatedly blocked any efforts to combat climate change. With Democrats now in control in the House, I am looking forward to working with like-minded colleagues to demonstrate there are those of us ready and willing to act.

Today, I am joining Representative BARBARA LEE of California to introduce the Women and Climate Change Act of 2019. This bill recognizes that while the negative impacts of climate change often impact women the most, they too often don't have a seat at the table when it comes to developing policy.

Our bill creates a Federal inter-agency working group that will collect data and develop policies and strategies to address the effects of climate change on women both at home and abroad. We need to empower women to tackle climate change. They need seats at the table.

So long as Donald Trump and his Republican allies in Congress obstruct meaningful debate and action, States and local communities are taking their own decisive steps to combat climate change.

Almost every State in the country has begun to experience the impact of climate change. But as an island State, Hawaii is poised to experience some of the harshest consequences of climate change. Rising sea levels, combined with increased storm runoff, will increase coastal flooding and erosion, damaging sensitive ecosystems, infrastructure, and agriculture.

According to research from the University of Hawaii Sea Grant Program, 70 percent of beaches in Hawaii are eroding and 13 miles of public beaches that once were present no longer exist. Waikiki Beach alone generates \$2.2 billion of Hawaii's economy every year and could be completely submerged by the end of the century. A warming ocean will increase bleaching and disease outbreaks on coral reefs, which currently support \$360 million in economic activity each year.

For Hawaii, a sea level rise of 3.2 feet—which could happen as early as 2060—will result in \$20 billion in damage, the chronic flooding of 38 miles of major roads, 25,000 acres of land, 6,500 structures rendered unusable or lost, and 20,000 residents displaced.

The prospect of such widespread climate change-driven devastation has spurred the State of Hawaii to action.

We have made a commitment to become carbon-neutral and generate 100 percent of our electricity from renewable energy sources by 2045, and we became the first State to separately ratify the Paris climate agreement. Eighteen States and Puerto Rico have since followed suit.

In addition to efforts at the State level, local communities, families, and landowners are taking their own steps to cope with the threat of climate change and adapt as necessary. Last week, I met with National Park Service officials, members of the Ala Kahakai Trail Association, local government representatives, nongovernment organizations, and community partners, including Native Hawaiian lineal descendants, to learn what they are doing to lead community-based approaches to trail management and how the issue of climate change is threatening national treasures on our coasts in Hawaii.

During my visit, members of the Kailapa Community Association created a plan to cope with decreased rainfall, coastal erosion, and other impacts on the ahupua'a—or division of land—that they have lived on for more than 12 generations. Families and communities in Hawaii who understand the threat of climate change are demanding that we take divisive action to combat it.

Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress should muster the political courage to do the same, but that is not happening anytime soon—quite the contrary. Instead, as with so many ideas they oppose, Republicans have resorted to mocking and distorting what the Green New Deal does. They are doing it by their tried-and-true method—by scaring people.

Donald Trump and the majority leader have invested a lot of time in attempting to justify their claim that the Green New Deal is going to ban air travel. What?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. HIRONO. Let me conclude by saying that the Green New Deal is aspirational. To say that it is going to result in forcing everyone to stop eating meat—it is like, what the heck? What these so-called facts opponents and the climate change deniers are saying about the Green New Deal is laughable, coming from the very people who deny the scientific fact of climate change.

I could go on, but obviously my time is up. I will have more to say as we continue this so-called sham debate. But let's not continue to stick our heads in the sand.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter written by an 11-year-old girl in Hawaii who spoke at a climate change rally in Hawaii. She was so articulate. She said: You know, this is like experiencing world war III for the young people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. HIRONO. They demand that the adults in the Senate to do something

about it and address climate change in an appropriate way.

Thank you.

On Sunday, I received a letter from Mesina—an 11-year-old girl—who spoke at a March 15th climate action protest in Hawaii, and she wrote:

"I hope that all of our eyes are open now. Floods are demolishing people's homes, forest fires are killing people and singeing acres of land. Sea creatures are dying. Oceans are rising. How can we deny climate change and the science that supports its human cause?"

"We are experiencing World War III, except in this war, we are all on the same side. We can all agree on clean air, clean water, and a clean earth. As a child that is going to inherit our Earth, I beg you please do everything in your power to protect my generation's future and the generations to follow."

Mesina is asking us to step up. It's past time to take urgent action to combat climate change.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 201. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 202. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 201. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief, 2019".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

DIVISION A—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF, 2019

Title I—Department of Agriculture
Title II—Department of Commerce
Title III—Department of Defense
Title IV—Corps of Engineers—Civil
Title V—Department of Homeland Security
Title VI—Department of the Interior
Title VII—Department of Labor
Title VIII—Legislative Branch
Title IX—Department of Defense
Title X—Department of Transportation
Title XI—General Provisions

DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

Title I—Violence Against Women Act Extension

Title II—Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund

DIVISION A—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF, 2019

The following sums in this division are appropriated, out of any money in the Treas-

ury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS PROCESSING, RESEARCH AND MARKETING OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Secretary", \$3,005,442,000, which shall remain available until December 31, 2020, for necessary expenses related to losses of crops (including milk and harvested adulterated wine grapes), trees, bushes, and vines, as a consequence of Hurricanes Michael and Florence, other hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, typhoons, volcanic activity, and wildfires occurring in calendar years 2018 and 2019 under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide assistance for such losses in the form of block grants to eligible states and territories and such assistance may include compensation to producers, as determined by the Secretary, for forest restoration and poultry and livestock losses: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, tree assistance payments may be made under section 1501(e) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(e)) to eligible orchardists or nursery tree growers (as defined in such section) of pecan trees with a tree mortality rate that exceeds 7.5 percent (adjusted for normal mortality) and is less than 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality), to be available until expended, for losses incurred during the period beginning January 1, 2018, and ending December 31, 2018: *Provided further*, That in the case of producers impacted by volcanic activity that resulted in the loss of crop land, or access to crop land, the Secretary shall consider all measures available, as appropriate, to bring replacement land into production: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading and applicable policies of crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) shall not exceed 90 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading for producers who did not obtain a policy or plan of insurance for an insurable commodity for the applicable crop year under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for the crop incurring the losses or did not file the required paperwork and pay the service fee by the applicable State filing deadline for a noninsurable commodity for the applicable crop year under NAP for the crop incurring the losses shall not exceed 70 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That producers receiving payments under this heading, as determined by the Secretary, shall be required to purchase crop insurance where crop insurance is available for the next two available crop years, excluding tree insurance policies, and producers receiving payments under this heading shall be required to purchase coverage under NAP where crop insurance is not available in the next two available crop years, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That, not later than 120 days after the end of fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress specifying the type, amount, and method of such assistance by state and territory: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the “Emergency Forest Restoration Program”, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$480,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for “Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations”, for necessary expenses for the Emergency Watershed Protection Program related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the cost of grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available, out of the funds made available under section 18 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$25,200,000 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 102. For purposes of administering title I of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), losses to agricultural producers resulting from hurricanes shall also include losses incurred from Tropical Storm Cindy and losses of peach and blueberry crops in calendar year 2017 due to extreme cold: *Provided*, That the amounts provided by this section are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts

repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 103. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a person or legal entity is not eligible to receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program established pursuant to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.) if the average adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is greater than \$900,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a person or legal entity if at least 75 percent of the adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is derived from farming, ranching, or forestry related activities.

(b) A person or legal entity may not receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program described in subsection (a)(1), directly or indirectly, of more than \$125,000.

(c) In this section, the term “average adjusted gross income” has the meaning given the term defined in section 760.1502 of title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect July 18, 2018).

(d) The amount provided by this section is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 104. In addition to other amounts made available by section 309 of division A of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (Public Law 115-72; 131 Stat. 1229), there is appropriated to the Secretary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, \$600,000,000 to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for disaster nutrition assistance in response to a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2020, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

SEC. 105. There is hereby appropriated \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an independent study, including a survey of participants, to compare the impact of the additional benefits provided by section 309 of Public Law 115-72 to the food insecurity, health status, and well-being of low-income residents in Puerto Rico without such additional benefits: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 106. In addition to amounts otherwise made available, out of the funds made available under section 18 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to American Samoa for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to the territory under this section shall remain available for obligation by the territory until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such amount

is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Pursuant to section 703 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3233), for an additional amount for “Economic Development Assistance Programs” for necessary expenses related to flood mitigation, disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure in areas that received a major disaster designation as a result of Hurricanes Florence, Michael, and Lane, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, and of wildfires, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and other natural disasters occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That within the amount appropriated, up to 2 percent of funds may be transferred to the “Salaries and Expenses” account for administration and oversight activities: *Provided further*, That within the amount appropriated, \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to the “Office of Inspector General” account for carrying out investigations and audits related to the funding provided under this heading.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for “Operations, Research, and Facilities” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and of wildfires, \$120,570,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, as follows:

- (1) \$3,000,000 for repair and replacement of observing assets, real property, and equipment;
- (2) \$11,000,000 for marine debris assessment and removal;
- (3) \$31,570,000 for mapping, charting, and geodesy services;
- (4) \$25,000,000 to improve: (a) hurricane intensity forecasting, including through deployment of unmanned ocean observing platforms and enhanced data assimilation; (b) flood prediction, forecasting, and mitigation capabilities; and (c) wildfire prediction, detection, and forecasting; and
- (5) \$50,000,000 for Title IX Fund grants as authorized under section 906(c) of division O of Public Law 114-113:

Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for funding provided under subsection (4) of this heading within 45 days after the date of enactment of this division.

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Acquisition and Construction”, \$25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for improvements to operational and research weather supercomputing infrastructure and satellite ground

services used for hurricane intensity and track prediction; flood prediction, forecasting, and mitigation; and wildfire prediction, detection, and forecasting: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the date of enactment of this division.

FISHERY DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Fishery Disaster Assistance” for necessary expenses associated with the mitigation of fishery disasters, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds shall be used for mitigating the effects of commercial fishery failures and fishery resource disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce, including those declared by the Secretary to be a direct result of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoon Yutu, \$1,336,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for “Buildings and Facilities” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoon Yutu, \$28,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RELATED AGENCIES

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For an additional amount for “Payment to the Legal Services Corporation” to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act by providing for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence, Michael, and Lane, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, calendar year 2018 wildfires, volcanic eruptions, and earthquakes, and calendar year 2019 tornadoes and floods, \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this division to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of, sections 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, and 506 of Public Law 105–119, and all funds appropriated in this division to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such sections, except that all references in

sections 502 and 503 to 1997 and 1998 shall be deemed to refer instead to 2018 and 2019, respectively, and except that sections 501 and 503 of Public Law 104–134 (referenced by Public Law 105–119) shall not apply to the amount made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That, for the purposes of this division, the Legal Services Corporation shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$200,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$400,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for “Investigations” for necessary expenses related to the completion, or initiation and completion, of flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, studies which are currently authorized or which are authorized after the date of enactment of this division, to reduce risk from future floods and hurricanes, at full Federal expense, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended, for high priority studies of projects in States and insular areas that were impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, and Tropical Storm Gita: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, including new studies selected to be initiated using funds provided under this heading, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this division.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Construction” for necessary expenses, \$740,000,000, to remain available until expended, to construct flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, projects which are currently authorized or which are authorized after the date of enactment of this division, and flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, projects which have signed Chief’s Reports as of the date of enactment of this division or which are studied using funds provided under the heading “Investigations” if the Secretary determines such projects to be technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable, in States and insular areas that were impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon

Yutu, and Tropical Storm Gita: *Provided*, That projects receiving funds provided under the first proviso in “Title IV—Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Construction” in Public Law 115–123 shall not be eligible for funding provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That for projects receiving funds provided under this heading, the provisions of Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 shall not apply to these funds: *Provided further*, That the completion of ongoing construction projects receiving funds provided under this heading shall be at full Federal expense with respect to such funds: *Provided further*, That using funds provided under this heading, the non-Federal cash contribution for projects other than ongoing construction projects shall be financed in accordance with the provisions of section 103(k) of Public Law 99–662 over a period of 30 years from the date of completion of the project or separable element: *Provided further*, That up to \$25,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for continuing authorities projects to reduce the risk of flooding and storm damage: *Provided further*, That any projects using funds appropriated under this heading shall be initiated only after non-Federal interests have entered into binding agreements with the Secretary requiring, where applicable, the non-Federal interests to pay 100 percent of the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs of the project and to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction or operation and maintenance of the project, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this division.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For an additional amount for “Mississippi River and Tributaries” for necessary expenses to address emergency situations at Corps of Engineers projects and rehabilitate and repair damages to Corps of Engineers projects, caused by natural disasters, \$225,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this division.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance” for necessary expenses to dredge Federal navigation projects in response to, and repair damages to Corps of Engineers Federal projects caused by, natural disasters, \$245,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for coastal harbors and channels, and for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress

as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for “Central Utah Project Completion Account”, \$350,000, to be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary in carrying out fire remediation activities related to wildfires in 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

For an additional amount for “Water and Related Resources”, \$15,500,000, to remain available until expended, for fire remediation and suppression emergency assistance related to wildfires in 2017 and 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND
INVESTIGATIONS
COAST GUARD
OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Operations and Support” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael, Florence, and Lane, Tropical Storm Gordon, and Typhoon Mangkhut, \$46,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND
IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Construction, and Improvements” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael, Florence, and Lane, Tropical Storm Gordon, and Typhoon Mangkhut, \$476,755,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND
RESTORATION

For an additional amount for “Environmental Compliance and Restoration” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence, \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Construction” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence, Lane, and Michael, and flooding associated with major declared disaster DR-4365, and calendar year 2018 earthquakes, \$82,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount \$50,000,000 shall be used to restore and rebuild national wildlife refuges and increase the resiliency and capacity of coastal habitat and infrastructure to withstand storms and reduce the amount of damage caused by such storms: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For an additional amount for the “Historic Preservation Fund” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and Typhoon Yutu, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2022, including costs to States and territories necessary to complete compliance activities required by section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (formerly section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) and costs needed to administer the program: *Provided*, That grants shall only be available for areas that have received a major disaster declaration pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided further*, That individual grants shall not be subject to a non-Federal matching requirement: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Construction” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, \$78,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for “Surveys, Investigations, and Research” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquake damage associated with emergency declaration EM-3410, and in those areas impacted by a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) with respect to calendar year 2018 wildfires or volcanic eruptions, \$98,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$72,310,000 is for costs related to the repair and replacement of equipment and facilities damaged by disasters in 2018: *Provided further*, That, not later than 90 days after enactment of this division, the Survey shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations that describes the potential options to replace the facility damaged by the 2018 volcano disaster along with cost estimates and a description of how the Survey

will provide direct access for monitoring volcanic activity and the potential threat to at-risk communities: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES
INSULAR AFFAIRS
ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for “Technical Assistance” for financial management expenses related to the consequences of Typhoon Yutu, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2018, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for “Science and Technology” for necessary expenses related to improving preparedness of the water sector, \$600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST
FUND PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, calendar year 2018 earthquakes, and Typhoon Yutu, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For additional amounts for “State and Tribal Assistance Grants” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and calendar year 2018 earthquakes for the hazardous waste financial assistance grants program, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended; for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Typhoon Yutu for the hazardous waste financial assistance grants program and for other solid waste management activities, \$56,000,000, to remain available until expended, provided that none of these funds shall be subject to section 3011(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; and for grants under section 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, to address impacts of Hurricane Florence, Hurricane Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, notwithstanding subsections (b), (e), and (f), of such section: *Provided*, That such amounts are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

For an additional amount for “State and Tribal Assistance Grants”, \$349,400,000 to remain available until expended, of which \$53,300,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and of which \$296,100,000 shall be for capitalization grants under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 604(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(a)(1)(D) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds appropriated herein shall be provided to States or Territories in EPA Regions 4, 9, and 10 in amounts determined by the Administrator for wastewater treatment works and drinking water facilities impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and calendar year 2018 wildfires and earthquakes: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, for the funds appropriated herein, each State shall use not less than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent of the amount of its capitalization grants to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall retain \$10,400,000 of the funds appropriated herein for grants for drinking water facilities and waste water treatment plants impacted by Typhoon Yutu: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein shall be used for eligible projects whose purpose is to reduce flood or fire damage risk and vulnerability or to enhance resiliency to rapid hydrologic change or natural disaster at treatment works as defined by section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any eligible facilities under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other eligible tasks at such treatment works or facilities necessary to further such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may retain up to \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for management and oversight: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for “Forest and Rangeland Research” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended for the forest inventory and analysis program: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For an additional amount for “State and Private Forestry” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for “National Forest System” for necessary expenses re-

lated to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$84,960,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount \$21,000,000 shall be used for hazardous fuels management activities: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for “Capital Improvement and Maintenance” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$36,040,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Wildland Fire Management”, \$720,271,000, to remain available through September 30, 2022, for urgent wildland fire suppression operations: *Provided*, That such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2018 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For an additional amount for “National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences” for necessary expenses in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9606(a)) and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 related to the consequences of major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2018, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 601. Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this division, the agencies receiving funds appropriated by this title shall provide a detailed operating plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this title by State and Territory, and by program, project, and activity, to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That no such funds shall be obligated before the operating plans are provided to the Committees: *Provided further*, That such plans shall be updated, including obligations to date, and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations every 60 days until all such funds are expended.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Training and Employment Services”, \$50,000,000, for

the dislocated workers assistance national reserve for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), to remain available through September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may transfer up to \$1,000,000 of such funds to any other Department of Labor account for reconstruction and recovery needs, including worker protection activities: *Provided further*, That these sums may be used to replace grant funds previously obligated to the impacted areas: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, up to \$500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to “Office of Inspector General” for oversight of activities responding to such covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For an additional amount for “Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant”, \$30,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191): *Provided*, That the Secretary shall allocate such funds based on assessed need notwithstanding sections 658J and 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That such funds may be used for costs of renovating, repairing, or rebuilding child care facilities without regard to section 658F(b) or 658G of such Act and with amounts allocated for such purposes excluded from the calculation of percentages under subsection 658E(c)(3) of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 658J(c) of such Act, funds allotted to a State and used for renovating, repairing, or rebuilding child care facilities may be obligated by the State in that fiscal year or the succeeding three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That Federal interest provisions will not apply to the renovation or rebuilding of privately-owned family child care homes, and the Secretary shall develop parameters on the use of funds for family child care homes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not retain Federal interest after a period of 10 years in any facility renovated, repaired, or rebuilt with funds appropriated under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for costs that are reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, under a contract for insurance, or by self-insurance: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein prior to the date of enactment of this Act may be charged to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Children and Families Services Programs”, \$90,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191): *Provided*, That \$55,000,000 shall be for Head Start programs, including making payments under the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That none of funds provided in the previous proviso shall be included in the calculation of the “base grant” in subsequent fiscal years, as such term is defined in sections 640(a)(7)(A), 641A(h)(1)(B), or 645(d)(3) of the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided in the second previous proviso are not subject to the allocation requirements of section 640(a) of the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be for payments to States, territories, and tribes for activities authorized under subpart 1 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act, with such funds allocated based on assessed need notwithstanding section 423 of such Act and paid without regard to percentage limitations in subsections (a) or (e) in section 424 of such Act: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 shall be for payments to States, territories, and tribes authorized under the Community Services Block Grant Act, with such funds allocated based on assessed need notwithstanding sections 674(b), 675A, and 675B of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 676(b)(8) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, each State, territory, or tribe may allocate funds to eligible entities based on assessed need: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for costs that are reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, under a contract for insurance, or by self-insurance: *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available for Federal administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein prior to the date of enactment of this Act may be charged to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$201,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), including activities authorized under section 319(a) of the Public Health Service Act (referred to in this Act as the “PHS Act”): *Provided*, That of the

amount provided, \$80,000,000 shall be transferred to “Health Resources and Services Administration—Primary Health Care” for expenses directly related to a covered disaster or emergency for disaster response and recovery, for the Health Centers Program under section 330 of the PHS Act, including alteration, renovation, construction, equipment, and other capital improvement costs as necessary to meet the needs of areas affected by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That the time limitation in section 330(e)(3) of the PHS Act shall not apply to funds made available under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be transferred to “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC-Wide Activities and Program Support” for response, recovery, mitigation, and other expenses directly related to a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, not less than \$100,000,000 shall be transferred to “Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Health Surveillance and Program Support” for grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for behavioral health treatment, treatment of substance use disorders, crisis counseling, and other related helplines, and for other similar programs to provide support to individuals impacted by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, up to \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” for oversight of activities responding to such covered disasters or emergencies: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Hurricane Education Recovery” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), \$165,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, for assisting in meeting the educational needs of individuals affected by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided*, That such assistance may be provided through any of the programs authorized under this heading in title VIII of subdivision 1 of division B of Public Law 115–123 (as amended by Public Law 115–141), as determined by the Secretary of Education, and subject to the terms and conditions that applied to those programs, except that references to dates and school years in Public Law 115–123 shall be deemed to be the corresponding dates and school years for the covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Education may determine the amounts to be used for each such program and shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of these amounts not later than 7 days prior to obligation: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Education for

oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated under this heading, and up to \$1,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be for program administration: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 701. Not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education shall provide a detailed spend plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this title, including estimated personnel and administrative costs, to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That such plans shall be updated and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations every 60 days until all funds are expended or expire.

TITLE VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for audits and investigations related to Hurricanes Florence, Lane, and Michael, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, the calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquakes, and volcano eruptions, and other disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this division, the Government Accountability Office shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spend plan specifying funding estimates for audits and investigations of any such declared disasters occurring in 2018 and identifying funding estimates or carryover balances, if any, that may be available for audits and investigations of any other such declared disasters: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE
CORPS

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps”, \$115,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for planning and design related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael on Navy and Marine Corps installations: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive a master plan for the installations: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this division, the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Air Force”, \$700,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for planning and design, and construction expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Michael: *Provided*, That none of the

funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive a basing plan and future mission requirements for installations significantly damaged by Hurricane Michael: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this division, the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Army National Guard”, \$42,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive form 1391 for each specific request: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this division, the Director of the Army National Guard, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such funds may be obligated or expended for planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

**VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
MEDICAL FACILITIES**

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Medical Facilities”, \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Mangkhut and Yutu: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, upon determination that such action is necessary to address needs as a result of the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Mangkhut and Yutu, may transfer such funds to any discretionary account of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit notice thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for obligation until the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM**

For an additional amount for the “Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program”

as authorized under section 5324 of title 49, United States Code, \$10,542,000 to remain available until expended, for transit systems affected by major declared disasters occurring in calendar year 2018: *Provided*, That not more than three-quarters of 1 percent of the funds for public transportation emergency relief shall be available for administrative expenses and ongoing program management oversight as authorized under sections 5334 and 5338(f)(2) of such title and shall be in addition to any other appropriations for such purpose: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS**

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Of the amounts made available for “Federal Aviation Administration—Operations” in division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123), up to \$18,000,000 shall also be available for necessary expenses related to the consequences of major declared disasters occurring in calendar year 2018: *Provided*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM**

For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program as authorized under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, \$1,650,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For an additional amount for “Community Development Fund”, \$1,060,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018 pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That any funds made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115–254 that remain available, after the funds under such headings have been allocated for necessary expenses for activities authorized under such headings, shall be allocated to grantees, for mitigation activities in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018: *Provided further*, That such allocations shall be made in the same proportion that the amount of funds each grantee received under this division and the same heading in division I of Public Law

115–254 bears to the amount of all funds provided to all grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2018: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under the text preceding the first proviso under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115–254, the Secretary shall allocate to all such grantees an aggregate amount not less than 33 percent of the sum of such amounts of funds within 120 days after the enactment of this division based on the best available data, and shall allocate no less than 100 percent of such funds by no later than 180 days after the enactment of this division: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not prohibit the use of funds made available under this heading and the same heading in Public Law 115–254 for non-Federal share as authorized by section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, grantees may establish grant programs to assist small businesses for working capital purposes to aid in recovery: *Provided further*, That as a condition of making any grant, the Secretary shall certify in advance that such grantee has in place proficient financial controls and procurement processes and has established adequate procedures to prevent any duplication of benefits as defined by section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155), to ensure timely expenditure of funds, to maintain comprehensive websites regarding all disaster recovery activities assisted with these funds, and to detect and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds: *Provided further*, That with respect to any such duplication of benefits, the Secretary shall act in accordance with section 1210 of Public Law 115–254 (132 Stat. 3442) and section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall require grantees to maintain on a public website information containing common reporting criteria established by the Department that permits individuals and entities awaiting assistance and the general public to see how all grant funds are used, including copies of all relevant procurement documents, grantee administrative contracts and details of ongoing procurement processes, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary for approval detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursed by, or for which funds have been made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers, in excess of the authorized amount of the project or its components: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the non-disaster formula allocations made pursuant to section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306): *Provided further*, That a State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That the first proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115–254) is amended by striking “State or unit of general local government” and inserting “State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community

Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))": *Provided further*, That the sixth proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115-254) is amended by striking "State or subdivision thereof" and inserting "State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))": *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), if the Secretary finds that good cause exists for the waiver or alternative requirement and such waiver or alternative requirement would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the preceding proviso, recipients of funds provided under this heading that use such funds to supplement Federal assistance provided under section 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408 (c)(4), or 502 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) may adopt, without review or public comment, any environmental review, approval, or permit performed by a Federal agency, and such adoption shall satisfy the responsibilities of the recipient with respect to such environmental review, approval or permit: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 104(g)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)(2)), the Secretary may, upon receipt of a request for release of funds and certification, immediately approve the release of funds for an activity or project assisted under this heading if the recipient has adopted an environmental review, approval or permit under the preceding proviso or the activity or project is categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish via notice in the Federal Register any waiver, or alternative requirement, to any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver or alternative requirement: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building and technical assistance, including assistance on contracting and procurement processes, to support States, units of general local government, or Indian tribes (and their subrecipients) that receive allocations pursuant to this heading, received disaster recovery allocations under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, or may receive similar allocations for disaster recovery in future appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, up to \$2,500,000 shall be transferred, in aggregate, to "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Program Office Salaries and Expenses—Community Planning and Development" for necessary costs, including information technology costs, of administering and overseeing the obligation and expenditure of amounts under this heading: *Provided further*, That the amount specified in the preceding proviso shall be combined with funds appropriated under the same heading and for the same purpose in Public Law 115-254 and

the aggregate of such amounts shall be available for any of the same such purposes specified under this heading or the same heading in Public Law 115-254 without limitation: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1001. (a) Amounts previously made available for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster, including funds provided under section 145 of division C of Public Law 114-223, section 192 of division C of Public Law 114-223 (as added by section 101(3) of division A of Public Law 114-254), section 421 of division K of Public Law 115-31, and any mitigation funding provided under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of Public Law 115-123, that were allocated in response to Hurricane Matthew, may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities in the most impacted and distressed areas related to Hurricane Florence. In addition, any funds provided under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" in this division or in division I of Public Law 115-254 that are allocated in response to Hurricane Florence may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities in the most impacted and distressed areas related to Hurricane Matthew. Until HUD publishes the Federal Register Notice implementing this provision, grantees may submit for HUD approval revised plans for the use of funds related to Hurricane Matthew that expand the eligible beneficiaries of existing programs contained in such previously approved plans to include those impacted by Hurricane Florence. Approval of any such revised plans shall include the execution of revised grant terms and conditions as necessary. Once the implementing Notice is published, any additional action plan revisions shall follow the requirements contained therein.

(b) Amounts made available for administrative costs for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas under this division or any future Act, and amounts previously provided under section 420 of division L of Public Law 114-113, section 145 of division C of Public Law 114-223, section 192 of division C of Public Law 114-223 (as added by section 101(3) of division A of Public Law 114-254), section 421 of division K of Public Law 115-31, and under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of division B of Public Law 115-56, Public Law

115-123, and Public Law 115-254, shall be available for eligible administrative costs of the grantee related to any disaster relief funding identified in this subsection without regard to the particular disaster appropriation from which such funds originated.

(c) The additional uses pursuant to this section for amounts that were previously designated by the Congress, respectively, as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE XI

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS DIVISION

SEC. 1101. Each amount designated in this division by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

This division may be cited as the "Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief, 2019".

DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

TITLE I

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT EXTENSION

SEC. 101. Any program, authority, or provision, including any pilot program, authorized under the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 54) shall continue in effect through September 30, 2019.

TITLE II

HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND

SEC. 201. In subsequent fiscal years, any discretionary appropriation for the Corps of Engineers derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (not to exceed the total amount deposited in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in the prior fiscal year) shall be subtracted from the estimate of discretionary budget authority and outlays for any estimate of an appropriations Act under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 202. In subsequent fiscal years, funds made available for donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports in accordance with 33 U.S.C. 2238c shall be considered to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and may additionally be used for an in-water improvement or maintenance of in-water infrastructure that benefits commercial navigation.

SA 202. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **PARTICIPATION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) in subsection (r), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”; and

(B) in subsection (u)(3), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”.

(2) ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “and Guam,” and inserting “Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,”; and

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Hawaii,” each place it appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (6)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as applicable, on the date described in subparagraph (B) if the Secretary of Agriculture submits to Congress a certification under subsection (f)(3) of section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028) (as added by subsection (b)).

(B) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date referred to in subparagraph (A) is, with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the date established by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, respectively, in the applicable plan of operation submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (f)(1)(A) of section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028) (as added by subsection (b)).

(b) TRANSITION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TRANSITION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF PLAN BY PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—

“(A) SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF PLAN OF OPERATION.—If a State agency is designated by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (referred to in this subsection as a ‘governmental entity’) and submits to the Secretary a request to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and a plan of operation under section 11 (including a date on which the governmental entity will begin to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program), the Secretary shall determine whether that governmental entity and State agency satisfy the requirements that

would apply under this Act for approval of that plan if the governmental entity were 1 of the several States.

“(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—

“(1) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve a plan of operation under subparagraph (A) if the governmental entity and State agency satisfy the requirements described in that subparagraph.

“(ii) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary does not approve a plan of operation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the governmental entity a statement that describes each requirement that is not satisfied by the plan.

“(2) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES.—If the Secretary approves a plan of operation under paragraph (1)(B)(i), the Secretary shall accept from retail food stores located in the applicable governmental entity applications under section 9 for approval to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a certification that a governmental entity qualifies to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as if the governmental entity were a State if the Secretary—

“(A) approves the plan of operation under paragraph (1)(B)(i); and

“(B) approves the applications under paragraph (2) of a number of retail food stores located in the governmental entity requesting to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that would be sufficient to satisfy the requirements of this Act if the governmental entity were 1 of the several States.

“(4) CASH BENEFITS PROVIDED IN PUERTO RICO.—As part of a plan of operation submitted under paragraph (1)(A), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may submit to the Secretary a request to provide benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the form of cash.

“(5) FAMILY MARKET PROGRAM IN PUERTO RICO.—As part of a plan of operation submitted under paragraph (1)(A), notwithstanding subsection (g), the Secretary shall allow the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to continue to carry out, under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, the Family Market Program established under this section.

“(g) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) through (e) shall cease to be effective with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as applicable, on the date described in paragraph (2) if the Secretary submits to Congress a certification under subsection (f)(3).

“(2) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date referred to in paragraph (1) is, with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the date established by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, respectively, in the applicable plan of operation submitted to the Secretary under subsection (f)(1)(A).”

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section such sums as are necessary for each fiscal year, to remain available until expended.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet

during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 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 Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Chairman's housing reform outline.”

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at a time to be determined during votes, to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security, Gordon Hartogensis, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and Courtney Dunbar Jones, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Ukraine's progress and Russia's malign activities.”

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Making electronic health information available to patients and providers.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Examining guidelines for State action.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURING, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Small business perspectives on a Federal Data Privacy Framework.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

The Subcommittee on East Asia, The Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to hearing entitled, “U.S. policy towards North Korea after the second summit.”

GOLD STAR WIVES DAY

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res 68 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 68) designating April 5, 2019, as “Gold Star Wives Day”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 13, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FORT BENNING IN COLUMBUS, GEORGIA

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res 72 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 72) honoring the 100th anniversary of Fort Benning in Columbus, Georgia.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 14, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res 117 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 117) designating March 22, 2019, as “National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 117) was agreed to.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 14, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 27; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 268; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postclosure on the motion to proceed to H.R. 268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Madam 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 KLOBUCHAR.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may consume.

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise to join my colleagues in sharing my concerns and all of our concerns that we have—and really the concerns of a nation—about the announcement last night from a Department of Justice that works for this administration, which announced its plans to literally invalidate the Affordable Care Act and strip healthcare coverage away from millions of Americans, including those with preexisting conditions.

Before this time, it was a bit unclear, despite a court filing in Texas, what the intentions were. Some of our colleagues were saying, “No, we don’t really want to repeal the Affordable Care Act,” but last night we learned the truth, and the truth was very clear. The Justice Department took a hardline approach that they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The President tweeted today that the Republican Party “will soon be known as the party of health care.” In fact, yesterday’s filing—in which the administration changed its previous position and argued in support of affirming the decision of a district court judge in Texas—ensures exactly the opposite; that this administration will break the promise it made to the American people that they can have healthcare insurance; that if they have a preexisting condition, they will not lose their healthcare. That was what the situation was before we had the protections in place in the Affordable Care Act, before you were able to keep your kids on your insurance until they were 26. That was a huge positive development.

Then we also put in place protections that said you couldn’t be kicked off your insurance for preexisting conditions. All over the last year, we had a debate about this in this Nation. I still remember being in a smalltown parade in Northern Minnesota, where a mom was pushing a stroller. She brought me over and pointed to her toddler in that stroller, to her young boy who had Down syndrome. She said: This is what a preexisting condition looks like, and I will do everything to protect my child. Guess what. Last night, the administration announced they wouldn’t protect that child because they will do everything to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Let’s start with the absurd ruling the administration is basing its actions on. The Texas ruling last December came more than 6 years after the Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Roberts, upheld the law’s constitutionality, which also found that parts of the law can be severed from the rest of the legislation. It also came after

the administration's refusal to defend the law. Instead of going in to put out the fire when the house was burning down, they just stood there. They just stood there and poured lighter fluid on, in terms of tweets and rhetoric.

If this ruling takes effect, the consequences of just this ruling alone from Texas will be devastating. To start, protections for people with preexisting conditions will be gone. About half of all Americans have preexisting conditions. This isn't just rare diseases. It is much more common diseases, like diabetes and asthma. The ability to keep your kid on your insurance plan until they are 26 would be gone. The work we have done to close the Medicare doughnut hole coverage gap would be gone. The provisions that help people buy insurance on the healthcare exchanges would be gone.

In my State, Minnesotans would see a loss of \$364 million in premium tax credits, and roughly 272,000 people would lose their coverage. That is one State alone.

We cannot allow this to happen. The decision from Texas should be overturned, and we need a President who believes the same thing. It is time to stop trying to reset the clock or start from scratch. This is not what the American people want. The vast majority of Americans support those protections in the Affordable Care Act.

We know we can make improvements to the Affordable Care Act. I would like to see pharmaceutical prices go down. I would like to pass my bill to allow Medicare to negotiate cheaper prices for prescription drugs. We could have a vote on that. I would love to see the bill I had with Senator McCain, and now Senator GRASSLEY, come up for a vote that would allow less expensive drugs to be brought in from other countries that are safe, like Canada. I would like to see a vote on the bill that Senator GRASSLEY and I have to stop pay-for-delay, where pharmaceuticals pay off generics to keep their products off the market.

We have already seen what kind of healthcare proposal my Republican colleagues have put forward. We saw it just last year. The legislation we saw last Congress would have hurt people by kicking millions off of Medicaid, by letting insurance companies charge people more when they get sick, and by jacking up healthcare costs.

Every major group you trust, when it comes to your health, was opposed—the largest groups of doctors, nurses, seniors, hospitals, people with cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, diabetes. Why were they opposed to repealing the Affordable Care Act? Because there was nothing good that was proposed to replace it.

We cannot spend the next 2 years going backward and fighting old fights, as this administration announced they would do last night. We need to focus on building on the strengths of the Affordable Care Act, those protections, and making it even stronger by allow-

ing seniors to negotiate for less expensive drug prices, for bringing in less expensive drugs from places like Canada, and for stopping pay-for-delay.

We can also reduce premiums by passing the bipartisan bill that Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have for reinsurance, by passing Senator SHAHEEN's cost-sharing bill, by moving on for a public option which could be supported with Medicaid, the bill that Senator SCHATZ has, or Medicare, which is another bill Senator KAINE has.

I have always said the Affordable Care Act was a beginning and not an end, but guess what. Last night, we found out this administration truly wants to end it.

What are real people saying about this who don't work in this place? What are people who actually have to depend on the protections of the Affordable Care Act saying? I am going to spend the rest of my time this evening telling some of those stories, reading from the letters that I and others have received about people who have been protected by the Affordable Care Act, the very act that this administration announced last night it wanted to repeal—not just partially repeal. They announced they want to repeal all of it.

What would that do to people? Let's hear the stories. Let's read the letters. I am going to read 100 letters tonight, and I am starting, with the first letter, from my home State.

Bruce from Minneapolis has diabetes. He was spending \$1,000 a month for medical coverage before Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010. Today, he pays \$300. He was quoted saying: "As an individual with pre-existing conditions, the ACA has helped save me thousands of dollars and given me a better lifestyle."

Amy of St. Paul said she needs the Medicaid benefits she gained under the ACA. What happened to her? She slipped on an icy driveway, as many people in Northern States, in this past winter, have done. Sadly for her, she had a brain injury when that happened. The ACA Medicaid benefits helped to cover her medical costs.

Delaney was able to access a mammogram screening to see if she carries the same genetic trait that predisposed several of her relatives to breast cancer. I have worked on the EARLY Act—passed this bill as part of the Affordable Care Act—that allowed us to do more to help especially people who have genetically tested to have the same gene, especially, by the way, certain women in African-American populations and certain women who are Jewish. We have found a prevailing gene that means they are more likely to get breast cancer when they are younger, but before we had the Affordable Care Act, none of this would have been covered. None of this would have been paid attention to.

Delaney wrote that because of the bill, she was able to access a mammogram screening to see if she had that

trait. Any threat to the ACA concerns her because the law mandated that healthcare plans cover recommended screenings.

Story No. 4. Katherine of Minneapolis is trying to regain financial independence after diabetes forced her out of her job. For now, she is covered by a low-income government policy that would continue if the ACA stays in place but otherwise it goes away. She worries that any income from a part-time job would disqualify her for coverage and that she would struggle to find private insurance without the ACA's protections for people with preexisting conditions.

I think this is really important for people to know because even if you are not using those exchanges because maybe you have employer insurance, which over half the people in this country have, the ACA helps you. Do you know why? It has those prohibitions that say your insurance can't kick you off just because you have a preexisting condition, just because you are born with diabetes, just because later in life you have breast cancer, or, as was the case before we passed the ACA in a number of States, if you were a victim of domestic violence, that was considered a preexisting condition because it could happen to you again.

So as I read these letters and tell these stories, people need to understand that the people who have been protected are not just the people who are getting their insurance on the exchanges. There are a whole lot of people who are on private insurance but were protected because the Affordable Care Act made clear that they can't be kicked off their insurance.

Story No. 5, letter No. 5. Amy qualifies for Medicaid only because the ACA raised the income limits to be eligible for the State program for those with disabilities. She had 73 doctor visits after she had this head injury, and she doubts she would have received that much care without good insurance.

That is the same story we had here in the letter; it is the same person who slipped and had a brain injury. This is another piece of why this is so important, because she got a disability when she slipped, and that means she is concerned that because of the income limits, that could change.

Story No. 6. Kate wrote to me and shared the following story:

I call my son the baby that almost didn't happen. A bright, loving and entirely all-boy 4-year-old, Daniel was a gift to us after I battled cancer from 27 to 34 years old. Unable to find care for my cancer after it reoccurred, my only insurance option even denied my pap smears and lifesaving tests. Cancer dotted my cervix in an attempt to overtake me; I refused to allow it to win.

Because of the ACA, I faced a future of hope—not only for myself, but for cancer sisters who were unable to receive other treatment and died. My best friend's cancer scans weren't covered by her insurance until 2015 and after battling for 3 years, she passed last year. Special provisions are now in place in the bill for women's health. Healthcare is going to be more affordable for people like

me and my children for years to come. Being a woman should NOT be a pre-existing condition.

Story No. 7. Abbey of Minneapolis was diagnosed with a parasitic infection at the age of 10 months old. Because of the ACA, she was still on her insurance throughout college when she had to have two brain surgeries and multiple eye surgeries. It also helps her pay for the only medicine that treats her disease.

Story No 8. Mary Jo from Minnesota is struggling with the costs of sending three kids to college. She was able to provide health insurance for her middle daughter only because the ACA allowed her to be covered by her father's insurance. Mary Jo writes that a reversal of this legislation would "be the last straw for us. Please don't take it away from us—we're hanging on by a fingernail."

I think that is a good one to send to the White House: This would "be the last straw for us." This is someone who is struggling to keep their kids in college and who needs the ACA to keep the kids on their healthcare.

Tara is another one from outside of my State. Tara's young son would not be alive if it weren't for Medi-Cal. Tara was laid off from her job just prior to his birth, and there was an issue with transitioning to COBRA. Her husband is self-employed without insurance, so when her son Benjamin came, he was uninsured. Tara said:

We were hard-working Americans, but that didn't matter when it came to insurance. Benjamin was uninsurable because of his heart.

When Benjamin was 2 weeks old, he was taken to the emergency room, where they learned he had a congenital heart defect that was causing him to go into heart failure. As doctors rushed to save his life, Tara and her husband panicked, not knowing how they would afford any care. Tara's mom and sisters offered to sell their houses, and their extended family looked to liquidate whatever assets they had. At that point, someone at the hospital gave Tara the paperwork for California Children's Services. That is where they live. They found they were eligible, and Benjamin's coverage began shortly thereafter.

For years, Tara and her family watched their income levels closely, keeping their income low, fearing that Medi-Cal would be terminated. She didn't return to work for years. She emphasizes that they never collected any other kind of assistance, but she was left with no choice, knowing that they would never be able to find other coverage for Benjamin.

Her mom, who is retired, takes care of Benjamin and helps her. Tara eventually went back to work, but when she went back to work, her husband was diagnosed with hepatitis. He now joins the millions of Americans who have preexisting conditions. She wrote:

If the ACA is repealed and I lose my job, and insurance, my husband and son will lose

access to health insurance we can afford. No healthcare saving will cover the cost of their care, not on a teacher's salary. Benjamin will soon be an adult and unable to be covered on my health insurance. I pray he will be able to afford health insurance.

She says this is what she wants lawmakers to know—that means us, right here, who work here:

We never collected any other type of assistance, but we had no choice to accept the [healthcare] coverage. Please consider the effects of repealing this act on children like my son and our family. We are real people. We're not special. We're normal Americans. We work hard, with some extraordinary circumstances. We don't want a free ride; we just want help and for lawmakers to know we're not disposable.

Letter No. 10. Kathy from Nevada says:

Before the Affordable Care Act, there were times in my life when I had health insurance and other times when I did not. Some employers would offer me a plan, and then if I switched jobs, I'd lose it.

By the way, I can't tell you how many times I heard this in my home State.

She goes on:

I tried to apply for coverage on the individual market—

This is before the Affordable Care Act—

but insurers would deny me when I admitted [and told the truth] that I had occasional migraines and sinus issues.

In late 2013, I started to notice pain in my abdomen nearly every time I ate anything. . . . I drove myself to the nearest urgent care facility. Many tests and procedures followed, and by March I was diagnosed with Burkitt's lymphoma, a rare form of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma that's extremely aggressive. . . . The diagnosis came at the worst time imaginable. My mom died unexpectedly in January and a tree fell on my house in February. I found myself running away to escape because I was completely overwhelmed and terrified of chemotherapy. But after about a week, the cancer had weakened me to the point where I could barely walk from my car. . . . I went home to begin cancer treatment.

Because Burkitt's lymphoma is so aggressive, I needed . . . infusions of chemotherapy for 5½ days during each round, for a total of six rounds. These infusions could only be administered in the hospital.

When I finally finished treatment, I had amassed an astronomical amount of medical bills. . . . If I had not had medical insurance, I honestly don't know if I would have been able to continue.

The gratitude I felt (and continue to feel) for the ACA and the fact that I have medical insurance, is off the charts! The thought of going back to the days of not having medical insurance is so frightening to me. It almost feels barbaric, for lack of a better term, for anyone to be denied the opportunity to take care of his or her health without the looming possibility of bankruptcy.

She continues:

It is truly inhumane. I recently moved to Nevada and enrolled in their exchange. I will require monitoring for the rest of my life. Now that the ACA is up in the air, I feel like I am fighting for my life again! Congress is trying to take away the one thing that continues to guarantee access to screenings and treatment. Because of my age and my cancer history, any plan that doesn't have those protections guarantees that I will be charged

more and that I am at risk for being discriminated against.

Thank you for listening to my story.

Story No 11. Mendy in Virginia says:

My family's whole world was turned upside down in September 2015 when my husband, Ed, survived a massive stroke.

The stroke left Ed severely disabled. He lost the ability to verbally express himself, needed a wheelchair, and required help with all basic functions, including bathing and toileting.

When the stroke hit, Ed was working for an insurance company and I was a stay-at-home mom. His employer was kind enough to keep us on their health insurance for as long as they could. But within a couple of months, it became apparent that the damage was too severe, and Ed's recovery would take too long. His employer had no choice but to let Ed go, and with that, we lost our health insurance.

It was frightening—I knew that Ed needed help and that COBRA was too expensive at \$600 a month. A friend recommended that we make an appointment with a navigator at the local health center. I had no idea help like that even existed, but we walked out of an appointment with a silver plan for \$15 a month. . . . Our son was able to receive coverage through CHIP.

The insurance is what we can ask for [and it is good]. It covers Ed's physical therapy . . . our family doctor, his cardiologist, neurologist, and all of the medications he needs to make sure he doesn't have another stroke.

Now, you can imagine if they didn't have this coverage, and if he had another stroke when he is not that old, it would be even more expensive. Those are my words that I am adding.

She says:

Almost two years after the stroke, Ed can move around with the help of a cane, but he still needs assistance standing.

What are we going to do if we lose access to insurance?

She continues:

I'm am not being dramatic when I say this is life or death. My husband will die if we lose access to affordable coverage.

I wish lawmakers—

And I would add in this case, as we know from what was announced last night, this administration—could understand that they are cutting our family's lifeline.

Letter No. 12. Celeste and Larry from Michigan say:

My husband and I worked our entire lives. Larry worked as a stone mason, while I pursued a degree . . . in social work. . . . We . . . saved for retirement. We built up a great safety net, but it all got yanked away. We're now 63 and 61, and I don't know what we are going to do if the Senate takes away—

If this administration takes away, I would add—

our access to Medicaid.

In 2006, Larry was laid off from his job and he struggled to find another job in light of the Great Recession. It became really important for me to keep my job so that we could maintain insurance for both of us.

Within a couple of years, Larry began to experience problems with his memory, and doctors diagnosed him with early onset Alzheimer's disease.

As we know, by the way, many millions of Americans are affected by Alzheimer's—some of them way too early and some of them not expecting it.

This can happen to any family—what happened to Celeste and Larry. That is why taking their word last night and looking at what they have said they wanted to do, which is to repeal the Affordable Care Act, would mean that not only do those who buy insurance on the exchange lose out, but every American loses out who could have a preexisting condition or who does have a preexisting condition.

So she says this:

He was diagnosed with early onset Alzheimer's. Unfortunately, because he had been out of work for so long, he wasn't eligible for disability benefits. I had to leave my job because I became disabled. We were without any insurance until the Affordable Care Act marketplaces opened. In order to get by, we sold our houses, spend down our retirement, and took drastic measures to pay our medical bills and day-to-day living expenses. That first year, we bought a plan that cost us only \$27 a month. The next year, we qualified for expanded Medicaid.

We paid into the system our entire lives. I don't think it is right that lawmakers are now threatening to take everything away from us.

She says this:

My parents immigrated to this country. English wasn't their first language. Four out of five of us kids went to college. All of the grandchildren went to college. Everyone is doing well because we worked.

My family has collectively paid into the system more than enough to cover us, but now they are talking about ripping away benefits. Where is the justice in that?

She adds this—this woman whose husband has Alzheimer's, who was protected by the Affordable Care Act. Do you know what she says in this letter?

We are not losers. We are not freeloaders. We should not have to be embarrassed or shamed for needing help. There should be dignity in getting old, and we should be enjoying our golden years, but that has been taken away from us. Don't make it worse.

Story No. 13, Mary and Erich:

Let me tell you about my son Erich. He is friendly and compassionate. When he grows up, he wants to be in a band and to be a Power Ranger. He loves to dance to videos we find together on YouTube. His greatest joy comes from being around his friends at Miracle League Baseball, [and that is a baseball league for kids with] special needs, where he plays third base.

Mary writes:

Erich was born with Down syndrome and a severe intellectual disability. At 20 years old, he functions at roughly the level of a second grader. While many young adults with Down's have been able to integrate into society and take on employment, Erich's disability is so profound that he requires full-time care, and he will never be able to live independently.

My husband, Mary writes, died suddenly in 2009. So today, it is just Erich and me. After my husband's death, I was forced to close down the business we owned, and we lost access to traditional insurance. Erich and I were able to get coverage through Medicaid. It has been a critical lifeline over these last 9 years, and I don't know what would happen to either one of us if it were to go away.

Through the services provided by Medicaid and other supportive programs in our community, I am able to keep Erich at home where he belongs. He needs Medicare for speech therapy as he has an enlarged tongue,

small mouth, and weak facial muscles. He has difficulty communicating and saying words like "water" [and] "phone". . . . His sentences are two and three words. Erich is prone to sinus and allergy infections due to a smaller cartilage in his nose typical of Down syndrome. He suffers from skin rashes due to the infections that he gets. He does require many prescriptions and doctor's visits and occasionally a visit to the emergency room.

As a boomer generation widow, I need to make sure that I am healthy enough to show up for him. He has NO ONE else. I depend on these services, too.

When I hear about potential cuts [to Medicaid, when I hear about repealing the Affordable Care Act], I think not just about Erich, but about all his "special needs" friends he has made over the years at the school, at the tutoring center, and on the baseball field. Cutting or capping programs like Medicaid will devastate us all. Many of his friends require more services, are wheelchair bound, have speech, hearing, heart, and constant ear problems.

As a society, and the greatest country in the world, we have to continue to support—

In her words—

our "special people" and families like ours. These "special people" enrich our lives and show us what is important . . . caring for each other, compassion, and friendship.

Story No. 14, Sara in Maryland. She says:

I am a physician, and the ACA allows me to document [healthcare issues] better and more fully. I no longer need to worry that if a person is designated as, for example, having acne and they have a serious condition later, they will be denied insurance for a pre-existing condition.

I thought this story in the letter was interesting because it shows what the doctors were going through as they were trying to figure out how they report things so this person isn't denied insurance later because they have a preexisting condition. Now they don't have to worry about that anymore, but if the administration wins—if they win in their action to repeal the Affordable Care Act, like they announced last night they wanted to do—we would go back to that situation.

Story No. 15, Tracey in Maryland. She says this:

In 2011, I began dialysis due to end-stage kidney disease. Before dialysis and well into it, I worked as a preschool teacher, a notoriously low-paying profession. In 2007, when I changed jobs, I lost my employer-based health insurance. After 1 year of COBRA, a local insurance person and a good friend of ours told me about the Maryland State Health Insurance Plan. Through that plan, I was able to qualify. When the ACA began, the MSHIP [State] plan ended. In a meeting with a member of Howard County's Health Department to figure out how to replace my insurance under the ACA, he told me that because of my end-stage kidney disease, I probably would qualify for Medicare. He was right. I also have a supplemental plan (Care First) and a drug plan [through] AARP, and my parents help pay the premiums for those. In 2015, I had to stop working because of exhaustion caused by dialysis. I then qualified for disability. In 2016, I had a kidney transplant. Medicare will continue to insure me. . . . Our hope is that by then I will be back to work, but my biggest concern is that without the ACA, my preexisting condition will prevent me from finding health insurance.

At the end of her letter, she asks a simple question: "What will I do then?" That is a question that millions and millions of Americans want to ask the President today. They woke up to read the newspaper or turn on TV and found out that this administration had announced that they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act—not part of it, no, no, the whole thing. So when they do this, this means these protections aren't in place. So there is a whole ton of people that joined Tracey in asking: "What will I do then?"

Story No. 16, Debbie in New Jersey:

I am a 48-year-old woman with chronic health issues that require me to visit doctors every few weeks and take prescription medications. I suffer from migraines. . . . I also have herniated discs in my back. . . . I am self-employed and run two businesses.

Guess what. That means she is contributing in a big way to our economy.

I purchase my coverage on the federal ACA exchange. Before the ACA—

Or as we know it, the Affordable Care Act—

I had nowhere to buy affordable insurance coverage that would actually cover my health issues. Repealing the ACA will have a devastating impact on small businesses and the self-employed, especially those of us with health problems. I am terrified that I won't be able to afford coverage as I inch closer to the 50-64 age bracket. And if the ACA is repealed and if there is no marketplace for me to purchase insurance, I will be forced to close my businesses.

Story No. 17, Stephanie in Massachusetts:

I was born with hip dysplasia. I had surgery to correct it at 9 months old. At best, the issue was corrected to 85 percent of what a normal hip will do. In college . . . I had hip pain. I underwent four separate surgeries to fix cartilage. That meant four sets of pre-op AND post-op MRIs or other scans and four sets of post-op hospital stays.

In just 27 years, my family and I racked up hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical bills. In recent years, insurance covered . . . [me].

I'm honestly not sure what repeal of the ACA means for me, but I guarantee it'll make life harder as it will for a lot of people. I was lucky to have insurance.

Please vote no on any bill that repeals the ACA. Save my care.

As for this story, even though she didn't know quite how it would affect her, I can tell you that with hip dysplasia, something I have, she has a preexisting condition, and that would mean that she couldn't qualify for insurance, especially when it came to further hip surgeries.

No. 18, Tegan in Ohio:

It would put me at risk of losing coverage [if you repeal] because of a genetic pre-existing condition. Congenital dilated cardiomyopathy killed my grandfather, nearly killed my aunt, killed my sister, and nearly killed my brother. When my brother, a 12 year old at the time, needed a heart transplant, doctors told our parents that the insurance could simply decide to not cover the procedure. They had buried a toddler just 4 years earlier, and they were faced with the possibility of losing another child.

Tegan writes:

We need to ensure that all Americans have access to care. You can't predict when you

will get sick or injured, and you can't predict when a dangerous genetic mutation may emerge in your family. How we treat our fellow Americans is a measure of who we are as a people.

That is a good one to send to the White House tonight.

No. 19, Shirley in Massachusetts. She writes:

My second daughter was born with liver disease, which was diagnosed 9 weeks after her birth and required surgeries and medications. Pediatricians, cancer specialists, heart doctors, and family physicians all agree that . . . [healthcare suggested changes that would repeal the Affordable Care Act] will make things worse, not better.

No. 20, Sheila in Illinois:

The ACA allowed us to start a new business, in spite of the fact that my husband was diagnosed in 1992 with hepatitis C after receiving a tainted blood transfusion in the '70s. We became, in her words, job creators because we were finally able to get coverage for him outside of employer provided coverage.

She says:

I have been self-employed for 28 years but have gotten a job because at age 61, the fear of losing affordable healthcare at my age could ruin our finances.

No. 21, Carter, 22 months. This is written by his family.

Meet Carter. He loves cars, swimming, and building blocks. He requires therapy (speech, occupational, and physical), orthotics . . . glasses, and nebulizer machine. He sees an infectious disease, pulmonologist, and neurologist. His disease is progressive . . . [he needs healthcare].

Story No. 22, Myka, age 7:

Myka is 7 years old. She loves the Girl Scouts, ice skating, and playing with her friends. Myka was born with a congenital heart defect. What does access to affordable quality healthcare mean? It means Myka is still alive.

No. 23, Leonore in New York. She writes:

I have Parkinson's, and I have had it for 18 years and have Medicare disability since 2008. I am 62, and the ACA allows me to have a preexisting condition and . . . [still get help].

She talks about her son, who is 24 years old and disabled and says:

We'd both be in terrible trouble if we lost our coverage.

No. 24, Joanna:

My name is Joanna. I am here to share the story of my daughter Jasmine. . . . I will start at the beginning of her life, 3 years ago, when she was . . . inside my belly.

I was four months pregnant . . . when I received the most devastating and heart wrenching news. . . . I was told that my precious little . . . [baby had a heart problem]. I was told she had one of the most complex and deadly conditions around.

I was told she would have half a heart with many of her organs flipped.

But she was given options.

I prayed for a decision. I was quickly reminded of the recent Obamacare legislation that would give Jasmine a chance at life. One that is hopeful and compassionate, that protects innocent children like Jasmine from being denied medical care due to pre-existing heart conditions, one that refuses to put a dollar sign on her life by imposing lifetime caps, and one that would ensure essential healthcare benefits to keep her alive.

She was born, and she had the surgery. She says:

Thank goodness for Essential Health Benefits that allowed me to receive proper maternity care when Jasmine was in the womb . . . and emergency services.

I am sharing my story today as a plea to not steal these lifetime protections away from Jasmine. . . . Please do not tell my child and children like her that they are too expensive, not worthy of life any longer. Please know, this is a life and death fight for me and my daughter, and I will do everything in my power to protect her and to stand up for whatever is needed to keep her alive.

No. 25, Kendall in Oklahoma.

The moment I finally realized what it meant to be poor and sick in America, I was sitting by myself in the cancer center an hour from my home. I had arrived early for my infusion that day, checked in and gotten that day's hospital bracelet. Before I could be hooked up to an I.V., I was pulled into a side room and told my insurance had denied my claim.

That is the story, and that is what is going to happen over and over again if we go back to those old days before we had the Affordable Care Act.

No. 26, Jennifer.

My husband Chris is one of many ACA success stories in red state Oklahoma. In January 2006, at age 29 at the time, Chris began working for a nonprofit that offered healthcare benefits after a certain period of employment. A few months later, we went to the ER thinking he had appendicitis. Doctors quickly took him to surgery thinking the same. After several hours, the surgeon (accompanied by a chaplain) said he removed a large tumor from Chris' colon. He was on the brink of death with a rare aggressive form of colon cancer. Removing the tumor increased his chances for survival but the cancer was far too advanced for traditional chemotherapy. The only course of action at that point was to see an oncologist every month for CEA labs and a colonoscopy every 6 months until the oncologist determined he was out of danger for recurrence. We crossed our fingers and hoped for the best.

Between 2006 and 2009, Chris tried to get health insurance but [was] rejected due to cancer diagnosis being a preexisting condition. Once the ACA became law, because of its protections for people with preexisting conditions, my husband was able to purchase a [healthcare] policy through the federal exchange and continue seeing an oncologist for needed care.

Miraculously, Chris has not had a recurrence—so far. Without ACA protections for preexisting conditions, my husband will be forced [and] (priced) out of the market. Given the high probability for recurrence and increased costs impeding an early diagnosis of recurrence, survival is less likely for my husband. I cannot bear the thought of losing my love, my best friend . . . my hero.

Story No. 27 is from Texas. His name is Mike. All he says is this:

My wife and I are uninsurable without the ACA. I take life-saving medications.

Think of how many people just write those simple words.

No. 28, Amanda in Texas.

My son, Cooper, is 3 years old. We found out he has cystic fibrosis when I was 14 weeks pregnant. Though he has been very healthy for a child with CF, literally a simple cold could change that. He will always have CF, and both preexisting conditions and lifetime maximums keep us up at night. Just

being insured won't mean anything if there is a lifetime maximum. By the time he reaches grade school, he will likely have exceeded the typical "million dollar maximum" we dread so much. Please keep our boy healthy.

She pleads not to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

No. 29, Adele in Massachusetts.

I was diagnosed with epilepsy at 18 years old. Beforehand, I was dealing with chronic depression which required high doses of antidepressants. . . . My mother is a single parent and I am currently 22, so we try our best to be able to afford our medications. . . . If the ACA [is repealed] it is possible that we will no longer be able to afford our medicines and that I could fall into a deep depression. . . . If the ACA repeal is passed I will no longer be proud to be an American.

No. 30, Helen in North Carolina.

Insuring me through COBRA when my husband retired would have cost us a full third of our small, fixed income. The ACA provided [us] not only assured access to health insurance for me, but insurance with a premium and an out-of-pocket maximum that fits [with] our budget.

So many of these stories involve people trying to fit their budget with healthcare.

She writes:

That insurance allows me to continue my treatments for my illnesses. Without my medications, I will be in extreme pain, will have more joints eroding to the point of being nonfunctional, and will be landing in a hospital multiple times a year. . . . Without the tax subsidy I get through the ACA, my insurance premiums plus the max for my current plan would cost 80% of our income.

No. 31, Jennifer in Arizona.

I am an attorney and have been employed full-time since graduating law school in 2006. I take care of myself, make healthy choices, and work hard. I have encountered multiple medical challenges in the last 15 years. I was diagnosed with thyroid cancer in my first semester of law school and had surgery to remove my thyroid over Christmas break that year. The surgery damaged my [parathyroid] glands which produce a hormone that helps the body process calcium. I have to take replacement thyroid hormone, activated Vitamin D, and calcium supplements to stay healthy. Over the last 15 years my prescription costs have gone up from \$30 a month to about \$110 a month.

In 2012, I had an unexplained placental abruption with my first pregnancy and delivered my son 9 weeks early. He spent 5 weeks in [intensive care] learning to eat and breathe.

Last year, my son tripped over his Pull-up and broke his femur. He was placed in a full-body cast for almost 8 weeks.

We [have good jobs] with good employer health coverage.

But here is the problem. Because of her problems with her thyroid, she would have a preexisting condition. They would not get health insurance.

We are working on continuing to be contributing members of society, investing our savings . . . [and making sure we participate] in the economy in every way.

No. 32, Debra in Illinois.

Our older daughter is severely disabled.

By the way, anyone who dealt with the past attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act knows that the disability

community was mobilized as never before. Because they, of anyone, the families of people with kids with disabilities, understand more than anyone how important this preexisting protection is.

Yet, last night, without regard to them, without regard to anyone in America with a preexisting condition, the administration just announced they are going all out to repeal these protections in the Affordable Care Act.

That is what happened.

Debra from Illinois.

Our older daughter is severely disabled. Essentially a preexisting condition since birth. In 2014 I underwent treatment for Stage 3 . . . breast cancer. I was horrified. Then I pulled myself together. If I can survive cancer, I can survive [this].

But without healthcare, we can't survive.

No. 33, Felicia in Texas.

I have struggled with chronic pain for over 20 years. For years I've gone to specialist after specialist, and pain clinic after pain clinic. No one could tell me why regular approaches to joint and tendon pain never worked for me.

Just last year I was finally diagnosed with . . . a genetic . . . connective tissue disorder.

She goes through and describes what this means to her: There is no cure for my chronic condition, only pain management.

Because these conditions are rare, [these physicians don't know] how to help me.

She says she depends on healthcare specialists. She says she needs the affordable healthcare act because of the preexisting condition protection. I believe her.

No. 34, Janet in Illinois.

I have a son who survived cancer and a daughter with Crohn's disease. My daughter's husband has Cystic Fibrosis.

Repeal of the ACA would change everything.

Let them stay healthy.

No. 35, Elizabeth in Illinois.

I am lucky (for now), in that I have coverage through my employer. That said, even I could be impacted if lifetime and annual benefits caps are put back in place. I have two family members undergoing cancer treatment right now, what happens to them? What if one of my children is diagnosed with a . . . disease like my best friend's 5-year-old daughter was?

No. 36, Patricia in Illinois.

I have a preexisting condition as I have Multiple Sclerosis. My treatment includes MRI's yearly and medications that cost nearly 60,000 dollars yearly. I am now in Medicare and Medicaid and would be left with no options as I am on disability and could afford no insurance.

No. 37, Noel in Maryland.

I will soon be 26 and off my parents' health insurance, and it is thanks to Obamacare that I have been able to stay on that insurance while I have been struggling with a chronic disease. . . . I have made great strides in recovering my health . . . should not be punished for having a preexisting condition.

No. 38, Megan in Texas.

My dearest friend recently donated her kidney to a two year old child who was on di-

alysis, and saved his life. At the time of her donation, Obama was President and pre-existing conditions seemed protected, and she didn't question such a transformative medical procedure. Pre-existing Condition coverage must remain in order to protect living organ donors and encourage people to save lives by donating. Who would donate an organ if they knew insurers could charge them or not accept them? We must protect this important provision!

No. 39, Jeffery in Illinois.

I have MS. . . . Every 48 hours I inject myself with prescription medication to prevent the disease from advancing.

If the ACA was repealed, I would not have protection, and MS would, of course, be considered a preexisting condition.

The ACA has allowed me to remain a productive wage earner supporting myself and my family.

How many times do you hear this?

Please consider the personal and societal costs of repealing the ACA.

No. 40, Lauren in California.

When I was a freshman in college, I donated blood to the Red Cross. A couple of weeks later, a letter from the Red Cross informed me that I had Hepatitis C—I was 18, living away from home (clear across the country) for the first time, and I had no idea what to do or how I might have contracted the virus. After a year it was determined the diagnosis was a false-positive . . . but every blood test since has indicated liver enzyme levels outside of normal, which means Hepatitis C will be a pre-existing condition that follows me around for the rest of my life. I just earned my PhD and I'm still looking for my first postdoctoral job, which means I'll need health care coverage until I am insured by an employer. . . . I'm screwed [if I don't have the ACA]. I've worked hard to make good choices for my health, but now an administrative mistake that I have no control over—

That was the information she received when she gave blood—

has the potential to wreck my chances for affordable health insurance [if the ACA protections aren't in place].

No. 41, Koula in Texas.

I have high blood pressure & pre-diabetic. I am retired and currently I'm covered under my employers plan as a retiree (I pay premiums at twice what an active employee pays) until the age of 65 then I switch to Medicare and my employer insurance will become secondary. If you cut the requirements that corporations offer to their employees and retirees I will be greatly affected as I'm living on a fixed income. My condition is heredity and no amount of exercise or dieting will ever bring down my blood pressure enough for it to be normal. . . .

No. 42, Joy in Texas writes:

I would be dead and/or bankrupt without ACA coverage. Within 6 weeks of moving to Austin from New York City in 2012, I was diagnosed with stomach cancer; I had had breast cancer . . . I came with insurance associated with my business, a plan unavailable in Texas. When that expired, I was kind of stunned to discover I was uninsurable. . . . For the next 6 months, I was in the state pool and basically self-insured until the ACA became effective. . . . Although not perfect, it provided the coverage I needed at a price point I could afford.

No. 43, Liz writes:

I wish the ACA had been around 10 years ago. Back then I was almost 30 years into a happy and successful teaching career. . . .

But then along came that little glitch in the economy, and schools were tightening belts. I found myself unemployed, uninsured, and living with a pre-existing condition requiring very expensive, but life extending medications. Worse, I was living in a country where health care is tied to one's job status.

Jobs were scarce, and age was not on my side in a tight job market. So I worked in daycare centers, and did babysitting. My Cobra ran out. Private insurance was totally out of reach.

Ultimately I had just one option left: I was just old enough to retire early as a teacher and to qualify for retired teacher benefits with TRS. It was a last resort. . . . By law, I would no longer be eligible to teach. . . . Without the ACA, I had to choose between my job and my life.

No. 44, Jerry writes:

Fifteen years ago I was self-employed and working furiously to get a new company off the ground. Things were going fine until I ran up against a brick wall—health insurance. My wife and I had been happily paying for health coverage through my previous employer via COBRA, but then we approached the time limit allowed under that coverage. It was impossible for us to buy a policy on the individual market for two reasons: my wife had not only been recently treated for cervical cancer, but she was also pregnant with our first child.

He says:

Protect our care. Entrepreneurial and creative Americans deserve the freedom to chase our dreams without having to risk financial ruin by being denied access to comprehensive . . . healthcare. Isn't that risk-taking spirit . . . what . . . [people say] . . . is needed to build our economy ever higher?

No. 45, Lisa writes:

No healthcare coverage for my chronic illness will result in my death [because of the ACA.]

No. 46, Hannah writes:

My spouse is a research scientist. Some years ago, while working at the University of Texas, he received a highly prestigious national research fellowship. The fellowship made him ineligible for employee health insurance. . . . Due to a preexisting condition he contracted as a teenager, however, he was denied affordable insurance. . . . We oppose the repeal of the ACA because the denial of healthcare to individuals based on their employment status, their economic status, or their health conditions is deeply unethical and ultimately deadly.

No. 47, Jaime writes:

I am a 62-year old and am currently in the hospital awaiting open heart surgery. I am only able to have this surgery due to being in ObamaCare.

No. 48, Devora in Maryland writes:

My daughter Esther was diagnosed with Leukemia when she was 12. She would not be able to get health insurance under the proposed bill. She has been through enough.

That is what a lot of people in America would say right now to the Trump administration. They have been through enough because of their health problems and because they have worked hard, and they deserve to be carried. They have been through enough because they have had that healthcare threatened over and over. They voted in 2018 because they wanted to have their healthcare protected.

Yet now, last night, the administration—not listening to that—announced

they would repeal the entire Affordable Care Act.

No. 49, Darla in Michigan writes:

I'm on disability from chronic pain because of a doctor's mistake with back surgery. I am going to have my fifth back surgery. I live alone and am on disability. I already pay huge premiums.

She says: If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, "I will be homeless."

No. 50, Nathan in Michigan writes:

I am a builder who builds and maintains homes for many of the wealthiest people in our State. I have worked hard and climbed my way to the top over the last 20 years. None of the employers in my area offered insurance, and only until the ACA was I able to afford the healthcare I need. I have severe asthma and have arthritis in my right hip. Even with the ACA, we still struggle to pay my medical bills, but we manage.

He says:

Now, we are worried that . . . [if we lose the ACA] I could be priced right out by being put in a high-risk pool because I have pre-existing conditions. I am making top dollar working for the people who are going to reap the profits. . . .

He finishes by saying: This is taking away my ability to do the work on their houses.

No. 51, Ellen in New York writes:

My husband has been disabled from a stroke for almost 20 years and unable to work. I am a licensed clinical social worker within busy Private Practice doing counseling with individuals, couples, and families. If Mental Health Services are dropped . . . I will not be able to support my family.

My husband and I are both seniors and anticipate insurance premium rates going up. . . . [if we don't have the Affordable Care Act]. . . . we both have preexisting conditions.

Erika in Washington writes:

I have triplet sons, each of which have all had a form of healthcare issues that would be deemed under this plan to now be pre-existing conditions.

I can't fathom the thought that another woman or a mom would not be alive or her children would not receive the same care we have. I will stand against anyone who threatens my children's future access to health. I don't know a single mother who won't be right there alongside me.

Well, I think they are going to have to go to the White House now because we just heard last night that they want to repeal the entire Affordable Care Act.

No. 53, Marcy writes:

I'm in fairly good physical health, but mental health has been a lifelong struggle for me. I take medication and have turned to therapists . . . several times over the years. I do my best to stay mentally healthy. But there have been many times when I needed help. . . . I believe everyone should have access to mental healthcare. It's not something you should choose as part of your health care plan or not.

We ALL need full, comprehensive, excellent healthcare coverage. Essential coverage for mental health, maternity care, well care check-ups, medication, etc. is important for EVERYONE.

No. 54, Samantha in Massachusetts writes:

My husband has a genetic kidney disorder . . . and at the age of 47, needed a kidney transplant. He is now, thanks to the mir-

acles of modern medicine and the incredible generosity of his donor, back at work, paying taxes, and living a good life. The transplant took place one week before the last election, and the last thing we did before the surgery was vote early—in large part to try to stave off the repeal of the ACA. My husband's prospects are very good. . . . The financial implications to both my family and the kidney donors are impossible to predict or calculate, but the cost of losing ObamaCare would be steep, terrifying, and entirely un-American.

No. 55, Amal in Tennessee writes:

I feel ridiculously lucky that the ACA existed when I had my baby, and here's why: My husband and I were both freelancers when I got pregnant and were on ObamaCare in New York. When I was 5 months pregnant, we moved to Nashville for his job, which didn't provide insurance. Because of the ACA, we were able to buy coverage, even though somehow pregnancy is considered a preexisting condition. It could once again become the basis for an insurance company to reject you or to increase your premiums if the ACA is repealed.

Denying a pregnant woman insurance coverage can have far-reaching effects. She might stay in an unhealthy job to maintain coverage, or stay in an unhealthy or abusive marriage to maintain her husband's coverage. A family might forego a good opportunity to move for a better life for their child. . . .

No. 56, Matthew in Washington writes:

I was diagnosed with a chronic medical condition when I was 9. Growing up, I was fortunate to have a mother who was able to fight for me, from keeping me enrolled in a public school to getting me access to experimental drugs at any of trials. . . . But I also saw her in tears over medical bills when my father was laid off after 9/11 and we had to go on COBRA, and how draining negotiations with insurance companies were.

I am now successful, independent, and working in international relations in Washington, D.C., which I love. If the ACA is repealed, I will live in constant fear of being laid off or fired and losing my insurance, or worry that I will have a flare-up that would devastate me financially.

No. 57, Page writes:

I was fired in 2015 when I was 5 weeks pregnant. Thank goodness we had the Affordable Care Act because I could not be discriminated against under any preexisting condition limitations. I knew my maternity care would be covered. I logged onto the exchange, compared plans, [and] signed up. . . . I'm just so grateful that happened for me.

No. 58, Kelsey writes:

My brother has Type 1 diabetes and prior to the ACA, he was covered on my parents' insurance, but I don't know what's going to happen to him [when we don't have the ACA, if they took it away].

No. 59, Macon writes:

I'm a member of a union that takes care of me, but a lot of people are not that fortunate and I'm scared for them. I have family members with preexisting conditions, and by every accounting, this bill, if it passes, is going to take coverage away from people who are vulnerable. . . .

No. 60, Samantha writes:

I'm fighting the repeal of the ACA because my father has a preexisting condition and he's hoping to retire in the next few years. I don't believe plans should be changed because of a bill that would remove protections for people with preexisting conditions. . . .

No. 61, Golchin from Nevada writes:

It will be really hard for us to get insurance since I will be [considered having a pre-existing condition]. . . . We would love to start our family. . . . Having kids is all we talk about, so please don't take that away from many of us.

No. 62, Cathy writes:

ObamaCare saved my life. I had health insurance. I needed brain surgery. My health insurance company kept delaying approvals. . . . Because they refused to pay for a CT scan that was needed to confirm a diagnosis, I had to pay for one out of pocket. . . . But, because of the public pressure, when ObamaCare was being drafted, my surgery was eventually approved by the insurance company in 2009.

I am deeply concerned that legislation repealing ObamaCare could leave in place devastating and historic cuts to my hospital. Please do not gut protections for those of us with preexisting conditions. . . . Do not eliminate services for special needs kids.

No. 63, Jennifer in Nevada writes:

If the ACA is repealed, my healthcare might go away and I could never afford continuing care with my . . . [heart condition] . . . and my husband's arthritic condition. When my battery runs out in four years, if I don't have health insurance, I'll probably die or have to go bankrupt. . . . My brother also has heart trouble. . . . And for what? So that the wealthy can have more . . . ? Our government is supposed to work for our best interests. . . .

No. 64, Adrian writes:

In 1986 to 1987, I was diagnosed with [genetic] breast cancer and was told I had a 25 percent chance of living 5 years. I quit my job to have medical treatment, and, after COBRA coverage ran out, was put in a high-risk pool (Illinois). My insurance payments were high . . . I had to go back to work to pay for . . . [them]. If that's what happened 30 years ago . . . [what would happen now if I had a preexisting condition and couldn't get insurance coverage]?

No. 65, Michelle writes:

I have had three surgeries for the "chronic disease". . . . Prior to ACA, these surgeries would not have been covered. . . .

No. 66, Elizabeth writes:

Please do not allow States the ability to opt out of holding insurances companies accountable to cover essential health benefits like maternity care, mental health treatment, and rehabilitation treatment. As an elementary public art educator, I know firsthand the importance of [the] mental health care [provision]. The school district I serve . . . has suffered the loss of four students who have taken their own lives just this year to battles with mental and emotional issues, the youngest of whom was 12 years old and a former student of mine from the first year I taught. . . . These saddening and possibly preventable deaths have rocked our community. Coverage for mental health and treatment will allow parents the ability to seek help for their children whose precious lives hang in the balance in the politics of healthcare. Affordable care helps destigmatize mental and emotional illnesses, giving these students the confidence and ability to speak up.

People have long stories, and they care about this a lot.

Story No. 67, Karen:

My friend Mary was never able to purchase health insurance until ObamaCare passed. She bought a policy the very first day it was available to her. A few months later, she was

driving, and she was almost killed. She required prolonged care and rehab, which would not have been available to her before she had health insurance. Through good care, hard work, and persistence, she is alive and again a productive member of society. Please do not take healthcare away from people like my friend Mary.

No. 68, JoSelle in Florida:

I am self-employed as a freelance editor and writer and have been for most of my post-college life. Unfortunately, I also have preexisting conditions.

Pre-ACA, I was ineligible for insurance despite taking some of the cheapest, most common medications on the marketplace. I was forced into a high-risk pool in the State where I lived at the time, Utah, which placed an enormous financial burden on me. . . . Post 2014, I can afford to pay for my insurance.

Of course, the ACA isn't perfect. I am sympathetic to those who faced premium increases under it or who found their access to healthcare diminished. However, the logical thing to do is to improve it, not demolish it.

That is a pretty good line. Send that one to the Justice Department.

I urge all people reading this to stop and think. Whether you voted for Clinton or Trump, whether you preferred one of their primary challengers to either of them, whether you live in a red, purple, or blue State . . . it does not do to not have the Affordable Care Act.

No. 69, Kat in Kansas:

I had advanced stage 3 breast cancer and inflammatory breast cancer. I am now on disability. Contrary to what many have said, I did nothing to bring this on myself. I ate right and exercised. I didn't smoke. My cancer was genetic. So was the heart problem I had. I did not ask for this. Disability is no picnic. I can barely make ends meet. If the ACA is repealed, I will be homeless at the best and, at worst, dead.

No. 70, Lois in New York:

Breast cancer runs throughout my family on both my parents' sides. My mother, aunt, and cousins have all had this disease. Some have died from it, including my mom. When I was 23, I had a lump removed. Luckily, it was benign. The anxiety, pain of discovery, and treatment are excruciating enough without having to worry if you can afford care.

No. 71, Penny in New York:

My son has a life-threatening preexisting condition for which he received medical treatment and medication through the ACA expansion of Medicaid in the State where he lives. Without this, he will be unable to pay for his medications and doctors' visits and will surely decline. Both my mother and my husband's father were able to be cared for in nursing homes, until their dying days, because of Medicaid. I am desperate to make sure we keep our healthcare.

Thank you for listening.

No. 72, Jen:

In 2015, I donated a kidney to a stranger, kicking off a chain of three transplants. I didn't have to worry about how it would affect my health insurance because, thanks to the ACA, I could never be charged more or be denied coverage because I shared my spare kidney. I am 55 years old and self-employed. This repeal will be a direct attack on my financial and health security.

No. 73, Jolene:

I know many of my friends rely on Medicaid. Losing it means the loss of their lives. They cannot afford their medications without the ACA.

No. 74, Deborah:

My family's story is over, but I want people to know how much the ACA meant to us at a very difficult time. Our niece, a single adult, lost her job and her insurance coverage when she was in the middle of the fight for her life, battling advanced melanoma. Because of the ACA, she was able to sign up for insurance on the marketplace. I will be very honest and say it wasn't easy, and she was forced to change insurance companies because of changes in available plans. However—and this is big—

she writes in capital letters, sort of similar to the President's tweets—

she was able to get coverage despite the fact that she was very ill. Anyone who has watched a loved one suffer from this devastating disease of melanoma knows how terrible it is. Even though she eventually succumbed to the melanoma that had spread throughout her body, she was able to have continued quality medical care and, eventually, hospice care until her death. I beg you to consider how your decisions will impact people. Even the least of those among us—

That was a quote she put—

deserve the dignity of receiving quality medical care.

Think about this. This is a story of someone whom she lost in her family, and she is making a point that, I think, many would make in this Nation. Even when people are going to die, they want to have them die peacefully. They want them to have good healthcare. They don't want to have them taken off of their insurance because of preexisting conditions.

Story No. 75 talks about how a financial burden in the early 2000s forced him into bankruptcy. The reduction of work hours and required continuing medical costs left him unable to afford healthcare.

Now, with the potential loss of affordable healthcare on the horizon, my wife is facing a similar situation with her preexisting condition.

He writes:

Anyone is one step away from a financial disaster due to the onset of a serious medical condition. Believe me, I lived it first hand, and I didn't see it coming. I think most people who get suddenly sick would say the same thing. They have gone through their lives. They are working hard. They didn't see it coming. That is why we need the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

No. 76, Jackson:

Most of the people in my family are likely to lose coverage without anything less than the protections established in the ACA. Any one of us without the ACA would be one car accident or illness away from bankruptcy.

That kind of says it all.

No. 77, Allison in Utah:

My husband and I are self-employed, so we buy our insurance on the open market. Although we were much healthier than some people when we applied for insurance prior to the ACA, we were both rated out because of preexisting conditions. I was even rejected by one company. This seemed ridiculous since the preexisting conditions that caused the rate increases were injuries from being active and were both completely resolved. This made our insurance astronomically expensive.

When I say we are healthy, we really are healthy. We are lean; we are trim; we are in

our mid forties; but we can run, hike, climb, and do more pushups than most people in their mid-20s. We eat healthy, exercise hard, and never get sick. At the most, we might catch one cold a year between the both of us.

Since the ACA, we have had no problem getting health insurance, and we are not rated out because of preexisting conditions, but the best part is we feel comfortable that we have health insurance. Now it sounds like people are scheming to take away the protection we enjoy under the ACA.

OK. They are not just scheming. They actually announced last night to the entire country that they were going to do this. People woke up. They watched the TV. They looked at their newspapers. The administration said, yes, it is not going to repeal just part of the ACA; it is going to repeal the whole ACA.

It goes on to read:

We are against their attempt to take away the mandate that prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against individuals with preexisting conditions.

No. 78, Erin in Missouri:

Ours is a story of a genetic mutation that none of us could fathom would bring incredible health challenges to our family. We are the lucky few that have jobs that provide us with insurance. My grandfather's sister was the first to be diagnosed with breast cancer. My mother's cousin and her sister were next. Then my mom was diagnosed with uterine cancer. Then I came along at 32 with the diagnosis and then my sister. Now, as I type this note, my 78-year-old mother awaits another radiology appointment.

This story is filled with heartbreak and much love. These are the things patients should have to worry about, not whether they can afford their care or be discriminated against because they carry a gene that is beyond their control.

No. 79, Mary in Massachusetts:

We have MassHealth and great hospitals. Without both of these, my daughter would have died at birth. Everyone, no matter their income, deserves proper access to healthcare even if you have a preexisting condition or a previous illness. Every time I look at my daughter, it affirms this.

No. 80, Brent:

When I graduated high school, my dad informed me that he had paid enough for my health insurance, and now that I was an adult, he wasn't going to pay for it anymore. That's it. That was the entire conversation. I had no idea how to get health insurance for myself, much less how to pay for it, so I just went without for 7 years. Within that time, I had health problems.

My sister lives in France.

He talks about her getting protections.

Instead of being punished, we should be able to have healthcare. This is no way to run a democracy. This is no way to be a decent human.

No. 81, Tina in Texas:

I have stage 4 colon cancer, and I am currently on private insurance. I will be forced on to Medicare in another year as I am currently on disability. My life span is at risk if the provision to cover preexisting conditions is abandoned. I have literally risked my life in order to participate in a phase 1 drug trial to help advance our knowledge of treating cancer. How good is that knowledge if we will not be covered?

No. 82, Julia:

I am a 29-year-old adult who was diagnosed with a syndrome at age 9, and all through

most of my life, I have had no real help besides my mom, but she is a single mom. There is not just me but my brothers and sisters as well as there is only so much one person can do.

She writes:
Help me.

No. 83, Nicole in Kansas:

I am writing on behalf of my 15-month-old daughter, Mira. I experienced a normal pregnancy, a normal birth, and a normal maternity leave, but around the 4-month mark, we learned that Mira had a neurological disability that may very well render her unable to walk or talk. I could not return to work for a year while I was acting as her mom.

The ACA is the only thing that kept our family afloat in the most difficult year of our lives. If the ACA is repealed, Mira, who has absolutely no control over the state of her health—

a 15-month-old kid—

she will suffer needlessly. Please help us.

No. 84, Jane:

I am a psychologist with a Ph.D., employed for the past 30 years in community mental health centers. I have a serious preexisting condition that made me completely uninsurable before the ACA. Access to healthcare matters.

No. 85:

Because the ACA mandates access to free mammograms, I got one this year that resulted in a breast cancer diagnosis. Because the ACA mandates coverage for genetic testing, I was able to have that done and found out I have a gene that means I am at risk for cancer. My risk of ovarian cancer was 60 percent. My risk of breast cancer recurrence was 70 percent. I get to ensure that won't happen to me. Yes, early menopause and a mastectomy suck, but they are a whole lot better than radiation, chemo, and possibly death.

No. 86, Ashley:

In 2012, at the age of 29, I had my first job and was diagnosed with a heart disease. This is a pregnancy-induced form of heart failure that occurs in women with no prior history of heart disease. My recovery has been a long and brutal one of heart disease. I was on a life vest—a portable defibrillator—for the first month, and I should have been on it longer. I will always have a preexisting condition. The ACA makes me safe.

No. 87, Lea:

I am a wife, mother, grandmother, sister, aunt, and great aunt. In my family, my husband and I owned a small business and couldn't change health insurance because of a preexisting condition in one of my children. As a sister, I watched my older sister fight cancer while still working 12-hour shifts as an RN. As a great aunt, I have watched my niece handle two sons with medical conditions. These people deserve the health insurance that does not have any lifetime maximums, and they should be able to pay reasonable premiums.

No. 88, Hillary from New York City and Kansas.

Although I live in New York now, Kansas City is home. I was raised in KC, attended Shawnee Mission Schools and KU. My friends, family, and a piece of my heart remain there. I was born with spina bifida, so I have always had a preexisting medical condition. I need affordable healthcare.

No. 89.

Eleven years ago, I had just turned 23.

She talks about her pregnancy, how she needed the protection, and how the

Affordable Care Act—now that she has a preexisting condition and has a photography business and her husband's work insurance doesn't cover her, ACA has saved her and allowed her to work, and she has a beautiful baby.

No. 90, Laura.

My son Danny was born at 30 weeks gestation via emergency C-section. He was diagnosed with spastic cerebral palsy at the age of 1. Without the protections of the ACA, we would not have him. Now we don't have to worry about lifetime limits, preexisting conditions, and the security of knowing we could keep him on our insurance until he is 26.

No. 91, Kerry.

My initial surgery, a bulging disk, happened when I was 17 and a senior in high school. When I was 18, the disk herniated. I had back surgery at 19, and then I felt like a new person. No more crawling to the bathroom every morning, no more chronic pain. In June 2003, I was days away from being kicked off my parents' insurance when I re-injured my back.

Then she talks about how, later, the ACA helped her.

Now I am going to finish up with letters from my own State.

No. 92, Kayla from Belgrade. Kayla lost her child to cancer and wrote to me that if protections for preexisting conditions are taken away, more families will suffer similar heartbreak.

No. 93, Katie. Katie told me that without protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, she would not have been able to have gotten her diagnosis and beat cancer.

No. 94, Tony. Tony is afraid that without the protections provided by the Affordable Care Act, he will be unable to afford healthcare or be denied coverage because of his preexisting condition.

No. 95, Alison. A nurse named Alison from Minnesota is concerned that changes to the health law could make the homeless populations she works with even more vulnerable.

No. 96, Julie. Julie is concerned for her young son, Hudson, who has asthma and a rare food allergy. Without protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, Julie believes Hudson will be forced into a plan that will dramatically reduce his access to healthcare or, worse, prevent him from getting health insurance to begin with.

No. 97, Sarah. Sarah was diagnosed with stage IV colon cancer when she was 34 and has undergone countless rounds of chemo. She fears what the "scarlet letter" of having a preexisting condition will mean for her access to care and wonders how she will be able to receive the most cutting-edge treatments.

No. 98, Kate. I remember Kate. Kate did a video, and she became famous. She wrote to me about her son, Cooper, who has severe, nonverbal autism. Because of Medicaid, Cooper has access to the care he needs, and Kate can keep her job. Why were they famous? Cooper was featured on Jimmy Fallon and the "Today" show for being the cutest toddler to say "mama." He started a con-

test, and his mom Kate decided to enter herself and her son saying "mama." Cooper can't speak, but he uses a speech device to help him communicate. She sent in her video, that was the one they picked, and Cooper became a star.

Kate is afraid that changes to Medicaid could force her to quit her job in order to take care of Cooper. How could she explain that to her sons?

This is another story of someone who has a family member—in this case, her beloved son—with a disability that would then be considered a preexisting condition. Maybe there would be a way to cover him, of course, under disability insurance, but then you start messing with whether his mom can work. We would be right back where we were before these protections took place.

Story No. 99, Penny of St. Paul. Penny works with disabled veterans, but she has a chronic condition of her own—rheumatoid arthritis. Thankfully, her current insurance allows her to get the care she needs. But without the ACA, Penny is concerned that she and many others with treatable conditions will be unable to afford their medications.

Last, Ariane. Ariane had triplets at just 28 weeks, and her pregnancy included three hospital stays and bedrest. Without the ban on lifetime caps, Ariane said she would have lost everything.

Those are just 100 stories. Think of the millions more, the millions of people who would like to tell the President and the Justice Department and this administration what it would mean if what they said they wanted to do last night actually happened. These are just 100 people from across the country.

I hope my colleagues are listening to this because just last night, this administration announced that they were going to go all-out, that they were going to do everything to repeal the Affordable Care Act. These 100 people are not going to let this happen. You have heard the stories of those moms who will do anything for their kids with disabilities. You heard the story of the woman who, while her family member was lost to melanoma, that coverage for a girl who would have had a preexisting condition allowed her to have a peaceful life in her last weeks of life.

These are the stories this administration needs to hear to understand that this isn't just some political battle to see how this sits with your base, to be against ObamaCare; these are real Americans with real healthcare needs. We will fight this on their behalf to the end.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:07 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BRIDGET A. BRINK, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC.

JOHN JEFFERSON DAIGLE, OF LOUISIANA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CABO VERDE.

MATTHEW S. KLIMOW, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO TURKMENISTAN.

CHRISTOPHER LANDAU, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES.

THE JUDICIARY

ADA E. BROWN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE TERRY R. MEANS, RETIRED.

DAVID JOHN NOVAK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, VICE HENRY E. HUDSON, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JEFFREY A. ROSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE ROD J. ROSENSTEIN.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. TOD D. WOLTERS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8043:

To be general

LT. GEN. DAVID H. BERGER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

LA TANYA D. AUSTIN
LUIS E. MILLAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL T. CHARLTON

ROBERT T. UNGERMAN III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ELISSA R. BALLAS
MATTHEW W. BOOTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

BRIAN C. BANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS L. REMPFER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 7436(GA):

To be colonel

SHANE R. REEVES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBIN N. SCOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW R. THOM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

DAVID M. POWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

FORD M. LANNAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

LUKE A. RANDALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK M. KUBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RHANA S. KURDI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL D. NORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

JASON A. BYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NATHANIEL C. CURLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

SEWHAN KIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

EARLY HOWARD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ISAAC L. HENDERSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

SHAWN D. TRULOVE
JOHN B. WELLS

To be lieutenant commander

DENA R. BOYD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TRACI J. MCKINNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PATRICK H. O'MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

CHARLES E. JENKINS IV

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 26, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

BRIDGET S. BADE, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.