



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

No. 53

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, from whom all blessings flow, we thank You for the gift of this day. Inspire us to use these precious hours and minutes to glorify Your Name. Lord, give us the wisdom to number our days that we may have hearts of wisdom. Guide our Senators with strength, courage, hope, and love. Empower them to build bridges that will keep America strong. Use them to pull down barriers of contention and replace them with gates that lead to harmony and peace. Lord, do for our lawmakers more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

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

sume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 268, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

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

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, yesterday, we had debate on the Green New Deal. I wonder how many Americans realize that this debate on the Green New Deal was not on a bill before the Congress that would become law but was on nothing but a non-binding resolution. Rather than working on specific changes in the law, the authors chose vague aspirations for dramatic action in the future. That is the difference between an active environmentalist and an environmental activist.

I am proud of my accomplishments that have had a real, positive impact on the environment. For instance, I authored the production tax credit for wind energy back in 1992. During my leadership on the Senate Finance Committee in the 2000s, I oversaw the establishment, enhancement, and renewal of numerous clean energy tax incentives.

My point is not to say that I made some impact on the environment but to say that there is a difference between offering a bill and, in turn, just a nonbinding resolution, which—the Democrats haven't put forth any real law.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, my Democratic colleagues in this body offered the American peo-

ple a crystal-clear picture of what the Democratic Party stands for in 2019 and whom it represents. Nearly all of our Democratic colleagues wrapped their arms around the radical policy they have marketed to the public as the Green New Deal.

I am sure we will be hearing carefully crafted spin about the transparent political maneuvering behind voting present instead of voting yes. Not exactly "Profiles in Courage." Not exactly "Profiles in Courage."

I am also certain that we will hear more indignant claims that I somehow sabotaged the legislation they said they support by actually bringing it to a vote. That is a fascinating sight in the Senate—the cosponsors of a policy complaining bitterly that they actually had to go on record to actually vote for a bill they supposedly support, but go on record they did. They can call it voting present. They can call it voting yes. But when every single Senate Democrat running for President has signed on as a cosponsor, when all of the energy and momentum in the Democratic Party is behind this, when just a tiny handful of Democratic Senators could bring themselves to vote against it on the floor, what we have is a Democratic Party that is fixated on satisfying the far left, even at the cost of crushing—crushing—working-class and middle-class American life as we know it.

Yesterday, the vast majority of Senate Democrats could not dismiss something as crazy as ending the production of American oil, coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy within a decade. They couldn't vote against that.

Senate Democrats could not dismiss something as absolutely ludicrous as a federally mandated overhaul of every building in America to meet the greenness—greenness—standards of Washington bureaucrats.

Senate Democrats could not reject a plan to take more control over where Americans choose to live, how they

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2011

choose to get around, and how they earn a living.

Senate Democrats could not even reject a plan that, according to rough estimates, could raise families' utility bills by hundreds of dollars a month and cost the U.S. Government more than the entire 2017 GDP of the whole world. They couldn't vote against that.

American manufacturing, American agriculture, industries, jobs, houses, farms, buildings, and cars that make up daily life for millions of working Americans—Democrats want Washington, DC, to declare war on all of that because it doesn't comply with the latest fashions in Brooklyn or San Francisco. They want to march the entire country toward extreme environmentalist goals that even President Obama's former Secretary of Energy has dismissed as impossible. That is what the Democratic Party of 2019 apparently has become.

Remember, their last Presidential nominee bragged, after her loss, that at least she had won all the places in America that are "optimistic, diverse, dynamic, [and] moving forward." We can fill in the blanks and see how they view all the other places that millions of Americans call home, those places that just aren't enlightened enough to vote for Democrats, places where farm jobs and factory jobs really matter, places where expensive high-speed rail and electric cars and trucks simply will not get the job done, places where soaring electric bills represent a kitchen-table crisis and not just a minor inconvenience, and places that are actually home to the workers who would be, as the resolution breezily puts it, "affected by the transition"—in other words, jobs shipped overseas and workers out in the cold. In Democrats' eyes, all of us in these places are just backward and out-of-date. People who live in those areas are just backward and out-of-date. Our lives need to be transformed by Washington, DC, bureaucrats, whether we like it or not.

The disruption isn't limited to just environmental and energy issues; there are so many more things Washington Democrats want to get their hands around.

Democrats are pushing Medicare for None, a scheme that would make it unlawful to provide the private health insurance policies that American families rely on and force everyone into a brandnew government scheme designed, of course, right here in Washington. It is ironic that this approach would mean long waiting lists for people with preexisting conditions and cause over 180 million Americans to lose the coverage they choose and rely on. Republicans are dedicated to protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. Republicans are the ones fighting for American families as they try to navigate the unaffordable wreckage of ObamaCare.

The story is the same on every issue: Democrats aren't interested in security and stability for American families;

they are interested in Washington re-designing middle-class Americans' lives from scratch so they can conform better to leftwing dreams.

Forty-plus—forty-plus—of our Democratic colleagues, including all of their Presidential candidates, could not even bring themselves to vote against the obviously absurd socialist wish list we considered yesterday. This is what the modern Democratic Party wants to be. These are their plans for the country. At least the American people are certainly offered a very, very clear contrast.

DISASTER FUNDING

Madam President, on an entirely different matter, in recent months, natural disasters have occupied an outsized share of headlines across our country. We have seen counties in Alabama and Georgia bear the blows of a vicious tornado, and we support the loved ones of those 23 people whose lives it claimed. We have seen a spate of powerful hurricanes tear across the shores of Florida and the Carolinas, leaving tens of billions of dollars in damage behind. Flooding has repeatedly caused damage in my home State of Kentucky, and, of course, it is currently at major disaster levels in communities across the Midwest.

In some places, the process of rebuilding has already dragged on for months. Families have faced the daily struggle of getting things back to normal.

Others are still literally—literally—underwater. Residents are wading through the wreckage of homes and businesses. Normal seems a long way away.

From the gulf coast to the heartland, there are Americans calling for our help. Here in Congress we must have their back. We must take swift and comprehensive action. I am pleased to say, a number of our colleagues have crafted legislation that would allow us to answer these calls for help from our people.

The supplemental funding measure advanced by the Senate yesterday would deliver over \$13 billion to help American communities recover and rebuild following recent natural disasters. It would mean more help for victims of tornadoes in our Southern States, victims of hurricanes from North Carolina to Puerto Rico, and the families in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, who are still, as we speak, waiting for the waters of a truly catastrophic flood to recede. The legislation before us would equip the Department of Defense to conduct urgent repairs to bases and installations damaged by storms. It would help America's farmers and ranchers cover storm-related losses, and it would help get local schools, healthcare facilities, and major infrastructure back on track more quickly.

I am proud of the work put in by many Members to prepare this latest package so swiftly and thoroughly on behalf of our communities in need. We

owe thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHELBY, along with the efforts of Senator PERDUE, Senator ISAKSON, Senator SCOTT, Senator RUBIO, and others who made this effort possible. Thanks to them, the Senate can take action soon on a comprehensive measure to support our fellow citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress and which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object. As I mentioned yesterday, when a similar unanimous consent proposal was proffered, I have consistently supported the proposition that the special counsel should be allowed to complete his work without interference, and I have consistently supported the proposition that his report ought to be released, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the law and with the need to protect sources and methods and the need to preserve the integrity of ongoing investigations, including investigations the special counsel has referred to others.

The Attorney General has committed to as much transparency as possible in the release of the report, and he is working with the special counsel toward that end. I think we should be consistent in letting the special counsel actually finish his work and not just when we think it may be politically advantageous to one side or the other for him to do so.

Therefore, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to make remarks as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, last Friday, Special Counsel Mueller submitted his report to Attorney General Barr. On Sunday, the Attorney General provided a four-page summary of that report to Congress and the American people.

Unfortunately, the Attorney General's summary tells us little about what Special Counsel Mueller actually found. In fact, according to the summary, Mueller's office spent 2 years investigating, with a team of 19 lawyers and 40 FBI agents and other professional staff. The special counsel issued

more than 2,800 subpoenas, executed nearly 500 search warrants, obtained more than 230 orders for communication records, issued almost 50 orders authorizing the use of pen registers, made 13 requests to foreign governments for evidence, and interviewed approximately 500 witnesses. That is quite a record.

The fact is, a four-page summary cannot possibly illuminate what this thorough of an investigation uncovered. I find it so disappointing that so many are rushing to judgment without being able to see the full report or all of the underlying facts.

This report should be made public. As has been, I think, well stated, not only is the official government interested, but the American public is interested in our findings as well.

We know the Russian Government interfered with the U.S. election. That has been reported by the intelligence community and intelligence committee—I sit on that committee—and it has been reaffirmed by the special counsel's investigation.

We also know, from court filings, documents, and press reports, that the President and at least 17 people associated with his campaign had more than 100 contacts with Russia or Russia's intermediaries.

However, Attorney General Barr's summary provides no information about any of these contacts or multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the campaign, and that is a quote—"multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the campaign"—referred in the Attorney General's summary.

Congress must determine the risks to national security, whether there was, in fact, misconduct, whether existing laws are sufficient to deter and punish election interference, and what next steps are appropriate. The American people also have a right to the truth about what happened in the 2016 election and to judge the facts for themselves.

Special Counsel Mueller also did not draw a conclusion, one way or the other, as to whether the President committed a crime through his efforts to obstruct the investigation. Instead, Mr. Mueller wrote: "While this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him."

Since Special Counsel Mueller elected to describe the facts but did not decide whether to charge the President with a crime, we don't know why he made this decision, but clearly we do need to see the facts for ourselves to be able to make a decision about how to proceed and what, if any, additional steps are necessary.

While the Attorney General concluded there was no crime of obstruction committed, we knew that was his conclusion 9 months ago when he wrote a 10-page memo explaining why the President can't be charged with obstruction of justice. Special Counsel

Mueller found that there is "evidence on both sides of the question." Congress and the American people should be able to see that evidence and make a determination, including what the appropriate next steps are, if any.

I am very disappointed that some Republicans are saying Democrats need to move on before we even see the report or underlying evidence. Many of these Republicans called for eight congressional investigations into the Benghazi attack and demanded and received 880,000 pages of documents related to the Clinton email investigation. We have also already obtained documents related to Mueller's investigation, including classified FISA Court applications.

Of course, unwarranted foot-dragging is really not good, and really bad for this country. I had thought we were past that with prior events where we did take action, and we were able to see both sides. After 37 indictments, 6 of whom were indicted Trump advisers, as well as 7 guilty pleas, surely spending more than a week on understanding what happened and asking for the full report is warranted. How can we have 37 indictments, 6 Trump advisers, as well as guilty pleas, without being able to understand what actually happened and not be afforded the material to gain that understanding?

I hope this can be a bipartisan effort to ensure the full record is produced and the facts are uncovered. It is really puzzling to me why the Republican side would not want to do this. Do they presume guilt on their side, and therefore they want to hide it from the public? If you don't, why wouldn't you want whatever the true facts are to come out? The American people deserve no less.

On March 14, the House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for Special Counsel Mueller's report to be made public. The vote was unanimous, 420 to 0—420 to 0. Both sides of the House of Representatives said this should happen.

Senator SCHUMER, our minority leader, has now twice sought unanimous consent for the Senate to consider that resolution. These requests have been blocked by Republicans. I don't understand that. If the House can consider this, why can't we look at what the House has done? This, to my knowledge, in the quarter of a century that I have been in this body, has never happened before, where the Senate has actually refused to look at information.

I very much hope there can be a change of mind and allow the U.S. Senate to do its due diligence in this matter. Hiding the information will not solve the problem.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there is so much going on. So I will be addressing several topics today: healthcare, climate change, Mr. Mueller's report, and Puerto Rico.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, two nights ago, President Donald Trump and Attorney General Barr decided to escalate their 2-year war against healthcare to a whole new level. They declared that the entire Affordable Care Act, and the healthcare for tens of millions of Americans and protections for more than 100 million, is unconstitutional and ought to be eliminated.

Now, the President wants to go back to repeal and replace again? Make our day. The Republicans here in the Senate tried over and over to deal with repeal and replace. They couldn't because they have no replacement. The American people spoke loud and clear in the November 2018 elections and addressed the Republican antics by defeating them resoundingly. The American people resoundingly rejected the Republican plan of repeal and replace for healthcare. In fact, very few Republican Senators would embrace it when they were running as candidates.

Indeed, if the Republican Party wants to be, in Donald Trump's words, "the Party of healthcare," God help the middle class. God save the middle class. God save people with disabilities. God save the hundreds of millions with preexisting conditions.

If the administration had its way, the elimination of the Affordable Care Act would send premiums soaring for millions of Americans. It would revoke coverage for tens of millions more who gained coverage through Medicaid expansions. It would strike protections for hundreds of millions, even people who get coverage through their employer. It would tell college students and graduates aged 21 to 26 that they could no longer be on their parents' healthcare.

Let's not forget that this decision would impose billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs for seniors on Medicare. Does the Republican Party really want to raise the price for senior citizens when they buy drugs? That is what they are doing. That is what President Trump is doing. I wasn't at the lunch where the President talked about this, but I didn't hear any reports of any Republican in that room rejecting what the President said when he said repeal and replace. This Republican Party is the Party of healthcare? Come on, now.

You can't undo all the healthcare for tens of millions, the protections for preexisting conditions for hundreds of millions, the drug costs for tens of millions of seniors, the protections for millions of young college graduates,

and say you are for healthcare. You just can't.

Compounding the injury, the President's latest budget wants to cut more than \$1 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. In doing so, the President is breaking his promise, blatantly and uncaringly. He doesn't care about what he promised people. He is breaking his promise to the American people that he would do no such thing. This is the party of healthcare? The Department of Justice's decision is a moral and institutional outrage. Not only would it harm Americans, but it would undermine the rule of law.

Today I am announcing a new plan—a new way for my colleagues to show that they mean what they say. I am introducing a simple amendment to the pending appropriations bill we are considering here in the Senate. It will very simply prohibit the Department of Justice from using any funding to litigate the downfall of ACA in the circuit court. Let's see how all of our Republican colleagues who said they don't want to take away protections for pre-existing conditions, who said they don't want to take away healthcare for millions, and who said they want to lower seniors' drug costs vote on this.

Will the leader do what he has been so characteristic of doing in the majority and block a chance for this amendment? Will any Republican on the other side stand up and say: Don't block it, Mr. Leader; we have to protect the American people's healthcare. We shall see.

My Republican friends, you are going to have the chance this afternoon or when they vote on this bill to show us which side you are on.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, the Senate finally held the Republican leader's promised political stunt vote on the issue of climate change and the results did not make the Republicans happy. The stunt was exposed for what it was. The whole issue of climate change—for the first time, really—was debated here and turned on our Republican colleagues. It became clear to the American people that our Republican colleagues have no plan for climate change.

We have heard what they are against. We haven't heard a peep about a comprehensive plan that they are for. The attempt by the Republicans to make a mockery of the issue completely backfired. Leader MCCONNELL was forced to answer some questions that he has ducked for a very long time. Whether or not Leader MCCONNELL intended it, the fact is, at the very least, that this Chamber is doing something it hasn't done in years. It held an actual debate on the topic of climate change.

MCCONNELL's stunt, again, boomeranged on him and his colleagues, and they finally had to discuss this issue rather than do what they have liked to do for the last 5 years and sweep it under the rug.

Yesterday, the day before, today, and continuing in the future, we ask our

Republican colleagues three simple questions to which they owe an answer to their constituents. First, do you believe climate change is real? Second, do you believe climate change is caused by human activity? And third, do you believe Congress has to act immediately to deal with this problem?

We are finally getting some answers, thanks to MCCONNELL's trick that he eventually played on himself. No less than Leader MCCONNELL was asked by the press yesterday afternoon at his Ohio Clock press camp if he believes in climate change, and he said he believes it is real and he believes it is caused by human activity. Well, there is one more step if you believe all that: What is your answer—not what you are against but what you are for?

I want to commend Senators ROBERTS, ALEXANDER, and MURKOWSKI. They came to the floor and stated unequivocally and clearly that climate change is real and caused by humans. Make no mistake, in this glacial atmosphere controlled by the Republicans, when it comes to climate change, this is real progress, but, of course, it is not close to enough.

As to the third question, Leader MCCONNELL offered no solution. All we got was a sham vote that he voted against. So I ask Leader MCCONNELL: What is your plan? Some Republicans now seem to admit the challenges of climate change. OK, that is good. Now, what is your solution?

Turning the Senate floor into a campaign ad studio is not a solution to climate change, nor is it very effective even for their own purposes. Several Senators seemed to suggest that this problem can simply be solved by funding for more research. I support funding for research. It should be part of any climate plan. Yet I say to my friends—particularly, those from coal States—that is not going to solve the problem. Dealing with coal sequestration and coal technology will, at best, solve 1 percent of the problem. So I say to my friends: What about the other 99 percent, because 1 percent isn't enough? Temperatures will still go up. The oceans will still rise. The terrible kinds of disaster—flooding, tornadoes, and wildfires—that we have had will continue. To simply say that you are doing some research into how to deal with coal is not close to solving the problem.

Yesterday was a golden opportunity for this Chamber to come together and show the American people that Republicans are serious about tackling the threat. I asked to create a bipartisan select committee on climate change. Let's get some of the people who are most interested in this issue from different ideological stripes and from different places in the country to come together and come up with a solution. Of course, once again, the Republican leader blocked that genuine attempt. Unfortunately, my good friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, objected when we asked for this. Instead,

the Senate wasted the American people's time on a ridiculous charade featuring a sham vote that fooled no one.

Read the press today. Read the Wall Street Journal. Yesterday's vote on the Republican version of the Green New Deal was not just a cynical ploy—although it was—it was the ultimate "tell" that Republicans, for all their talk, have no real plan to combat climate change, no real plan on healthcare, and no real plan on climate change—just a lot of political stunts.

I am glad that finally, though—this is the good news here—some of my colleagues are starting to see the light and admit that it is real and admit that it is caused by human activity. Now, they need to put their money where their mouth is and work with us to take action that matches the scale of the problem. If our colleagues refuse to join us on a bipartisan basis in creating this select committee, we Democrats aren't going to wait. We will take action on our own.

Later today, we will be announcing our own path. We are going on offense on climate change, keeping a spotlight on this issue and making sure that this Chamber keeps debating this most urgent issue of our day.

We cannot play politics with our children's future any longer. I have a new grandson. By the time he grows up, I don't want the waters to be rising, the climate to be changing, and the whole world totally discombobulated so he can't live a good and happy life. We should all feel that way.

Avoiding the problem, whether it is because special interests are saying to avoid it—the Koch brothers, coal industry, oil industry, and everyone else—is not serving our country well.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. President, the Republicans and the White House are refusing to make several minor changes to the disaster bill under consideration today—changes that will help Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Puerto Rico was devastated by Hurricane Maria a year and a half ago—devastation we haven't probably seen in any other part of our country. It is reported that nearly \$91 billion of damage was done by the hurricane.

Puerto Rico is still struggling to recover. These are American citizens. Let's not forget that. These are not people from some foreign land. Yet it has been publicly reported that the President has told his staff to find ways to limit Federal dollars from going to Puerto Rico. It was even reported that at yesterday's lunch with Republicans, the President complained that Puerto Rico has been getting too much aid. He said he "doesn't want another single dollar going to the island," even though he has held up the dollars that Democrats and Republicans voted for.

We help Americans when there is a disaster. We don't pick and choose because they may not vote for us—or

vote at all—or because we don't like the elected official. These are people who are hurting.

What the President is doing with Puerto Rico is disgraceful but typical of his view to divide and pick winners and losers. What the President is doing is unacceptable and un-American.

I urge my Republican colleagues to come to the table, to accept the commonsense changes we have proposed to help the territories recover—the same proposals that passed the House—and to help us pass a disaster package that addresses the needs not of some but of all disaster survivors and that addresses the needs of all Americans who are affected, not just those he happens to like. That is not what any President before has done. That is not what America does.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, finally, I want to say a few words on the report by Special Counsel Mueller.

From the start, the Democrats have argued that nothing short of full transparency will satisfy the American people's right to know what happened during Russia's attack on our election. That is why it is unacceptable that Mr. BARR, who reached his initial conclusions quickly—in 48 hours—now needs several weeks, he says, to review the report, and there are reports that he may now only release a summary of that finding.

First, let me talk about the time.

Attorney General Barr moved like a hare to get out the summary he wrote with the purpose of exonerating the President. He is now moving like a tortoise to issue Mueller's full report. People are going to ask: What the heck is going on? Is there some political motivation here? Americans are entitled to see the full report, not a summary.

We all know the intelligence community can redact parts of the report—small they will be—to protect secret sources, but we also expect the rest of the report to be issued, not a summary. Mr. BARR has issued one brief summary already, and many Americans don't trust that summary because they want to see the whole report before jumping to a conclusion. So we need the report now, without delay. We can't have political considerations enter into it. "Oh, we will delay it for several weeks to let things cool off." I hope that is not what is happening.

In any case, we need the report now. This is too important for Mr. BARR to be playing politics. He can remove any cloud of suspicion by releasing the full report as the President and members of his party call for. When we read reports that Barr only wants to release a summary and that Leader MCCONNELL is unsupportive of transparency, something doesn't smell right.

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.

Mr. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, the Senate voted on the Green New Deal—the Democrats' \$93 trillion socialist fantasy.

How did the Democrats vote on this deal? They voted present. That is right. There were 43 out of 47 Members of the Democratic caucus who voted present.

This may be the first time in my experience here that I have ever seen a piece of legislation and people who authored that legislation—in this case, there were 13 Democrats who authored the bill, cosponsored the bill, introduced the bill, and indicated that action on the issue needed to be taken now—proceed to vote present. I have never seen that in my time either in the House or in the Senate. There was always an opportunity, as the Presiding Officer knows, in the House of Representatives, when you voted by electronic machine, to punch the yellow "present" option. You had red or green or present, but very rarely was that used. Yet I don't think I have ever seen, in the U.S. Senate, 13 U.S. Senators file a bill, introduce a bill, cosponsor a bill, talk about how important it is that we deal with it and deal with it immediately, and then proceed to vote present. That is what happened yesterday.

I want to step back for a minute and talk about the Green New Deal—the Democrats' plan to put the government in charge of everything from your energy to your healthcare.

The costs of this plan would be staggeringly high. One think tank released its first estimate that found that the Green New Deal would cost somewhere between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over a 10-year period—between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. The 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world—the whole planet—only came to \$80.7 trillion, which is more than \$10 trillion less than the Democrats are proposing to spend on the Green New Deal. This \$93 trillion is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history.

So how do the Democrats plan to cover that \$93 trillion? Well, they don't actually have a plan. The Green New Deal resolution itself makes a vague reference to "community grants, public banks, and other public financing."

Then, of course, the Democrats have their favorite funding source, which is taxing the rich. The problem is, there is no way taxing the rich would even come close to paying for the Green New Deal. One analyst found that three Democratic proposals—the New York Representative's proposed 70-percent top tax rate, the Massachusetts Senator's wealth tax, and the Hawaii Senator's financial transactions tax—would together pay for approximately 4 percent of the Green New Deal.

Taxing every millionaire in the United States at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would bring in only a tiny fraction of \$93 trillion. Taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years wouldn't get the Democrats anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would still leave the Democrats far short of \$93 trillion.

The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for by taxing the rich. This plan would be paid for on the backs of working families. The size of the tax hikes that would be required to even begin to finance this massive government expansion would sharply diminish Americans' standard of living and usher in a new era of diminished prosperity, and I haven't even mentioned the freedom of choice Americans would lose and give up under the Green New Deal.

Your car's engine would likely soon become illegal. Washington planners could force you to rebuild your house to meet strict, new, energy-efficient guidelines. Your ability to travel by air might be restricted or entirely eliminated.

The Green New Deal doesn't limit itself to massive government expansion in the area of energy.

Among other things, it would also put the government in charge of your healthcare. So, if you like your health plan, get ready to give it up. Then there are the millions of current energy jobs that would be lost under this plan. Plus, there would likely be significant job losses in other industries as small businesses and larger companies would find themselves being unable to cope with the Green New Deal's mandates and taxes.

For American families, the Green New Deal would mean smaller paychecks, fewer jobs, fewer choices, and a permanently reduced standard of living.

You don't even have to take my word for it. Here is what the AFL-CIO, which represents 12½ million workers in a number of unions, had to say about the Green New Deal:

The Green New Deal resolution is far too short on specific solutions that speak to the jobs of our members and the critical sectors of our economy. It is not rooted in an engineering-based approach and makes promises that are not achievable or realistic. We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living go unanswered.

Let me repeat that:

We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living go unanswered.

Again, these are quotes from the AFL-CIO. That is what it is saying about the Democrats' Green New Deal.

The American people have a right to know where the Democrats stand on

this massive government expansion. Are they for it or are they against it? Their Presidential candidates have embraced this plan. There were 13 Senate Democrats, as I mentioned, who sponsored the original Green New Deal resolution in the Senate, and there were 92 Democrats who sponsored the original Green New Deal resolution in the House. Yet, yesterday, just four Members of the Democratic caucus had the courage to make their positions clear.

As for the rest, well, it is actually understandable that most Democrats didn't want to go on the record as supporting, perhaps, the most irresponsible and costly resolution ever to come before the U.S. Senate. It is pretty difficult to tell your constituents that you support cutting their paychecks, eliminating millions of their jobs, and drastically reducing their choices.

I am sure there are more than four Members of the Democratic caucus who don't support this plan, but the Democrats are more and more enthralled with the far-left wing of their party, and, clearly, some Democrats were afraid to actually reject this plan with their votes.

So what happened? There were 43 out of 47 Members of the Democratic caucus here in the U.S. Senate who left the American people in limbo about their views, and they ended up voting present.

I would love to think that every Democrat who voted present yesterday has realized how damaging the Green New Deal would be to working families. But the scary truth is that while some Democrats may have voted present simply because they wanted to avoid angering the far-left wing of their party, other Democrats really believe—they really believe—in the Green New Deal.

The junior Senator from Vermont was asked if the Green New Deal goes too far. His answer? "No. You cannot go too far on the issue of climate change."

Really? You can't go too far? Not even if you saddle millions of families with exorbitant taxes and other costs just for miniscule gains? Not even if you permanently damage the American economy?

One of the Green New Deal's authors has actually stated that it is a legitimate question whether people should have children because of climate change. Is that something the Green New Deal supporters want to legislate too? Really?

The Democrats' Green New Deal extremism is disturbing, and I am deeply disappointed in yesterday's vote because the American people deserve to hear where every Democrat stands on this dangerous plan. Americans deserve to know whether Democrats are willing to hike their taxes, eliminate their jobs, and diminish drastically their freedoms.

I hope more Democrats will join the four who rejected this massive govern-

ment overreach and will work with Republicans to develop responsible solutions to protect our environment—solutions that don't hurt American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CELEBRATING VAISAKHI

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a very special day for the Sikh religion and the Sikh community across America and in Pennsylvania—and this is the holiday of Vaisakhi.

Although the youngest among the major religions of the world, Sikhism has emerged as a distinct socio-religious community. By the numbers, it is, I believe, the sixth largest religion in the world, with 30 million adherents worldwide, and approximately 700,000 Sikhs have chosen to make their home in the United States.

A large number of those Sikhs live in my State of Pennsylvania. In fact, there are several Sikh places of worship across Pennsylvania. They are known as a Gurdwara, and they are located in and around Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Allentown, and Erie.

Sikhism itself was founded in the 15th century in South Asia on the principles of equality, justice, and respect for all human beings.

Sikhs pray twice a day—in the morning and in the evening—and they pray for the welfare of mankind.

Over a period of 239 years, Sikhism was established by 10 gurus. The first among them was Guru Nanak. These gurus were learned, spiritual guides devoted to improving the moral well-being of their followers and the communities in which they lived.

In 1699, the 10th and final guru—Gobind Singh—founded a fellowship of soldier saints called the Khalsa Panth. Today, Sikhs celebrate this occasion with the holiday that they call Vaisakhi. This year, Sikhs across the United States and around the world will celebrate Vaisakhi on April 14.

For Sikhs, Vaisakhi is a very special time. It is a special time to celebrate and share their faith with their friends and their neighbors. The occasion is marked by dancing and parades. Everyone is welcome to attend these celebrations, and they attract Americans from all religious, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds.

Vaisakhi celebrations are a really vibrant affair, and members of the Sikh community wear bright orange or yellow festive clothes to mark the occasion. These colors represent the spirit and the joy of the celebration.

It is interesting to note that when Vaisakhi is celebrated in the Sikh homeland of Punjab, the gold and yellow wheat fields are ready to be harvested.

This year, the Sikh Coordination Committee East Coast has organized a parade in Washington, DC, on April 6 to commemorate Vaisakhi as National Sikh Day. The theme of the parade is

Sikh identity, Sikh culture, and the Sikh way of life. Thousands of Sikhs from all over the United States will be here participating and celebrating.

I came here this morning because I want to add my voice as one wishing the Sikh community great luck and great joy at this parade and in the very joyous celebration of Vaisakhi.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate had a significant vote. Senators made their voices heard on the Green New Deal, and after a lot of grandstanding from those Senate Democrats who initially rushed to support this proposal, not a single one voted for the proposal.

However, my Republican colleagues and I didn't vote present. We don't believe that is what our constituents sent us here to do. Instead, we voted against the socialist grab bag of policies that would set us back an estimated \$93 trillion and would bankrupt the State of Texas. To be clear, voting no on the Green New Deal isn't a referendum on the issue of lowering carbon emissions or finding cleaner energy; it is saying no to the litany of far-left proposals that would leave American families footing the bill to the tune of tens of thousands of dollars each.

The Green New Deal promised things like free higher education. You might have thought this was really about the environment; well, it was a grab bag of government handouts and takeovers. It also included Medicare for All, which means that if you have employer-provided health insurance, you couldn't keep it. Even President Obama said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. But not now—not with this new, radical group of Democrats who now say: Forget that promise. We are going to take what you have, even if you like it.

There, of course, was the guarantee of jobs. I noted yesterday that the only thing missing from the Green New Deal is free beer and pizza for everybody.

It has been estimated that implementing the full list of the Green New Deal's promises would cost the average American family \$65,000 a year, which is well over what many Americans make annually.

These ludicrous proposals were pitched as a way to uplift the middle class and create jobs, but in reality, they would have undone the economic gains we made these past 2 years under the Trump administration. We could say goodbye to the record-low unemployment levels and the growth we have been seeing. What middle-class American do you know who could afford an extra \$65,000 each year to pay the Federal Government for the litany of Green New Deal line items, such as tearing down every building and replacing it with a green version?

Even the liberal AFL-CIO's energy committee had this to say:

We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living to go unanswered.

This is the AFL-CIO.

Instead of the Green New Deal, we should follow the Texas model of innovation. But it is not just Texas; there are some great private sector initiatives taking place that deal with this concern about CO₂ emissions in a much more practical, rational, free market way. We have a thriving energy sector in Texas, as the Presiding Officer knows, and it isn't stifled by overregulation. That is one reason it is thriving.

The Green New Deal would force us to rely on foreign energy sources because we wouldn't be able to produce enough here in the United States to keep the lights on. But with investment in innovative solutions and new technologies, we can ensure that our country can remain energy independent and deal with legitimate concerns about the environment.

I applaud our colleagues who voted against this legislation to ensure that the American people won't have to pick up the tab for the far-left wing agenda of our Democratic colleagues. Conversely, I stand ready to work on real, achievable solutions and to find ways to reduce emissions and lessen our environmental footprint without overregulating and overcharging.

DEER PARK, TEXAS

On another note, most people across the country hadn't heard of Deer Park, TX, until last Sunday. They were probably more familiar with nearby Houston, TX. But last Sunday morning was when the first reports came rolling out that residents were forced to shelter in place when a chemical tank at the Intercontinental Terminals Company, or ITC, caught fire.

ITC's tanks hold petrochemical liquids and gases used to produce gasoline—all highly flammable and hazardous. As many could have predicted, but certainly no one had hoped, the fire spread quickly to a nearby tank. By Wednesday, seven tanks were aflame. Firefighters fought for 3 days to extinguish the massive flames, and just when it seemed as if the fire was under control, it flared again last Friday, burning through 11 storage tanks in total. A massive fireball and billowing plumes of smoke could be seen for miles. This didn't stop, as new tanks caught fire, forcing schools and businesses to close and residents to rightfully question their safety.

Unfortunately, the story doesn't end there. By the end of the week, as ITC drained chemicals from the remaining exposed tanks, the containment wall surrounding the tank farm burst. Foam used to fight the fires and contaminants leaked, forcing a portion of the Houston Ship Channel to close and bringing a new round of health risks associated with the release of airborne and liquid toxins.

Earlier this week, officials from ITC said that cleanup crews had removed more than 33,000 barrels of an oily mixture from the ship channel. That is 1 million gallons, which is more than I can even imagine.

The chemical fire and resulting chemical spill not only brought grave health concerns to those who live and work around Deer Park and pollution to the air and environment, it also ground businesses in the region to a halt. Because of the chemical spill, nearly 7 miles of the Houston Ship Channel closed for 3 days, cutting off this booming area of our economy from the waterway and delaying shipment of goods up and down the ship channel. Some estimates show that the region's oil and gas and petrochemical sectors lost \$1 billion in revenue as a result of the closure. This ship channel sees hundreds of shipments a day, with tankers and freighters moving various products and goods up and down the shoreline to businesses surrounding the Houston area.

The effects from the closure of facilities and companies in the area will require a costly and lengthy recovery. Folks along the ship channel in Southeast Houston will also be concerned about health consequences until we can find out more answers.

The ITC's tanks contain chemicals commonly used in the production of gasoline—xylene, naphtha, pyrolysis gasoline. Naphtha, in particular, can irritate and burn the nose and throat when inhaled. When exposed to fire, naphtha can produce poisonous gases. The health effects of these chemicals are of grave concern, but it is not just the short-term effects—the irritation and burning—that are concerning; contact with these chemicals can potentially have lasting, long-term effects, making it vital to discern the exact level of exposure to these chemicals caused as a result of the fire.

It is important that we get to the bottom of this, and I am proud that our local, State, and Federal officials have quickly jumped into action. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, local responders, and the Coast Guard were all on the scene quickly and have been working around the clock since the start of the first fire. The U.S. Chemical Safety Board and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA, have opened investigations into the fires. The Environmental Protection Agency, along with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, are conducting continuous air quality checks.

I appreciate the swift action by local, State, and Federal agencies to protect my constituents in the region and conduct investigations to ensure that we can prevent this type of event from ever occurring again. I will monitor those investigations closely as they progress and will ensure they have the resources they need in order to complete their work.

Sometimes when people hear us talk about regulation, they act as if our side of the aisle believes that no regulation is appropriate, which is entirely false. It is important to have regulations to protect the public safety of the American people and particularly in places around tank farms like this one in Deer Park. I think it is very important that any existing regulations—that we make sure those regulations and laws are enforced.

As part of this investigation, I hope we will find out that there were no violations of existing regulations and laws, but if there were, then the people responsible should be held accountable. I am not going to prejudge at this early point before the investigation takes place whether there is any legal responsibility or whether anybody did things they should not have done consistent with the laws and regulations that do exist, but I will say that once the investigation is complete, if there were violations of regulations designed to protect the public safety or laws passed by Congress and signed by the President, that I will be the first to demand there be accountability for violation of those regulations and those laws.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.R. 268

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 16, more than 2 months ago, the House passed a supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 268, which addressed the needs of all communities impacted by recent natural disasters. The House-passed disaster bill provided assistance to help people impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, the Hawaii volcanoes, and the California wildfires. It provided aid to the people in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Guam, who were struck last year by typhoons, and the people of American Samoa, who were devastated by Cyclone Gita. It continued assistance for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to help them continue their recovery from Hurricanes Irma and Maria. They passed it 2 months ago.

Instead of moving quickly on this package to help those Americans in need, Senate Republicans, at the President's insistence, held up the House bill because it included assistance for Americans in Puerto Rico. Instead of giving aid to the people who need it, the President has chosen to delay it over petty grudges and political concerns.

The President's refusal to help Americans in Puerto Rico not only delays the important disaster bill that many of the other States are relying on to

speed their recovery efforts, it discriminates against the over 3 million Americans who reside in Puerto Rico, and that is wrong. We have never—certainly in my years here—had disaster bills in which we say that Americans in this State can be helped, but we do not like the Americans in this State, so they cannot be helped.

This is the United States of America. We are supposed to take care of all of our citizens when there is a crisis, not pick and choose who gets assistance based on who we are aligned with politically. I have voted for disaster relief for red States, for blue States, for purple States because they are part of the United States of America. I feel that as a country we have to come together to help each other when there is a disaster.

Certainly Republican Senators and Democratic Senators helped the State of Vermont when we were hit with a disaster a few years ago. Well, today it is Puerto Rico, and all of the Americans in Puerto Rico need our help.

A year and a half ago, it was hit by two back-to-back category 5 hurricanes. It is rare that anybody ever gets hit by two back-to-back category 5 hurricanes. An estimated 2,975 Americans lost their lives. Homes were demolished, communities destroyed. It was an extraordinary disaster, and it requires a commensurate extraordinary response.

I am glad we are finally moving to debate on the House-passed bill because we need that. We actually ought to just pass the House-passed bill, but, unfortunately, the Republicans say they will file a substitute that will take us backward, not forward.

Again, at the President's insistence, it eliminates critical assistance for the Americans in Puerto Rico provided for in the House bill, as well as assistance to other U.S. territories. It eliminates State-revolving funds that would help Puerto Rico rebuild damaged water systems and ensure they are resilient and can stand up to future storms. It eliminates a 100-percent cost-share for FEMA that would help cash-strapped Puerto Rico access Federal aid. It eliminates money to help Americans ensure that Puerto Rico is able to rebuild their electrical grid. It eliminates \$68 million in Medicaid assistance for American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands, whose programs face serious shortages due to the increased need.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle claim that this money is not needed. They point to previous disaster supplemental bills and argue that we have already addressed the needs of Puerto Rico, and we should move on. Well, that is untrue. We provided Puerto Rico with significant assistance, as we should have, given the extraordinary nature of the storms that ravaged the island and given the extent of the devastation, but as damage assessments come in and the full picture of the devastation becomes clear, we

must continually reassess and provide them what is needed to fully recover.

I remember when this first happened, back when the White House was saying there may be two or three or four or a dozen fatalities in Puerto Rico. Well, they were off by thousands. There were 2,975 people who lost their lives, not just a handful.

We don't simply appropriate the same amount of money to each State or territory that is hit with a disaster no matter the level of damage. We look at each place, and we provide what is needed for the people to rebuild their homes, their communities, and their lives.

I will give you one example of why one size does not fit all. With Katrina, we in Congress passed six supplemental disaster packages—not one, six—to help rebuild Louisiana and Mississippi because the storm was unlike anything we had ever seen. They needed the assistance coming in over time. I supported the help for Louisiana and Mississippi. No one at the time would have argued to stop after the first tranche of funding we provided and then leave them to fend for themselves, because they are Americans. We saw there were more problems, and we added money.

This is no different.

The President reportedly came to the Capitol and met with Senators yesterday and made his case as to why we should not continue aid to Puerto Rico. Let me repeat. The President of the United States—something I have never seen in my 45 years here with either a Republican or Democratic President—affirmatively argued that we should refrain from helping American citizens in need.

Of course, like so many things the President has said, it was not based in fact or reality. He claimed that Puerto Rico had received over \$90 billion in Federal assistance, but it has not. He knows it has not. Why does he keep saying this when he has to know that what he is saying is not true? He claims it is using Federal money to pay off its debt. It has not. The President knows that is not true. Why does he keep saying it?

Some here in this body have claimed that Puerto Rico has in the bank \$20 billion in previously appropriated money that they have failed to spend, and they argue that we should provide no more until it is drawn down. I do not know if they are getting their talking points from the White House or what, but that is simply false.

The bulk of the money to which they refer, which we Republicans and Democrats alike voted to appropriate over 1 year ago, is being held up by the administration in redtape and bureaucracy. It seems as though it is being purposely held back because of inaction by this administration. Billions of dollars that Congress approved over 1 year ago for disaster recovery efforts remain in the U.S. Treasury in Washington, DC, not where they belong—assisting the American citizens of Puerto Rico. There is no excuse for that.

They cannot have it both ways. The administration cannot simultaneously hold up recovery dollars for Puerto Rico and then point to Puerto Rico's failure to spend it as an excuse not to provide additional assistance. In other words, they are holding these billions away from Puerto Rico, saying: You cannot have it, but why are you not spending it?

Come on. You cannot do that. You cannot claim they are not spending the money that is being held back from them, and then say that is why they do not need additional assistance.

Yesterday, Senator SCHUMER and I sent a letter to the administration about these bureaucratic delays and demanded answers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated March 25, 2019, to Mick Mulvaney, Peter Gaynor, and Ben Carson.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PETER GAYNOR,
Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC.

Hon. BEN CARSON,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR MULVANEY, HONORABLE GAYNOR, AND HONORABLE CARSON, Last November, we wrote to express our concern about the significant and unsupported delays related to the immediate and long-term recovery needs of Puerto Rico in the aftermath of catastrophic Hurricanes Irma and Maria. Specifically, we highlighted the lack of effective Federal interagency coordination under the leadership of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which has and continues to impede on the Commonwealth's ability to finalize emergency repairs through FEMA's Public Assistance categories A and B programs, and subsequently its efforts to move toward permanent reconstruction. These delays are not unique to FEMA, as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has also been affected by OMB's micromanagement and excessive bureaucracy as they attempt to administer and oversee Puerto Rico's Community Development Block Grant—Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) funding. The lack of leadership and coordination, combined with delays in meeting the basic needs of the island, more than eighteen months after receiving a presidential disaster declaration, has left far too many children and elderly citizens in unhealthy and unsafe conditions, families in severely damaged homes, and communities without adequate infrastructure to sustain a decent quality of life.

The response that we received, several months later, was wholly inadequate and contained no information to respond to our concerns. Specifically, we raised concerns about OMB's failure to work expeditiously with HUD to finalize and issue a Federal Register Notice for nearly \$16 billion in CDBG-DR mitigation funding that Congress appropriated in February 2018, of which \$8.3 billion has been allocated to Puerto Rico. As a result, this critical source of funding remains unavailable for obligation more than a year after it was appropriated, and nearly

a year and half after the historic hurricanes made landfall. The purpose of the mitigation allocation was to provide not only Puerto Rico, but more than 15 other cities, states and territories the resources necessary to rebuild their homes, businesses, and critical infrastructure to updated construction standards in order to prevent the same level of destruction in future disaster events. As you are probably aware, some reconstruction has started to take place, but without the availability of the mitigation funding, Puerto Rico is unable to strategically adopt these improved standards, or leverage this critical resource toward a comprehensive island-wide rebuild strategy. Further delays in the availability of funding is unacceptable. We insist that you finalize the mitigation notice in the next 30 days.

It has also come to our attention that several issues have reached a critical point with FEMA that are hindering the recovery efforts in Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands as well. FEMA needs to work with the territories to develop ways to expedite approvals and obligations of funding, especially for priority projects. In addition, FEMA needs to develop clear policies with regard to the issues laid out below, share them openly with Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, and Congress, and ensure that they are being implemented in a consistent way.

First, finalizing the consistent implementation of the “pre-disaster condition” language from section 20601 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 is paramount. The intent of this provision was to facilitate the rebuilding of infrastructure, including the electric grid, in a way that is resilient to future weather events, reduces the need for future federal disaster assistance, and makes use of technology and modern standards when rebuilding. Congress specifically wished to avoid a situation where the islands would be forced to simply plug new pieces into antiquated infrastructure, which would only lead to more frequent failures in the future. It has come to our attention that there is a lack of consistency and transparency in the way that FEMA is implementing this language, and that FEMA’s interpretation of this language may be contrary to congressional intent. For example, recent news reports indicate that FEMA has reduced its cost estimate for a Project Worksheet covering rebuilding of a number of schools because upgrades to meet industry standards were removed from the scope of work, after previously being discussed by the stakeholders involved. FEMA must immediately rectify this situation and issue clear guidance and expectations on its approach to implementing both the “pre-disaster condition” and the “industry standards” portion of the Bipartisan Budget Act. If FEMA needs additional guidance from Congress, we must be informed of this need immediately.

Second, we are also concerned about changing FEMA guidance and approaches leading to substantial replication of efforts and excessive delays in approving and obligating funding for priority projects in the territories. For example, according to representatives of the Commonwealth, in March of 2018 FEMA determined that the level of damage to the Vieques Hospital justified replacement of the building, instead of repair. Accordingly, in August of 2018, a scope of work was agreed upon by the stakeholders involved, and coordination between FEMA, COR3, and the municipality began on the cost estimate of the replacement project. However, two months later, FEMA representatives informed COR3 and the municipality that they intended to review the validity of the replacement decision that FEMA had previously made, sending the agreed upon decision to the Expert Panel for

their review. A year after the initial decision to replace the building was made, the fate of the Vieques Hospital project remains in question, and it appears that no real progress has been made in addressing the long-term health care needs of the people of Vieques, who continue to rely on a mobile clinic.

Last, when FEMA provides disaster assistance, the receiving State or Territory is responsible for implementing financial controls to ensure that funds obligated for a project by FEMA are drawn down by the grantee for the approved purpose. Currently, FEMA applies additional fiscal oversight requirements specifically to Puerto Rico, which require the Commonwealth to provide detailed documentation to validate that any costs incurred with disaster assistance funding are for allowable expenses. FEMA manually validates a percentage of those actions. Negotiations to end these additional oversight measures and expedite the processing of recovery funding have been ongoing; however, it’s unclear what remaining steps Puerto Rico must take to assume full responsibility of their recovery assistance. Until FEMA approves the transition of fiscal oversight to Puerto Rico, these extraordinary measures will stay in place. FEMA must be clear about the changes Puerto Rico needs to make in order to properly manage its own recovery expenses and eliminate any unnecessary bureaucratic steps.

As the territories continue to recover, it is crucial that FEMA address these issues and move forward with a stronger sense of urgency and consideration for the unique issues that they face. A recovery of this scale requires consistency, transparency, and constant coordination with territory officials.

Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands were hit by back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes, and the damage to the islands was catastrophic. An estimated 2,975 people lost their lives, homes were demolished, and communities destroyed. This extraordinary disaster requires a commensurate extraordinary response. We have a responsibility to come to the aid of fellow U.S. citizens in times of need, and this is certainly one of those times.

We ask for a detailed response providing an update on the status of these issues and the projected timeframe for their final resolution be provided without delay. Please respond by April 5, 2019.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senator.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the inspector general of the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced that it will review whether the White House has deliberately interfered with the timely distribution of hurricane funds to Puerto Rico. That is pretty amazing. I have never seen a case that I remember where the inspector general of Housing and Urban Development had to look into whether the White House was deliberately interfering with funds to go to a disaster area.

I know firsthand what it is like to see a State hit by disaster. Tropical Storm Irene hit Vermont in 2011, and it devastated our State. People lost their homes, roads were washed out, bridges destroyed, and communities forever changed. I saw bridges twisted like a child’s toy. I saw farmhouses that had

been on the north side of the river, which were now on the south side of the river, upside down and destroyed. I saw farmers’ fields wiped out, businesses ruined, schools destroyed, roads necessary to bring medical supplies into villages gone. I know firsthand. I know as a lifelong Vermonter that in these moments the Federal Government is a critical partner in the effort to recover and rebuild.

It is the same in other States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Texas, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands. They are all counting on us to get this bill across the finish line.

That is why, 3 weeks ago, I put a compromise on the table to create a path forward. I did it in my capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It was a reasonable proposal. It does not restore everything that had been eliminated from the House bill, but it was a compromise that focused on the most critical proposals and the immediate needs. Had Senate Republicans accepted this proposal, we likely would have seen quick passage of a disaster bill in a bipartisan fashion in both the Senate and the House. It actually would have eliminated the need for a conference and would have gotten the assistance to the people who need it sooner rather than later.

Unfortunately, it appears the President will not accept even this reasonable offer. It makes me think about when he closed down the government for over 1 month because the Congress gave him only \$1.6 billion for a wall, and then he reopened the government when we gave him \$1.3 billion. I don’t know if they actually read the proposals and bills that we sent.

In this case, I think it is obvious what is happening. The President is willing to endanger the entire disaster package for all of the United States because he wants to pick winners and losers. When there is a disaster, there are no winners and losers. Americans come together to help everybody. Yet he wants to say who gets assistance in the wake of disasters based on his own arbitrary standards and political grudges. That is unacceptable. Where is it going to end? Which State will the President disfavor next? Remember that just a few months ago, the President, in a tweet, threatened to cut off aid to California as they were reeling from some of the worst fires in recent history. He sent a tweet telling millions of Americans he doesn’t want to help. We are an independent branch of government. We have to have a responsible party in the room, and it should be Congress.

I think back to when Vermont was hit by disaster and hurricane flooding. As I was traveling around the State the day after, surveying the damage, I was receiving emails from a number of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, saying: Vermont stood with us when we had a disaster; we will stand with you today.

That is what I want to do. I want to help, just as I voted to help Louisiana six times and Mississippi for their damage. It wasn't for a political benefit for Vermont, but it was because we are Americans and we all stand together.

To think that we might consider a disaster package that picks and chooses which Americans are helped when they have all suffered equally from disasters, and to say: OK, you, American, we favor you, you get money. You, American, I don't like you. So you are not going to get money. That is not the American way. That is not the way the Senate should be.

Let's pass a bill that addresses the needs of all communities impacted by disaster and do it now. People are waiting. The needs are pressing.

I will file an amendment today with my recommended compromise. It provides a reasonable path forward—one that allows us to move quickly to get assistance to the people who need it now. I hope all Members will support it.

The Governor of Puerto Rico made a strong statement this morning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Puerto Rico Governor Ricardo Rossello.

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

STATEMENT BY PUERTO RICO GOVERNOR
RICARDO ROSSELLÓ
(March 26, 2019)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—“The comments attributed to Donald Trump today by senators from his own party are below the dignity of a sitting President of the United States. They continue to lack empathy, are irresponsible, regrettable and, above all, unjustified.

“I want to be very clear: Not a single federal dollar has been used to make debt payments. This has been the most transparent recovery in the history of the United States, providing unprecedented access and collaboration with federal agencies. In fact, just yesterday we reached an agreement with FEMA on the transition of responsibilities for the reimbursement of recovery funds. An agreement predicated on the acknowledgment by the federal government that appropriate fiscal controls are in fact established.

“I can only assume that Trump is receiving misleading information from his own staff. I have now made several requests to meet with the President to discuss Puerto Rico's recovery and reconstruction, but up to this day we haven't received a confirmation or a date, even though Trump told me we would meet after his visit to Vietnam earlier this year.

“I invite the President to stop listening to ignorant and completely wrong advice. Instead he should come to Puerto Rico to hear firsthand from the people on the ground. I invite him to put all of the resources at his disposal to help Americans in Puerto Rico, like he did for Texas and Alabama. No more, no less.

“Of course, today the world knows the unpleasant truth that Puerto Rico is a colonial territory of the United States and are well aware of the democratic deficiencies we endure: We are not allowed to vote for our President nor have voting representation in Congress. Even as we have asked democrat-

ically for statehood twice in the past seven years, the federal government has delayed their responsibility to act.

People from all over the nation, and the world, have witnessed the inequalities Americans face on the island. The federal response and its treatment during these past months in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria is clear evidence of our second-class citizenship.

“Mr. President: Enough with the insults and demeaning mischaracterizations. We are not your political adversaries; we are your citizens.

“We are not asking for anything more than any other U.S. state has received. We are merely asking for equality.”

Mr. LEAHY. The Americans in Puerto Rico do not have representation in this body. Vermont is probably as far away from Puerto Rico as just about any State, with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii. They do not have anybody to speak directly on their behalf on such an important matter. The Governor has spoken out. I urge every Member to read what the Governor has to say. I agree with him. Americans in Puerto Rico should be helped just as Americans in Texas, Americans in Oklahoma, Americans in California, or Americans in New York, or wherever disaster has struck. We are the United States of America. Let's start acting like that on behalf of all Americans, not on behalf of political biases.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join again my colleagues to speak of the need for bipartisan action to address climate warming.

Throughout the past year, we have received warning after warning about the warming and about the devastating consequences of climate change that are coming much sooner than some people actually expected.

I remember when I first got to the Senate. I was part of the Environment Committee, and we had military leaders come to speak. We had scientists, and they basically predicted everything that we have seen coming, from the wildfires in the West to the rising ocean levels, to weird weather events like more tornadoes, to the type of flooding that we are seeing in the Midwest as we speak and the type of flooding we have seen in Florida as a result of hurricanes.

They also talked about the economic consequences of this. I think it is really important that people don't see this as environment versus economics. If we do nothing, the economics are bad. If we do nothing, we are going to continue to see homeowners' insurance increase, like we have nationwide—a 50-percent increase in the last 10 years.

If we do something and we do it right and we do it smartly, we are going to see a bunch of new jobs in the field of green energy. We are going to see more solar. We are going to see more wind. We are going to see a whole new industry of an electric grid and things that we need to do to bring down greenhouse gases and be a leader once again in energy for the world.

Last October, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a special report explaining the potential impact of climate change if the Earth warms 1.5 degrees Celsius above historic global temperature levels dating back to before the Industrial Revolution started. That report predicted that in just over 20 years, we could see even more of what we have seen this last year: persistent drought, food shortages, worsening wildfires, and increased flooding—damage that could cost an estimated \$54 trillion.

Then, in November, the “Fourth National Climate Assessment” issued a special report that concluded that without significant global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, climate change will threaten the health and safety of people, will slow economic growth, will damage our Nation's infrastructure, which we are seeing right now in the Midwest, and will impede the production of energy and food.

Finally, in January of this year, the U.S. Department of Defense released a report on the effects of a changing climate to U.S. military installations and their operational viability. All of these experts—yes, scientists, and, yes, military leaders—have made it clear that inaction is not an option for our economy, for our environment, for our country, or for our world.

Military and security experts have repeatedly reminded us that climate change is a threat to our national security. Look at the examples of refugees coming up from Africa—people who used to be subsistence farmers who no longer can make their livings. They used to eek by, which was not easy, but now they are moving up; they are moving to Europe. That is just one example of what we are seeing.

I am from a State of refugees. Our refugees are a major part of our economy, but we know we want to have a sensible refugee policy and that we can't have sudden droves of people moving up because of environmental catastrophes that are going on in their countries. Yet we are going to see more and more and more of that. At some point, we have to realize, you know what, we want thriving economies in Africa; we want thriving economies throughout the world; and climate change is going to be an impediment to that.

If you want to close your eyes to the rest of the world and pretend it is not happening, it is going to come knocking at your door. It is what is going to keep happening if we don't do something about climate change. There will

be more severe weather—heat waves that could reduce our water supply, extreme rainfall that could damage critical infrastructure, a decrease in agricultural productivity that could threaten, in my State alone, a \$20 billion ag industry, which ranks fifth in the Nation. We cannot close our eyes to climate change because it is happening right now around us.

That is why it is all the more disappointing that the Senate has failed to seriously consider legislation that would address climate change. I have been here for these close calls. When I first came to the Senate, we were so close to getting a renewable electricity standard put in place nationwide. I had a bill that would have done that. It would have been combined with the renewable fuel standard, and I think it would have been a good way to have brought people in from both parties, from both sides of the aisle, and from all parts of the country. I remember standing in the back of this Chamber with Senator CANTWELL, bemoaning the fact that we were just one vote short of getting it done. That was over a decade ago.

Meanwhile, yes, States are taking action. With our having a Republican Governor at the time, Tim Pawlenty, my State was able to get a renewable electricity standard put in place—something like 20 to 25 percent by 2025—and we are making that. We wouldn't have made it if we had not set a goal, which, at that time, seemed bold, and we did it on a bipartisan basis—with Democrats, Republicans, and the legislature. We combined it politically with a renewable fuel standard so it would get some of our farmers and other people on board. We had two provisions in there—a strong renewable electricity standard and a strong renewable fuel standard, with a Republican Governor leading the way. Why? We could see ahead. We could see the effect climate change would have on our outdoor economy. We could see the effect it would have on hunting and fishing and recreation in our State.

Here is what happened. We barely missed doing something on the renewable electricity standard. Then President Obama got elected, and we were in the middle of a downturn. I had actually hoped we would have moved on renewable electricity, but the decision was made to go with cap and trade. I supported cap and trade. In the end, despite its passing in the House, we couldn't get the votes in the Senate, in part, because we were in the middle of a downturn.

Since then, we have done a few things on energy efficiency, which have been good, that Secretary Chu called the low-hanging fruit. We have done some things in the farm bill with conservation, with the sodsaver provision that I have with Senator THUNE, but we haven't done anything that significantly makes a difference.

Instead, the administration has taken us out of the international cli-

mate change agreement, which means we are the only country in the world that isn't in it. When the President first made his announcement, Syria and Nicaragua were not in it. Now they are. This is not what leadership is when we are the only country that is not part of this agreement. No, that is not what leadership is, and it certainly impedes our doing business around the world when it comes to green energy.

Other countries can go in there and ask: Why are you going to do business with this country? It is the only one that hasn't signed on to the international climate change agreement? That happens. I have heard from businesspeople. That happens. That is one thing that happens.

When it came to greenhouse gases, the standards we had in place at the EPA were a compromise that had been worked on over years. It is now on the cutting room floor because this administration went backward.

The gas mileage standard is something else we could do. Again, we went backward. Instead of working on these things—coming up with more comprehensive legislation—unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decided, yesterday, to play politics by bringing up the Green New Deal resolution with the explicit intention of trying to create a divide by voting it down.

Do you know what? The resolution, as I have said, is aspirational. It sets out some audacious goals. We know we can't meet everything that is in that resolution in 10 years. Yet what has it done that I think is so good? It has reignited the debate on how the United States can lead the way in addressing global climate change while building a clean energy future that benefits American businesses, factories, and workers.

We are a country that sets audacious goals. We put a man on the Moon, right? We won World War II. We are a country that sets audacious goals. Sometimes it takes us longer to meet them, which is OK. If we see a problem, we don't just put our heads down. We look ahead; we look at each other; and we figure out how we are going to meet the challenge. That is what we have to do with climate change.

At the same time that our Republican colleagues brought up the Green New Deal resolution for a vote, they declined to consider the resolution that was offered by Senator CARPER that simply says climate change is real, that human activity during the last century has been the dominant cause of the climate crisis, and that the United States and Congress should take immediate action to address the challenges of climate change.

The challenges we face are too great to waste time on show votes and political stunts. For years, we have heard of the things we can do to make a difference. There is not one approach; it is an "all of the above" approach. We know—and I have seen the models—

what we can do to start bringing the temperature down to an international goal, by the way, of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. That is a lot, but our wanting to stay under that amount is actually a realistic goal right now.

Instead of spending time debating these kinds of show resolutions, we should be taking real action to combat climate change. We need a comprehensive approach that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote energy-efficient technologies and home-grown energy resources. That is what we should do. When Senator MCCONNELL brought up what was an aspirational resolution to bring people together, he did it as a show to divide people. That is not what we want to do here. We have people from all over the country who have some different views on this, and we should be coming together to figure out solutions. As I noted, I believe we must reinstate the Clean Power Plan rules and the gas mileage standards that the administration has reversed, which has rolled back the progress we have made.

I also want to talk today about my home State's work on these issues.

I am proud Minnesota has taken a proactive and innovative approach to energy use and sustainability, which is critical to addressing carbon emissions and climate change. As I noted, that 25-percent electricity standard would be met and is going to be met by 2025. This bipartisan bill was signed into law by Governor Pawlenty in 2007, and it passed the House back then.

By the way, that was 2007, right? Since then, everything we have learned has reinforced what we know, which is that climate change is happening. Back in 2007, we had not seen this big push against doing something about it. We had not seen all of the dark money that went in to take care of not doing something about it and to back up this inertia we are seeing. Yet, somehow, back in 2007, in my State, I guess we got it through—we got around some of this—because that legislation that was signed by a Republican Governor received overwhelmingly bipartisan support. It passed the Minnesota House by a vote of 123 to 10 and passed the Minnesota Senate by 63 to 3.

Earlier this month, our new Governor, Governor Walz, announced a proposal that would build on that earlier work by setting a goal of generating 100 percent of the State's energy from clean sources by 2050. We have also seen other Governors doing this across the country. I think that is great. Justice Brandeis once said that the States are laboratories of democracy, which is a good thing. We can't just sit there and expect States, on an individual basis, to change the national dialogue. Some of these things have to be done by us in this Chamber in Washington, DC.

Once we set those goals, which started with the Republican Governor of Minnesota and then moved on to two Democratic Governors, what we saw

was Xcel Energy—Minnesota’s largest utility—as being the earliest supporter of the last administration’s Clean Power Plan. This is an electric utility—the biggest one in our State—that recently announced plans to deliver 100-percent carbon-free electricity to its customers by 2050. As part of that pledge, it plans to reduce carbon emissions by 80 percent by 2030 in the eight States it serves. It is an electric company—a power utility—that has realized this is in its best long-term interest and that it is certainly in the best long-term interest of its customers.

If energy utilities like Xcel understand the need to reduce our use of fossil fuels and to embrace setting ambitious goals that will eventually get us to 100-percent clean renewable energy, then so should we and so should the administration.

We know energy innovation can’t really take root—not in any kind of serious way—without there being certainty, stability, and a clear path forward. Yes, some of that can happen in the States, and that is exciting. It can happen in our businesses and in businesses in Minnesota, like Cargill—the biggest private company in the country—that looks at the world and sees what is going to happen to its investors and its employees if we don’t do something about climate change. It has joined in an effort with major businesses to take this on. So, yes, States are doing things, and Governors are doing things.

Yes, electric utilities are doing things. Some of our small electric utilities in Minnesota have actually started creating incentives for solar panels. One of the most innovative ones will give its customers—this is a very small town in a small county—large water heaters that cost about \$1,000 if, in exchange, they will get solar panels.

Senator HOEVEN and I worked on a bill to make sure people in this Chamber understood that these large water heaters were really helpful in the basements of farmhouses and that they were actually more energy efficient. Then this utility—a little electric co-op—took a step forward and actually offered a free water heater in exchange for buying a long-term interest in a solar panel. It is not as easy when you are a small electric co-op. I have a ton of them in my State, and I have worked with them extensively, but they, too, are starting to see the future and are starting to do their part.

In my State, we have big businesses like Cargill, big electric utilities like Xcel, and little electric co-ops. We have our Governors. We have businesses that are not in the electric business but that see what is happening to their customers around the world. We have universities, nonprofits, churches, synagogues, and mosques that want to retrofit and make their places of worship more energy efficient, which is another bill I have with Senator HOEVEN. When all of this is going on, how can we just sit here and do nothing and in-

stead have negative show votes for no reason at all? We are going to keep talking about this and not let it go because what we need is action.

We need policies that encourage reduction in greenhouse gasses. We must leave our children with a world that is as good as the one we got.

There is an old Ojibwe saying—we have a lot of proud Indian Tribes in Minnesota—that says: You make decisions not for now but for seven generations from now.

You know what. That is our duty. But guess what. With climate change, it is no longer just seven generations now; it is for the pages who are sitting right here, because this is happening right now. The predictions are dire.

I was in Florida just a few weeks ago, and they predict that in a decade, 1 out of 10 of their homes is going to be flooded in their State—1 out of 10 of their homes.

You see what is happening in Norfolk, VA. You look at these pages and you think: This is not just seven generations from now; this is 7 years from now or 70 years from now. That is what we are dealing with. It is upon us. So it is our duty, our constitutional duty as elected representatives, to do our job. It is our moral duty to do the right thing for this country. So let’s get to work and get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to correct the record concerning statements the President reportedly made yesterday afternoon when he met with Senate Republicans.

Apparently, in between his efforts to stiff hurricane victims in Puerto Rico and tear affordable healthcare away from millions of Americans, the President claimed that Democrats were holding up ambassadorial nominations in the Senate. Just weeks ago, we heard similar comments from the Senate majority leader, who claimed that GEN John Abizaid’s nomination to be Ambassador to Saudi Arabia was “being held up.”

Let me be clear. No one wants to see the State Department vested with all the resources it needs to effectively conduct American foreign policy, including qualified and capable staff, more than I do. We cannot promote our foreign policy, protect American citizens, advocate for American businesses, or advance American values without a robust diplomatic core.

I want all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that each time the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has received nominations, I have dedicated my time and staff resources to efficiently and diligently vet and advance these nominations. In the last Congress, the committee reported 169 nominations. So I reject the assertion that we have not done our part to ensure that the State Department is appropriately staffed.

Now let me speak to General Abizaid because no one can honestly claim that the Foreign Relations Committee has been anything but extremely diligent and expeditious with this nomination.

With my full support, General Abizaid appeared in the very first committee nominations hearing of this Congress, and I very much look forward to voting in favor of his nomination as soon as our chairman—our Republican chairman—exercises his prerogative and puts him before the committee for a vote.

As with all nominees, the timing of his consideration by the full Senate is under the control of the majority leader.

It is clear that President Trump has an inaccurate or dishonest view of the nominations situation in the Senate and particularly in the Foreign Relations Committee.

We cannot confirm diplomats we do not have. All too often, the committee has received nominations late or not at all. The Trump administration took nearly 2 years before it even bothered to nominate General Abizaid, leaving a gaping hole in our diplomatic posture to Saudi Arabia and the region.

To go nearly 2 years without putting forward a nominee is a failure of leadership, pure and simple. Saudi Arabia’s actions over the past 2 years highlight the fact that we need an adult on the ground, which is why I wholeheartedly support General Abizaid and look forward to what I hope is his speedy confirmation.

Sadly, Saudi Arabia is not an isolated example. It took even longer—more than 2 years—for the Trump administration to nominate a candidate to be U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. Astonishingly enough, it was only this week that the President sent up an ambassadorial nominee for Mexico. We are now 26 months into the Trump administration, and we still lack ambassadorial nominees to critical countries such as Egypt, Pakistan, and our close ally, Jordan.

Let’s be clear. This is the President’s reckless abdication of a constitutional responsibility essential to projecting American power abroad. When you don’t nominate someone, President Trump has only himself to blame.

Furthermore, there is unfortunately another severe problem that we cannot ignore with regard to the administration’s nominees. When the Trump administration repeatedly fails to appropriately vet political nominations, Congress must exercise appropriate oversight. The President has nominated and renominated individuals with restraining orders for threats of violence; people who made material omissions, sometimes on a repeated basis, in their nomination materials; people who tweeted and retweeted vile things about Senators and their families and who have engaged in incidents that should, frankly, mean they should never have been nominated.

One nominee attacked my late colleague and good friend Senator John

McCain, claiming that John McCain, an American hero, was rolling “out the welcome mat for ISIS on America’s southern border.” But unfortunately we know that attacking McCain does not cross any redlines for this President.

Another nominee has claimed, with no evidence, that Senator CRUZ’s wife is part of a sinister cabal seeking to combine the Governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This nominee called Hillary Clinton a “terrorist with amnesia” and retweeted someone calling Senator ROMNEY a “dumbass.”

You can’t make this stuff up.

Senator SASSE’s office said that nominee should “put on his tinfoil hat and visit our office with evidence for his salacious conspiracy theories and cuckoo allegations” and went on to observe that “People who want to serve Americans as our diplomats and spokespersons abroad should know that words and truth matter, even during campaigns. Cynics and nuts are probably going to have a hard time securing Senate confirmation.” I couldn’t agree with him more.

Yet the President thought highly enough of this individual and lowly enough of the U.S. Senate that he nominated him for an ambassadorship in two successive Congresses.

Another ambassadorial nominee was the subject of a temporary restraining order after she left a bullet-ridden target practice sheet on her doctor’s chair.

Again, you cannot make this up.

As for being unresponsive to committee requirements for all nominees, I can understand that nominees may accidentally leave off a few businesses they were involved in, but we had one nominee who failed to inform the committee of dozens of businesses and another nominee who, even more egregiously, failed to mention multiple lawsuits he was involved in, including one in which he was alleged to have fired a female employee who complained of sexual harassment. Given the nature and frequency of these omissions, it is hard to believe they were unintentional.

So when the White House, either through negligence or incompetence, sends us unvetted, unqualified nominees—incapable and oftentimes offensive—my staff and I exercise due diligence on behalf of the American people.

To make this crystal clear, the President can speed up this process. All he has to do is start nominating Americans with appropriate credentials and honorable conduct in their careers. It is not rocket science.

The United States and our allies continue to face tremendous challenges around the world. We must continue to lead on the international stage and work in collaboration with international partners to achieve our shared security goals. But to have our diplomats in place, they must be nomi-

nated in a timely fashion and vetted properly. That is what the real holdup here is—not Senate Democrats. And I refuse to let the President point the finger at us when he should be pointing the finger at himself.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senate democratic whip.

S. 874

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the Dream Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that would give immigrant students who grew up in the United States a chance to earn their citizenship. This is not a new topic. It was 19 years ago that I introduced the Dream Act. It hasn’t become law yet, but it has inspired a movement of thousands of young people across this country.

Back in the day when I introduced this bill and talked about the Dreamers, people thought you were talking about a British rock group. In this case, the Dreamers happened to be a group of people living in America who were desperately trying to become part of America’s future. They came to the United States as children, infants, toddlers, and kids. They are American in every way except for a piece of paper on their immigration status. They have gone to our schools. They sit next to us in church. They are the kids whom you see on the playground with your own kids, but they are undocumented. Because they are undocumented, they are subject to deportation at any moment in their lives.

They end up going to school, but it is tougher for them. They don’t qualify for Pell grants or Federal loans. They have to find a way to save the money or find a way to secure a scholarship that just might be available to them, but it is rare. Most of the time it means a longer period of time in college before they can finish, as they save up the money. Ultimately, they are trained to become our teachers, our nurses, our doctors, our engineers, and even our soldiers.

Yesterday I reintroduced the Dream Act. My cosponsor is Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican from South Carolina and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I want to thank LINDSEY GRAHAM for joining me in this bipartisan effort. Bipartisanship is rare in this Chamber, and on an issue of controversy, it is even rarer.

Senator GRAHAM and I have a long history of working together because we believe that Congress has an obligation to do the job we were elected to do and pass legislation that solves problems. Senator GRAHAM and I were partners in the Gang of 8—four Democratic Senators and four Republican Senators. That was the gang with the great John McCain, CHUCK SCHUMER, MARCO RUBIO, LINDSEY GRAHAM, Jeff Flake, BOB MENENDEZ, and MICHAEL BENNET.

We wrote a comprehensive immigration reform bill a few years back in

2013. We brought it to the floor of the Senate. We covered virtually every aspect of immigration law. Believe me, immigration law is a mess, and it needed that kind of comprehensive approach. We brought it up to a vote on the floor, and the vote was 68 to 32. It was a bipartisan vote. After months of working on this bill, we couldn’t have been happier. We finally had a bipartisan bill to address the immigration challenge in America.

The bill left here and went to the House of Representatives under a Republican leadership, and it died. They wouldn’t even consider it, wouldn’t debate it, and, certainly, wouldn’t vote on it. Look at the mess we have today in the United States because of our immigration laws, and consider the possibility that 6 years ago we had finally found a path that could lead us to a bipartisan solution. That path is still there.

Part of that immigration law was the Dream Act, which we are reintroducing. In 2010 I joined with Republican Senator Dick Lugar of Indiana. We called on President Obama to use his authority as President to protect these Dreamers from deportation. In other words, if we couldn’t pass the law, could the President do something to help protect them?

President Barack Obama responded. He created a program called the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. Here is what DACA said: We will give you, 2 years at a time, temporary legal status to stay in the United States and not be deported and be able to work in this country. If you want the temporary status that is renewable every 2 years, you have to report to the government, go through a comprehensive background investigation, pay a fee, and, then, we will give you a chance to stay here, go to school and work, and not be afraid of that knock on the door.

More than 800,000 Dreamers stepped forward. They came forward in an extraordinary way. I can remember the first day when then-Congressman Luis Gutierrez and I decided at Navy Pier in Chicago, which is a huge gathering place, that we would have a sit-down for these young people so they could fill out the forms and apply for DACA status. Initially, we thought we were going to have 1,000. We didn’t know what we would do with it. Then, there were 2,000, and then 3,000, and it turned out that families literally stood in line all night long for the chance to come across that threshold to sit down with a volunteer and fill out their form for DACA status. Mothers and fathers were in tears with their kids thinking: At least my son or my daughter will have a chance not to be deported and to be part of America. More than 800,000 of these Dreamers came forward, and they received DACA protection because of President Obama’s Executive order. Forty-three thousand were in my State of Illinois.

DACA has unleashed the full potential of these Dreamers, who are contributing to our country in so many ways—teachers, soldiers, engineers, and small business owners.

Then came the day with a new President—President Donald Trump. On September 5, 2017, President Trump announced that he would repeal DACA and the protections that it gave to these people. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and, even worse, being deported from the only country they had ever known and being sent back to places they couldn't even remember.

When President Trump announced the repeal of DACA, he called on Congress to legalize DACA. Since then, President Trump has rejected every single bipartisan deal we offered him on the subject. I am not giving up on the Dream Act, and I am not giving up on the Dreamers. You would think that after all these years and all these young people, people would be coming to the floor who are against the Dream Act and against DACA, telling horrible stories about the young people who we are talking about today. Strangely, that has never happened. I am sure there is going to be somebody to disappoint me. That is human nature. Overwhelmingly, these young people are just nothing short of amazing.

I have come to the floor of the Senate more than 100 times to tell their stories because I think that is the best way for you to understand why this issue is so important.

This is an amazing young woman. Her name is Karla Robles. Karla Robles is the 116th Dreamer whose story I have told on the floor of the Senate. She was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was 8 years old. She grew up in Chicago, where her mom and dad worked long hours in a pizza restaurant. Karla's parents told her and her brothers and sisters: No matter what happens, make sure to stay out of trouble and study really hard. It will all pay off one day.

That is exactly what Karla did. When Karla started school in the third grade, she didn't speak English, but she worked hard and quickly became an excellent student. Karla wrote me a letter and she said: "Education has been an important part of my life and the teachers who took the time to guide my family and me are a big reason I want to go into this field."

In the seventh grade, Karla received the American Legion Award—this undocumented young girl—which was given to one boy and one girl in the class who "are deemed most worthy of the high qualities of citizenship and of true Americanism."

In high school, Karla Robles was a member of the National Honor Society and the President's Club, and she was active in student government.

She participated in a program called TRUST, where she agreed to volunteer her personal time to mentor younger students. She was captain and MVP of

the varsity tennis team. She received her associate's degree from Harper College. She is now a senior at Loyola University in Chicago.

Here is a special word about Loyola University in Chicago. This is an amazing campus that is doing its best to give people just like Karla a chance in life. They have created something called Arrupe College, which is a low cost approach to higher education for some of the poorest families in Chicago, and they don't exclude kids who are protected by DACA or are Dreamers. The Loyola medical school is one of the few in the United States with open competition where DACA students can apply. There are 32 medical students at Loyola in Chicago who are undocumented. They are DACA Dreamers. They desperately want to be part of America. Part of the agreement is if they go to medical school at Loyola and borrow money to do it, they have to pay back a year of service in an underserved area in the State of Illinois for the money that they are receiving to go to school.

Back to Karla.

During college, she was on the National Honor Roll and the Dean's List. She also volunteers with an outreach program for at-risk kids and with AmeriCorps VISTA, and she founded a tutoring program for elementary school students.

I know Karla a little better than I know some of the Dreamers because she interned here in my Washington, DC, office last year. What does she want to do at the end of this journey if she can stay in America? She wants to be a teacher in the Chicago Public Schools. She wants to pursue her master's degree and become a high school guidance counselor.

There are some people who look at this picture and say: This is not an American citizen. Tell her to leave. I look at this picture and think that we are lucky to have her, that this Nation of immigrants is lucky to have this young woman who simply wants to give back to America. That is all she is asking for—nothing special—just to let her give back to this country.

So we have reintroduced the Dream Act. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come forward and join me and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, my Republican cosponsor.

We think there are about 1.8 million young people who are eligible for the Dream Act in the United States. They have never known another country. In the mornings, when they walk into the classrooms in their schools, they stand up and put their hands on their chests and pledge allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. They were just kids when they were brought here. Shouldn't we do the right thing in America—this Nation of immigrants, this country of opportunity, this bright city on the hill, this shining city on the hill?

Yes, we should.

For the Dreamers and for their moms and dads, we have to renew our com-

mitment that the next generation of Americans who will come from all over the world will continue to make this one of the finest countries on Earth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, we rise to celebrate Women's History Month.

This month is, of course, very personal to me as a woman, a daughter, and a mother. One of the sayings I love is: "Well-behaved women seldom make history." This is so true. I want to reflect on a few of these fearless females—trailblazers—who have made history and who have shaped our future.

These are women like suffrage leader Carrie Chapman Catt. She founded the League of Women Voters in 1920, which was 2 years after she helped women gain the right to vote. Catt relocated to Iowa when she was 7 years old, and she graduated from what is now Iowa State University, my alma mater. She was so committed to the cause of women that she helped found the International Woman Suffrage Alliance to help spread rights for women all around our globe.

I fast-forward to today, when one can see the fruits of her labor. In Iowa, we just elected our first female Governor—my friend and a fearless female, Kim Reynolds. We also gained two new women lawmakers with the election of ABBY FINKENAUER and CINDY AXNE and a record number of women in the Iowa State House, led by Speaker of the House Linda Upmeyer. In Congress, we have a record number of women who serve in the U.S. House and 25 who serve in the U.S. Senate. While we come from differing backgrounds and political stripes, I admire these women for jumping into the arena.

I also reflect on a woman named Deborah Sampson. Sampson is credited as the first woman to serve in the U.S. Army. This hero, who couldn't serve openly as a female, disguised herself as a male and joined the Continental Army in 1781. She led forces on a mission that helped to capture 15 enemy soldiers. She served as a scout, dug trenches, and endured battle wounds. She even extracted a pistol ball from her own leg so no one would know she was a female.

Fast-forward to today, when thousands of women are serving in the military and are taking on bigger and badder roles. They are all brave, fierce, and honorable. They are modern-day Deborah Sampsons.

I think of the wonderful women with whom I served in the Army and of all of those whom I commanded—my wonderful mechanics, my truckdrivers, my admin specialists. I think of my daughter, who is a cadet at West Point, as well as Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson, and so many other women who serve in Active Duty, as reservists, and as National Guardsmen. They all serve our great Nation.

Finally, I reflect on Gertrude Dieken. Dieken was from Grundy County, IA. She was an editor and the first woman vice president of the *Farm Journal*—a renowned magazine that is dedicated to farming. Savvy in business, economics, and journalism, Dieken established a book publishing division and became the first female member of its board of directors.

Iowa women are today exercising their girl power, making it happen on the shop floor, in the boardroom, on the farm, and in every occupation in between. Iowa is now ranked eighth for growth in the number of women-owned businesses.

As part of my 99 County Tour, I have met many of these phenomenal women and have heard their stories and dreams for their futures. I am continually inspired by these fearless females and the thousands of other women like them who have paved the path forward and broken—shattered—that glass ceiling. They are changing lives and are helping our economy and our communities grow.

We know it isn't always easy today to be a fearless female, just as it was not easy for the trailblazing women of the past. We must continue to take on the challenges that confront women from all walks of life—harassment, abuse, and discrimination. Keeping the economy strong, along with issues like childcare access, criminal justice reform, healthcare, and paid parental leave, are areas in which I am working to move that ball forward.

Melinda Gates often says, “When women and girls are empowered to participate fully in society, everyone benefits.” I believe that to be true.

The future is bright for women today—in particular, for young women—because of the sacrifices of those who have come before us. We have a common bond as females, sisters, mothers, grandmothers, and daughters. It is easy to look at these historical examples as a mere recitation of facts and figures, but I view them as a challenge—a challenge to all women to stand strong and reject the status quo, to achieve greatness, to be a friend and a mentor, and to prove all of those doubters wrong. Whether you are a stay-at-home mom or a woman in America's boardrooms or anywhere in between, you are making a difference.

As Peggy Whitson—famed astronaut and first female to command the International Space Station—once said: “If a farmer's daughter from Iowa can be an astronaut, you can be just about anything you want to be.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, it is my honor to be here with my fellow woman Senator from the State of Iowa. I enjoy learning more about Iowa and about the strength of Iowan women and in our Nation.

I join my colleague to highlight and celebrate not only the women leaders

in the Senate but the millions of women throughout history and across the country who have made and continue to make a difference in their homes, in their communities, and in society in general.

I am very proud to represent the State of West Virginia—a State with a long and rich history of female trailblazers. It is a State that respects and celebrates those women. Maybe you have heard that phrase “mountain mamas.” Well, Mother's Day was actually originated in West Virginia by Grafton resident Anna Jarvis in 1908. President Woodrow Wilson made it an official national holiday in the year 1914, and it is an annual reminder today to cherish and thank one of the, if not the, most influential women in many people's lives—their mothers.

I miss my mother every day. I know my mother, who was the First Lady of West Virginia, was an incredible role model for me and an inspiration. Seeing all she did for our State and for our fellow West Virginians through her public service was a driving force throughout my life. Not only that, she was a great and loving mother, and as I said, I still miss her every day.

Another West Virginia woman who has been an incredible inspiration is Katherine Johnson. Katherine was born in White Sulphur Springs, WV, in 1918. In her being brilliant with numbers, she attended West Virginia State College and was later one of the first Black students to integrate West Virginia University's graduate school in 1939. That is pretty notable in and of itself, but Katherine didn't stop there.

In 1953, she took a job at NASA and began working as a human computer. She literally calculated how to get men into space. Remember, with the launch of the Soviets' satellite Sputnik in 1957, the space race was on. America needed a win, and Katherine Johnson played a major role in facilitating that win. Her work put John Glenn into space and into history. The success of that mission marked a turning point in the space race altogether, and it made a significant impact in the future of space travel and exploration. Some may better recognize Katherine's name from the movie “Hidden Figures.”

I am proud to say that in tribute to Katherine and her incredible legacy at NASA, I introduced legislation to rename West Virginia's only NASA facility after her. President Trump signed that bill into law last year, and Fairmont, WV, is now the home of the Katherine Johnson Independent Verification & Validation Facility. At 100 years young, Katherine still serves as a tremendous role model to me and to women everywhere.

Of course, all of our States are home to brilliant women. My home of West Virginia is home to numerous amazing women who have made significant contributions, and we are proud to claim them all.

I don't know if one remembers America's sweetheart of 1984, Olympic gold

medalist Mary Lou Retton, who is a native of West Virginia; Mother Jones, who is a champion of the working class and a labor organizer who campaigned for the United Mine Workers; Pulitzer Prize-winning author Pearl S. Buck; the host of the “TODAY” show, Hoda Kotb; actress and advocate Jennifer Garner; and Saira Blair. Many of you have never heard of Saira Blair. Several years ago, at the age of 18, she became the youngest person ever—male or female—to get elected to a State or Federal office. She served in the West Virginia House of Delegates.

These incredible women and so many others have helped to shape history and society, and they have paved the way for the next generation of leaders—girls and young women who might not yet have realized or achieved their full potential.

In 2015, I was sworn in as West Virginia's first female Senator. This distinction is a privilege for me, and it is an honor. It is certainly nothing I take lightly. I may well be the very first female Senator from West Virginia, but I am very confident that I will not be the last—certainly, not if I can help it.

So, shortly after I came to the Senate, I started an initiative called West Virginia Girls Rise Up because I want to inspire the next generation of leaders. Through that program, I visit fifth grade girls across the State. We talk about their dreams, what they can be when they grow up, and how they can be the best versions of themselves.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from Iowa mentioned the astronaut, Peggy Whitson. She was with me when I did two Girls Rise Up in West Virginia, and we talked about three different accomplishments that girls can do to reach their full potential—education, physical fitness, and self-confidence. I believe these are the building blocks for a successful future for whatever you want to do.

Then we set goals. Maybe it is reading more. Maybe it is eating healthier. Maybe it is raising your hand more in class. Most importantly, I challenged these girls to achieve these goals.

What I hope the girls get out of this is that you can reach a goal you set for yourself now—or at least really work hard to—and you can reach your next goal when you get older. Then you can reach your next goal and your next goal and your next goal, until you find yourself doing groundbreaking research in a lab, being a CEO of a Fortune 500 company, designing a skyscraper at an architectural firm, or working to make our country a better place from the floor of the U.S. Senate or, I will add, as President of the United States.

The possibilities are endless, but the common thread is this: Think about what it is you want, work hard to make your dreams a reality, and have confidence to never back down.

As I travel across West Virginia with my West Virginia Girls Rise Up Program, I am constantly amazed at the

potential of the young women I see. I know the same is true in States across this country.

I hope those girls are watching us here in this Chamber today. I hope they are hearing the stories of the incredible women and trailblazers who have come before us. I hope they are thinking to themselves: That could be me one day.

I am incredibly proud to be a part of what female leaders are doing right now, but I am more incredibly optimistic to see what our future female leaders will do in the years ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognizing Women's History Month and celebrating the countless women who have shaped our Nation and those who continue to devote their time and energy to the pursuit of equality here at home and abroad.

Women have demonstrated incredible perseverance in the face of adversity. Their stories of fighting for equal opportunity are ingrained in the history of our country. We wouldn't be the great Nation that we are without those who paved the path for a more promising future for women.

We honor the individuals whose remarkable courage and dedication to challenging the status quo helped advance women's rights and those who followed their dreams while breaking the glass ceiling.

In 1932, Arkansas elected Hattie Caraway to the U.S. Senate, which made her the first woman elected to this body. She broke barriers, changed norms, and helped lay the foundation for the new role women were beginning to be recognized as deserving to play in the Senate throughout her legislative career.

Senator Caraway served nearly 14 years in the Senate, where in 1933 she was the first woman to chair a Senate committee and in 1943 became the first woman to preside officially over the Senate.

Arkansans are particularly proud that our legacy in the U.S. Senate includes electing the first woman to serve in this Chamber. The path that Hattie Caraway trailblazed for more women to enter the ranks of the world's greatest deliberative body has, without a doubt, made the Senate a better, stronger institution and has benefited our Nation immensely.

Today, more women are serving in Congress than ever before. We need to look no further than Hattie Caraway to understand the magnitude of her decision to step forward and serve her State and country.

More women are also answering the call to serve our Nation in uniform. Women are the fastest growing demographic of veterans, but many Department of Veterans Affairs facilities don't have the ability to provide equitable care or services to our women veterans.

This Congress, Senator TESTER and I have reintroduced legislation to eliminate barriers to care and services that many women veterans face. The legislation is appropriately named for Deborah Sampson—the Deborah Sampson Act—which honors the service and sacrifice of the American Revolution hero who actually disguised herself as a man in order to serve in the Continental Army.

We can be proud of Deborah Sampson and the countless women patriots who have followed in her footsteps.

We must update VA services to support the unique needs of our entire veteran population, including the growing number of women relying on VA for care.

While opportunities remain to advance women's equality, the United States recently took an important step to empower women worldwide. Congress approved and President Trump signed into law the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act. Senator CARDIN and I introduced the legislation to eliminate global gender-related barriers and empower female entrepreneurs around the world.

In some parts of the world, women are pushed so far to the sidelines that they are denied access to even the most basic financial services. Cultural and historical barriers prevent women from launching a business, building savings, and supporting economic growth in their communities. Leveling the playing field will help the world economy grow substantially.

Providing women access to tools for economic success supports global prosperity. Our country can lead by example and help deliver these tools and empower women. I look forward to seeing women succeed because of this legislative effort.

I am a dad of three daughters and a grandfather to two little girls. I want women across the globe to have the same access to resources and opportunities that my girls have because I have seen with my own eyes how limitless their potential is.

Earlier this year, President Trump launched the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative to empower women around the world to fulfill their economic potential. The Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act is an essential piece of this plan to deliver global results.

Empowering women strengthens families, communities, and our Nation. As we take this time to reflect on the challenges women have overcome and still face, let us continue the momentum started generations ago by hard-working, courageous, and determined women who envisioned a country full of opportunities for success for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate has unanimously rejected the so-

called Green New Deal. In a display of political courage for the ages, 43 Democrats voted present, including many of the bill's own sponsors.

Now, many of them are running for President. In fact, these days, it seems that all of the Democratic Senators are running for President and perhaps may realize what a disaster the Green New Deal is for them.

The Green New Deal would force a transition in just 10 years—one decade—to 100 percent green energy, whatever that is. But it is an impossible goal that would require trillions of dollars of taxes and the effective nationalization of private industry in America.

That is not all—no, not all.

The Green New Deal would also overhaul or rebuild all existing buildings in the United States to achieve maximum energy efficiency—all—every single home and building in America. I guess you could call it the "Extreme Home Makeover Mandate."

The Green New Deal also calls for taxpayer-funded college and jobs for every person in the country, even for illegal aliens and even if you are unable or unwilling to work. That is according to a press release the Democrats sent out and then tried to send down the memory hole when it was justly mocked, and understandably so.

Jobs for everyone who is unable to work and unwilling to work—there is a big difference between those two groups of people.

The radical nature of the Green New Deal cannot be overstated. The amount of control it would give to politicians and planners in Washington would be the envy of Soviet Russia. Actually, it would make Stalin blush. And it would take Stalinist tactics to achieve a Green New Deal.

To borrow from Churchill, "Socialism may begin with the best of intentions, but it always ends with the Gestapo." Who else is going to come into your home and make sure that it is energy compliant? Who else is going to confiscate your gas-using pickup truck? Who else is going to ensure that you don't commit the terrible crime of eating a hamburger?

Perhaps we can come up with a better name for the Green New Deal—one that reflects its true lineage. Might I suggest the Red New Deal, the color of Communist regimes the world over, or perhaps the Green Leap Forward in honor of Mao.

I gather some House freshmen might actually feel pretty comfortable with those labels. They claim these radical ideas are necessary to stop the threat of climate change—a threat so dire, the Democrats insist—so dire that we will all be dead in 12 years—12 years—if we don't surrender to totalitarian levels of power over our lives to central planners in Washington.

Yet we gave them a chance to vote on this existential, apocalyptic threat and they all said: Meh, maybe later.

So this isn't really about climate change or even the environment. I

mean, come on. What do free college for rich kids and guaranteed jobs for lazy bums have to do with climate change?

The answer is: Nothing. And that tells you all you need to know about what the Democrats are up to.

The Green New Deal isn't a real policy proposal. It is just the Democrats' most fanciful and frightful dreams wrapped in one shiny package. I would call it a policy platform, but that would probably give it too much credit for substance.

The President put it very well. He said the Green New Deal is more like an undergraduate term paper, one written late at night after too many bong hits, judging from its botched rollout.

If you really feared a climate catastrophe, you would do a couple of simple things. First, you would build as many new, beautiful, carbon-free nuclear powerplants as you could. But the Green New Deal omits nuclear energy entirely, no doubt to please the Democrats' crony renewable energy lobbyists and the anti-nuclear know-nothings in the Democrats' base.

Second, you would get tough on the world's biggest polluters, especially on China. Foreign nations, after all, have driven almost all of the growth in global carbon emissions since the turn of the century.

But the Green New Dealers seem to believe America is the root of all of the world's problems, even though our emissions have been declining. It is just another case of the Democrats' guiding principle: Blame America first.

Of course, if we did something as stupid as pass the Green New Deal, most foreign nations would just laugh at us and keep building their economies and keep polluting while we tanked our own economy, immiserated our citizens, and lost millions of jobs in pursuit of a fantasy.

The Green New Deal would amount to America's unilateral disarmament on the world stage, which for some Democrats is probably a feature and not a bug. But sometimes even terrible ideas deserve a vote. So we gave them a vote on the Green New Deal, and the bill's own sponsors complained.

In any event, the Senate flunked the Democrats' term paper unanimously, and the only reason the Green New Deal got an F is that there is not a lower grade. So common sense prevailed this time, although I have a feeling this is not the last time we have heard of the Green New Deal.

Remember, this is not the hobby horse of some eccentric socialist fringe of the Democratic Party—oh, no, not at all. The Green New Deal has 90 Democratic cosponsors in the House. That is nearly two out of every five House Democrats, and the Democratic Presidential candidates have rushed to endorse the Green New Deal. Remember that when you step into the voting booth in 2020.

But let me wrap up on a more serious note. I have made a lot of jokes about

the Green New Deal, and, believe me, the Green New Deal is laughable. But for many Americans, the Green New Deal is no laughing matter.

Imagine, if you will, a mom and dad and a couple young kids outside Little Rock, let's say. Every day, they drive the kids to school. They commute into the city where they work and back out to the suburbs, just so they can afford a home. When they are home on the weekends, maybe they try to fire up the grill on the patio to have a little cookout for the kids.

This working-class family is doing its best to live the American dream and pass it on to their kids. The Green New Deal is not for that family. It would outlaw their entire way of life, from the minivan in the garage to the hamburgers on their grill, to the house they call home.

The Green New Deal would be a death sentence for America's families. Yet the Democrats have the nerve to sell it as a rescue mission. I reject that fraud on America, and now so does the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, March is Women's History Month. A number of my colleagues have been coming to the floor and talking about the accomplishments of particular women in their States. I want to do the same thing.

When Virginia Minor, a St. Louisan, was denied the ability to register to vote in 1872, she took her case all the way to the Supreme Court. While she wasn't successful at the Supreme Court level, she remained a leader in the suffrage movement and later testified before the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage in 1889. Remember that women didn't get the right to vote until 1920. So she was working on this with thousands of others for a long time. She is also one of seven women represented in the Missouri State Capitol's Hall of Famous Missourians.

Virginia Minor and her fellow suffragettes blazed a trail of political leadership that others followed. In 1952 Leonor Sullivan became the first woman in Congress from Missouri. During the 24 years that she served in the House, she became the first woman appointed to the House Democratic Steering Committee. She was elected secretary, one of the elected leaders, of the House Democratic caucus for five terms.

Our former colleague, Senator Claire McCaskill, won her Senate race in 2006. With that, she became the first woman elected to the U.S. Senate from Missouri. Certainly, Senator McCaskill and I disagreed on plenty of things over the years, but, frankly, when it came to the big issues affecting our State, we always figured out how to work together to get things done.

Also from our State, I want to recognize Margaret Kelly, who in 1984 was appointed to the position of State audi-

tor. When that happened, that made her the first woman to hold statewide office in Missouri. She was elected to a full term in 1986 and reelected two more times after that.

In Missouri, at least, you can't talk about politics and the impact on politics without talking about Phyllis Schlafly, who was a vocal and tireless advocate for conservative ideas. She was never afraid of a fight, but she also knew when to celebrate what was possible. One of the great things about Phyllis Schlafly was that she knew how to win, when you could win, and what you could win, when you could win it, and, then, how to come back and fight for what you didn't get the first time and continue to work for more. She was a friend of mine. I value her legacy. There is no question that she impacted the political landscape of the country.

As I mentioned earlier, there are seven women represented in the Hall of Famous Missourians. Two of them were committed lifelong to education. In 1873 Susan Blow, who was born in St. Louis, founded the first public kindergarten in the United States in the Des Peres public school in Carondelet. In 1818 Saint Rose Duchesne opened the first Sacred Heart school outside of Europe. The Academy of the Sacred Heart was the first free school west of the Mississippi and the first Catholic school in what would eventually become the St. Louis Archdiocese. I mentioned that this was Saint Rose Duchesne, one of the first women to be an American who rose to the level of sainthood.

There are also a few world figures in that hall of fame, like Josephine Baker, who was not only an iconic entertainer but also a civil rights activist and, interestingly, a member of the French resistance during World War II while she was entertaining in Europe. In our hall of fame, she is joined by other entertainers, like Ginger Rogers and Betty Grable.

The seventh woman honored in the State capitol is Sacagawea, who, of course, was part of the Lewis and Clark expedition into Missouri and up the Missouri River and other territories of the Louisiana Purchase.

To cover all of the notable Missouri women in history would be impossible. To talk about the countless women who are making an incredible impact in our State today would be impossible—people who are devoted to public service, who are successful entrepreneurs, who serve our country in the Armed Forces, and so much more. Those women and others continue to help lead our country and to inspire younger women. There is a reason that March is Women's History Month, and thousands and thousands—maybe millions—of Missouri women would easily qualify in that category of people who have made a difference in history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I am proud to spotlight Wyoming's great history and achievements for women's equality.

Wyoming is the "Equality State"—the first State to give women the right to vote and hold public office. We actually did it before statehood. Long before statehood, in 1869, the Wyoming Territory was the first to grant women the right to vote.

Louisa Ann Swain of Laramie became the first woman in the United States to vote in a general election in 1870, and Wyoming insisted on protecting women's right to vote as a precondition for even joining the Union in 1890.

Now, that is not all. The first elected woman Governor in the United States, Nellie Taylor Ross, was Wyoming's 14th Governor.

Wyoming women continue to hold key elected offices today, with strong leaders like U.S. Representative LIZ CHENEY.

The State owes a debt of gratitude to all of these extraordinary women leaders.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Now I would like to turn to this week's debate over the Democrats' so-called Green New Deal.

The Green New Deal isn't about protecting our environment. It is about increasing the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Every Democrat Senator running for President supports the Green New Deal. They have cosponsored it—each and every one of them, every single one.

By cosponsoring the Green New Deal, these Senators have shown Americans what they actually do support as candidates and as an agenda for America, and that is massively increasing the size of government.

This year the Federal Government is projected to spend over \$4 trillion. That amount includes everything—Social Security, national defense, Medicare, all of it. If we were to pass the Green New Deal, it would cost up to \$93 trillion over the next 10 years. That is \$9.3 trillion a year—more than double what our government currently spends.

So, you see, the Green New Deal would massively expand the Federal Government, and that is exactly what Democrat Senators running for President want and plan to do, if elected. Don't be confused by Senate Democrats' ducking this vote on the Green New Deal. This is where Democrats would take our country if they were to retake the White House.

The Green New Deal would bankrupt our Nation, would wreak havoc, and would wreck the economy.

Republicans' pro-growth, pro-jobs policies have strengthened the economy and improved the lives of American families in their everyday lives at home. Because of tax relief, millions of families have more money now in their pockets to decide what to spend, what to save, and what to invest.

The Green New Deal plan would eliminate fossil fuels by requiring 100 percent renewable, carbon-free energy in just 10 years. Talk about having extra money in your pocket to fill your gas tank, but just putting gas in the car would be extremely difficult if the Green New Deal were to come to pass.

On the issue of climate change, climate change is real, but the Green New Deal is unrealistic. While it is important, in 2017 wind and solar energy generated just 8 percent of our electricity. Should we have more? Yes, but 8 percent of what we need is certainly inadequate.

Affordable and reliable fossil fuels, like coal and natural gas, power three out of five U.S. homes and businesses. Excluding fossil fuels would snuff out the bright lights of Americans' prosperity. It would threaten national security. It would threaten jobs. It would threaten our independence from foreign energy, and all Americans' higher standard of living.

What Democrats are proposing is essentially a pipe dream. It is no surprise that Democrats have yet to provide a cost estimate. They don't want Americans to know that the Green New Deal could cost up to \$93 trillion over the next 10 years. That is roughly \$65,000 each and every year for each and every family in America.

The Nation is already over \$22 trillion in debt. So how are they planning to pay for this? By doing what they often plan to do—raising taxes.

Paying for a \$93 trillion bill would empty just about every Americans' savings account in the country, and let's not forget that the Green New Deal would not actually solve the problems they are trying to solve. Really, the proposal amounts to unrealistic economic disarmament.

Plus, U.S. economic decline would harm the environment. That is what we are hearing from the Green New Deal. It would be unilateral harm to our economy and no improvement to the overall global climate. They want it done immediately. They want it done drastically. It is a level of alarm that is not in any way called for.

When you think about the American economy and what we are able to do in this country, it is a strong economy that allows for a clean environment. The stronger the economy, often the cleaner the environment is. That is certainly the case here, when you compare us around the world to other countries and their economies and their environments.

The label "Made in America" means more than just the country of origin. It means the better the environment. We are being asked to destroy—that is what the Democrats are asking us to do with this Green New Deal—our strong, growing, and improving economy and allow the largest polluters in the world to grow at our expense.

Right now, 13 percent of emissions comes from the United States, but 33 percent comes from China and from

India, and emissions in the United States have been declining over the last dozen years, while they continue to go up in China and India and in other locations around the world.

Why do Democrats want to do this? Well, they would like to engineer a big government takeover—or, I should say, as they say, transformation—of the U.S. economy.

There is a real solution that will not wreck our economy, will not hurt our Nation, will not hurt people's jobs, and will not hurt American families. The solution is not taxation. It is not regulation. It is innovation. Republicans continue to work, and we do it in a bipartisan way to advance innovative strategies for reducing carbon emissions.

First, we are working to promote carbon capture, and then using that carbon and sequestering it, taking it away. That means taking carbon out of the atmosphere and using it productively. We can use it for medical projects, construction projects, and for extracting oil. You can push the carbon dioxide into the ground in the area of oil wells and get out more oil, as a result, leaving the carbon dioxide underground.

Last year, the Senate passed the bipartisan FUTURE Act. It was signed into law, and it expands tax credits for carbon capture facilities.

Now we are advancing the bipartisan USE IT Act, which will help to turn carbon that has been captured into valuable products.

A second way Republicans are working in a bipartisan way to reduce emissions is by supporting nuclear power. Nuclear power generates about 60 percent—60 percent—of American-produced carbon-free energy. By far, that is the largest source of American carbon-free energy. It is much more than double solar and wind power combined.

In late December, we passed the bipartisan Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. This legislation had Republican and Democratic support and was signed into law by President Trump. This law will help innovators develop advanced nuclear reactors that are safer, cleaner, and more versatile. That is what we need to do. It is simplifying the process on the front end for the innovators to build state-of-the-art nuclear reactors. These advanced reactors are going to power the next generation of nuclear plants. We need them to expand the use of carbon-free energy. We also need to maintain our existing nuclear powerplants, and Congress needs to address how we manage nuclear waste. Nuclear power is an area with broad bipartisan support. We must continue to work together on nuclear power.

A third approach that Republicans are taking to reduce emissions is increasing the use of renewable energy. Republicans have repeatedly passed tax incentives to promote clean energy. These include tax credits for wind and solar panels, as well as incentives for biodiesel and compressed natural gas.

We know all these innovative strategies work. We see it in America's unparalleled success in reducing emissions. This progress is not the result of taxation; it is not the result of regulation; it is the result of American innovation. Our cutting-edge technologies can be adopted globally.

Republicans want to make America's energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, while investing in promising innovations for the future. Democrats want more government control. That is what they asked for with the Green New Deal—control of our economy and control of our lives, despite the cost to American families and American taxpayers.

Let's continue to pass real climate solutions, not these far-left fantasies. Let's focus on what works for our environment and our economy, not what works for Democrats who are running for President.

Republicans are going to continue to oppose unrealistic, unworkable, and unaffordable proposals like the Green New Deal. It is a big green bomb. The Democrats are ducking it, they are dodging it, and they are now distancing themselves from it by showing up on the floor of the Senate—those who have cosponsored it, those who have gone on TV and on the hustings around the country saying they would support it and be for it—and voting not for it but present. The Democrats are ducking this for a good reason: They know what a disaster it would be for our Nation.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am on the floor today to talk about career and technical education and specifically legislation we have introduced that would provide a lot more training opportunities for people who need the in-demand jobs that are out there.

When people hear about career and technical education, sometimes they wonder what we are referring to. High school programs used to be called vocational education. Many in my generation might remember it as that. But it is not your father's Oldsmobile. It is not the old voc-ed programs you might remember. In fact, it is very impressive. If you go to these CTE schools today—and Ohio, luckily, has a lot of great career and technical academies and schools—you will see something amazing. You will see young people being trained for some of the most so-

phisticated jobs out there in bioscience and technology, welding, of course, and manufacturing—in Ohio, it is a big deal—and also CDLs for truckdrivers, commercial driver's licenses. You might see somebody there who is interested in going into firefighting or EMS. This morning, I had a chance to visit with a young man who is in a CTE program where he is going to be immediately hired by a fire department.

These are great opportunities for our young people. Right now, these CTE schools are incredibly important because the skills are needed, and the training is needed.

One of the challenges we have had, frankly, is that sometimes parents who are advising their kids are saying "You need to go to a 4-year college or university like I did" or maybe like their uncle or aunt did. Maybe that is the goal they have for their kids, and that is fine. For many young people, that is appropriate, but for others, what a great opportunity, to be able to get out of high school, get a job immediately—a good-paying job with good benefits—and then at some point, because often in these schools, including in Ohio, you get college credit while you are in high school, to go on to college later, and perhaps your employer will pay for that.

This morning, I was with a young woman named Jordan. She is at the Great Oaks career and technical center in Southwest Ohio. Jordan is becoming a welder, and, as I explained to Jordan, she is going to have amazing opportunities. She will have plenty of job opportunities because she is going to have a skill that is so badly needed in Ohio right now. Our manufacturing sector is desperate for welders, and they are willing to pay good money for welders. She can make 45,000, 50,000 bucks a year with good benefits at 18 years old as a welder instead of taking on student debt, which in Ohio is about \$27,000 on average. Somebody graduating from community college or a 4-year college or university is taking on significant debt.

This is an opportunity for us to get more young people into career and technical education. We think we ought to do it. We have a good economy right now thanks to tax reform and regulatory relief. There is a lot of hiring going on, and wages are actually higher right now. In Ohio, we have a number of people who are looking for employees. The "help wanted" signs are out there.

We have about 148,000 jobs available in the State, if you look at OhioMeansJobs.com, which is the website that offers these positions. Now, there are about 250,000 Ohioans out of work. How does that make sense? Well, it makes sense because if you look at the jobs that are being offered, for many of the jobs, you have to have a skill. You have to be a coder or a machine operator or a welder, or you have to have some bioscience background to be a tech. So if we had the

skills training, we would be able to fill these jobs, which is great for the companies and for the economy but also, again, a great opportunity for these young people.

In 2018, our economy added 223,000 jobs per month on average. That is about twice what the pre-tax reform baseline estimate was from the Congressional Budget Office of only 107,000 jobs per month. So we more than doubled it. We have also had strong wage growth over the last 12 months. In fact, wage growth in the last year was higher than at any time in the last decade.

In Ohio, frankly, for a decade and a half we have had flat wages. Finally, we are now seeing wages going up. Last month, the average was about 3.4 percent growth for private sector workers and, by the way, it is more for blue-collar workers than for white-collar workers, supervisory workers, which is all good news.

We have a lot of good things going on in terms of increasing jobs, increasing wages, increasing benefits. Much of that is due to tax reform. I have gone all around our State and talked to folks at roundtable discussions. I have been to over 25 businesses to talk specifically: What did you do with the tax savings? Every one of them has a great story, but with all these pro-growth policies kicking in, the thing I am hearing now is: Yes, the tax reform helped us. The regulatory relief is a good idea, but we need workers, we need people, and we need them to have the skills that go with the jobs we have. This mismatch between the skills that are out there and these jobs, that skills gap is the thing we need to close.

There are lots of ways to do that. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be middle-skill jobs that require education beyond high school but not a 4-year degree. If you have a career in technical, with opportunities in high school, and then when you get out of high school, you have a certificate or you can get into a course where you can learn how to do one of these skills—although you are not getting an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree, you are getting a certificate, often a stackable certificate that can lead to a degree later—that is what is going to be needed.

In its most recent skills gap study, Deloitte and The Manufacturing Institute highlighted the fact that there are so many jobs out there that need these skills. They estimate there are about 2.4 million positions likely to be unfilled between 2018 and 2028. The economic impact of not having these jobs filled is about a \$2.5 trillion hit to our economy. This is why all of this is so important.

About 6 years ago, we started the Career and Technical Education Caucus in the Senate. At first, there were two of us, Senator Kaine from Virginia and myself. Now we have 27 Senators on the CTE Caucus. Why? Because Members are hearing back home about this,

which has been good to raise awareness for career and technical education. It has been helpful for us to put together some bipartisan legislation that helps to promote career and technical education.

Last year, in the Perkins bill, for instance, Senator KAINE and I got legislation in that helps to improve the quality of CT programs all around the country, ensuring again that college credit can be offered, helping to hold up programs to make sure young people and their parents know about this opportunity.

Just a couple weeks ago, Senator KAINE and I reintroduced legislation called Jumpstart Our Businesses by Supporting Students Act. The acronym is the JOBS Act. The JOBS Act is something we introduced in the last couple of Congresses, but I really feel its time has come. I feel it is an opportunity right now for us to move forward with the JOBS Act. One, we are hearing from all around the country the need for this, but, second, we have the likelihood of a higher education bill moving this year, which would be the perfect place to put the JOBS Act.

It is a commonsense solution to help solve the skills gap problem we are talking about. It says, with regard to Pell grants—which is for low-income students—instead of just making them available for community colleges or 4-year colleges or universities or for longer term courses, why not allow Pell grants to be used for shorter term training programs? That is what is needed right now.

I think this is a fairness issue. When I talk to students, as I did this morning here in Washington, as I do back in the State of Ohio, what they tell me is: ROB, I don't have the money to get a driver's license and go through that process, much less to get a certificate to become a welder or to become a coder or to become a tech in a hospital setting. The government will give me a Pell grant to go to a junior college or a community college or a university, but I can't get a Pell grant to help me get the training I need to actually get out there and get a job that I know is right there, ready, good pay, good benefits.

To me, that shows how our system is not working with regard to the modern economy and the needs we have right now, and it is not fair to those students. I think we ought to allow students to use Pell grants for shorter term training programs of less than 15 weeks. I also think it is a matter of efficiency of the Pell grant and the taxpayer.

Unfortunately, most people who take a Pell who go to a college don't graduate. There are lots of reasons for that. I think the main reason is because many of them have to drop out because they have to work, but, in the meantime, they don't have the degree. So they have the Pell, but they don't get the degree, not even a certificate; whereas, in these short-term training

programs, a 15-week training program—trust me, if somebody starts off in one of these training programs, it is much more likely they will end up getting the certificate. They can see just around the corner where the job is. In a sense, the certificate is the ticket to that job, and it is a shorter term prospect. I think it is a very efficient use of the Pell grant, and we should expand the Pell grant, not take it away from colleges and universities—not at all. Pell is an incredibly important program, but let's allow it to be used for short training programs.

I was at the CT Program in Akron, OH, recently. I also went to Stark State Community College. They have a new campus. We had a roundtable on workforce development. We had a lot of local businesses there talking about how great these programs have been for them. We had students there. The chamber of commerce was there. Mayor Dan Horrigan of Akron and Summit County executive Ilene Shapiro were there. I heard from students in high school and in community college who were already working for some of the local employers, businesses like the K Company, an HVAC company based in Akron. They work with Stark State; they work with local high schools; and they get young people on the right educational track to be able to work in the HVAC field where there are plenty of jobs right now. If you are an HVAC tech, you can get a job. It has been a great example of where they are helping the economy, they are helping a particular business, and they are really helping students to get a great job.

Stark State president Dr. Para Jones is very innovative, working with our high schools and working with the business community, trying to ensure we are all working together on this. Dr. Jones, the employers who were around the table, the educators who were around the table, and the students who were around that table—all of them—were really excited about the JOBS Act. They know it is going to work. They know this will help them deal with exactly the problems they are seeing in the local community.

Last week, I also toured a company in Hubbard, OH, Warren Fabricating and Machining. As always happens, I heard about the need for skilled workers. It is a great example of a company taking full advantage of the tax reform and tax cuts. They bought a beautiful, new machine that is incredibly important for their effectiveness as a company to be able to compete with China and others. They have also been able to raise people's salaries and increase the benefits with their tax savings, but their issue now is getting the workforce. They want to operate at full capacity, but they can't find the people. They have openings right now.

I also visited an advanced manufacturer called Rhinestahl Corporation in Mason, right outside of Cincinnati. They manufacture high-precision parts

for the aerospace and defense industry. Other employers were there, as well as Butler Tech, which is a local CTE program which has done really incredible, innovative work.

There, I had the opportunity to meet with a lot of students. One of them was a high school student named Jake. He is a chemical operator at a nearby manufacturer called Pilot. He is a veteran who has completed his certificate training, and his employer is now paying for him to continue his education and get a degree while working for them. Connor was there, a high school student who is running machines and learning advanced manufacturing while working at a place called RB Tool. Tomez is a 19-year-old who went to the program and is now in charge of calibration and making sure precision tools are up to speed at this company, Rhinestahl.

The teacher of all these students, a guy named Dave Fox, was there. He said his last class of 28 graduates had a combined total of more than 100 job offers. Think about this. These young people going through these certificate programs, 28 young people, had more than 100 job offers. These are good job offers. We are talking about \$40,000, \$50,000 a year, jobs that pay \$18 to \$20 an hour and good benefits, and a lot of employers will pay for them to continue their education, should they choose to do so.

Last week, President Trump came to the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in Lima, OH. This is an incredible manufacturing facility that does something unique in America, which is they build tanks. The kind of welding they have to be trained on is incredibly sophisticated and difficult to do. The kind of machine work they have to do is really difficult. Cutting the tanks' steel is an incredibly difficult task, plus some other alloys they use to protect our troops in the field. They need to hire about 400 additional workers in the next year or so, partly because, with the defense buildup, we are putting more money into the plant. I am very pleased to say President Trump in his budget put more funding into the Lima plant this year, but they need workers, and they need help training people. They need skilled welders, machinists, assembly workers, and various types of engineers.

These are good-paying jobs and great opportunities for young people. Whether they are coming up through the ranks in high school or whether they are midcareer changing jobs, it would be great for us to help them get the people they need, and the JOBS Act, they all say, would be exactly what they need to help to do that.

At a roundtable discussion at Staub Manufacturing in Dayton recently, the CEO of the company told me he believes welders coming out of high school will be better off financially than many attorneys or doctors.

I asked him what he meant by that. He pointed out that while an attorney

or another professional might make more coming right out of school, by the time they get out of school—law school, as an example—and get out of debt and start investing, the welder is well on his or her way to building a significant nest egg.

It is true. When you think about it, a welder makes, let's say, \$50,000 a year starting at age 18. Let's say there is no student debt because, again, through the certificate program and through a Pell—if we get the JOBS Act passed, in particular—this person is able to do so without any student debt. Using an online calculator and assuming about 8 percent growth, if that individual sets aside 10 percent of his or her income toward retirement, from the age of 18 up to 67—and this assumes a person gets no raise at all, which of course is not going to happen. A person is going to have a higher salary over time as the person gets more seniority, but assuming no raise, \$50,000 a year: \$2.8 million in retirement savings at age 67. That is a nice nest egg to be able to live comfortably in retirement with peace of mind.

Compare that to an attorney, let's say, making \$100,000 a year in a big law firm, starts investing at least at 30 years old, after they get through school and paying off their debt. It may be later, but let's say 30 to be conservative. If that person sets aside 10 percent of his or her income: \$2.2 million by age 67. So even though the attorney had a higher salary and was investing twice as much each month, the welder making \$50,000 a year is going to be better off.

Part of this is getting people into these jobs and getting them into jobs when they are young, where they can begin to make investments in their retirement but also make investments in a car, buy the house, start putting money aside for their kids' education, just to have the peace of mind that comes with knowing you are going to have this profession and this opportunity to get ahead early in life.

I am hoping we can get the JOBS Act passed. It would help provide so many people—particularly young people—these opportunities. If we can shift the paradigm, stop this notion of thinking that everybody who is going through high school needs to go to a 4-year college or university right away and instead think about, how do you ensure that this young person can have an opportunity to get ahead in life, learn a skill where there is an immediate need, and actually help our economy? Because our biggest challenge right now, as I see it—not just in the manufacturing sector, where it is particularly obvious, but across the board, in bioscience, certainly in moving, transportation, truckdriving, and other professions, the biggest challenge we have right now is workforce. This would do both.

The JOBS Act has been endorsed by the National Skills Coalition, the Association for Career and Technical Edu-

cation, the Association of Community Colleges and Trustees—I know community colleges have put this highest on their list—and other groups.

I am also pleased to say, again, it is in the budget. President Trump puts together a budget every year. This year's budget actually has our JOBS Act included in it. It is one that is totally bipartisan.

Senator KAINE from Virginia and I have been the coauthors of this legislation over the years. We continue to work closely together on this. We have 10 cosponsors already, having just introduced this a couple weeks ago. It is a bipartisan group, mixed, Republicans and Democrats. We also have a lot of outside stakeholders supporting it, and, again, it is now in the President's budget.

The reason we are getting all this support is it works. It works. It will cover programs that, at a minimum, require 150 hours and 8 weeks to complete. There are some alternative programs that limit them by requiring them to be 320 hours. I will tell you our community colleges tell me none of their short-term training programs would qualify for that higher number of hours—programs like welding, precision machining, electrical trades. All those programs would fit into the JOBS Act but not into some of the alternatives that are being discussed.

We need the JOBS Act now, and we think there is a great vehicle for it—which is the Higher Education Act—this year. A big fan of career and technical education is the chairman of that committee, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER. He understands the need for us to provide the kind of skills training needed to fill the jobs that are out there that companies are desperate to fill. He sees this in his own State of Tennessee, where he has a lot of manufacturing jobs, including auto manufacturers that are looking for more skilled workers every day.

As we work to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, my hope is colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in ensuring that the JOBS Act is included in that. Let's be sure that we deal with the fairness issue here and that we have a sense of understanding about our economy and what the needs are right now.

A lot of that need is in skills and the kind of skills that the JOBS Act would provide. It just makes too much sense.

If we make career and technical education a priority and if we enact the JOBS Act I discussed today, we are going to help tens of thousands of our young people be able to achieve their dreams, whatever they are, and to have better opportunities. Just as important, we are going to be able to help our economy—help to ensure that here in the United States we have a growing economy where we have better tax policy, better regulation policy, and also, for the workers, ensure that the companies don't pick up and move because they don't have the workforce. Compa-

nies tell me in Ohio: You know, ROB, we could do what we are doing here in other places, and not just Indiana, which is next to Ohio, but maybe India.

We don't want that. We want to have the workforce that is needed to be able to keep these good jobs and keep these companies here in this country, to ensure that we can keep moving in a positive direction, and, again, to ensure that Ohioans can develop the skills they need to grow in the career of their choice and to fulfill their potential in life.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CHILDCARE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that I know is on the minds of many, many Americans, especially folks who are in the middle class or who are struggling to get to the middle class, and that is the issue of childcare.

I think most of us in this Chamber agree that all children born in this country have a light inside of them. For some children, that light will shine very brightly without a lot of help as they have innate abilities or they have circumstances they are born into for which they don't need a lot of help from public policy or from programs or from legislation. Yet there are a lot of children who have a light inside of them that can burn to the full measure of its potential if we do our job. When I say "our job," I mean the job of elected officials. I think it is the job of every elected official at every level of government and of those who work with them to do everything they can to make sure that the light inside of every child burns as brightly as at least the full measure of his or her potential.

We know, just by way of one example in the context of childcare, that affordable, high-quality childcare enables parents to work so they can support their families. Also, quality, affordable healthcare helps give children the early learning experiences they need to develop and succeed in school. When children learn more and it is early in life, they will earn more much later in their lives. That connection between learning and earning isn't just a rhyme; all the research shows that there is a direct connection. When that child learns at a younger age because of early education and quality childcare and so many other strategies, we are all better off. Not only is that child better off in his or her family, but we are all better off. We will have a higher skilled workforce; we will have a more productive workforce; and we will grow and be able to out-compete any country in the world if we invest in early learning.

Unfortunately, we know the challenges. The cost of childcare has increased by 25 percent in just the last decade, which has created significant

financial strains for those same middle-class families. According to data from Child Care Aware, which is in my home Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the average cost of full-time, center-based childcare is about \$11,560 for an infant and about \$8,712 for a 4-year-old. This is about 12 percent of a married couple's annual income in Pennsylvania, and it is nearly 46 percent of a single parent's annual income—46 percent. That is not sustainable. That is not a number that anyone should be satisfied with. Frankly, I am not sure that 12 percent of the annual income for a two-parent family is sustainable. We should get that number into the single digits. The bill I will talk about in a moment seeks to do that.

Just this past week, when we were all back in our States and were able to travel for the better part of a week, I had the chance to get to six childcare centers in cities across Pennsylvania, and I spoke to more than 25 families who shared their stories about their struggles. The struggle, of course, in this case, was the struggle to afford high-quality childcare.

I was in Philadelphia, Pottstown, Gettysburg, Verona, Erie, and Reading. If you had charted those cities on a map, you would have literally gone from the furthest corner of the southeastern part of our State, which is Philadelphia, to the most remote, northwestern corner of the State, in Erie. I went to communities below Erie and to the northeast as well—so literally every corner of the State. Across those communities, we heard a lot of the same challenges, a lot of similar stories.

For example, one single mom in Philadelphia told us recently what, I think, is emblematic of what is happening in a lot of communities:

I struggle every day to make ends meet. I am not eligible for any public assistance, so I juggle my bills just to make ends meet. I have to become very creative in making sure that I pay my mortgage, utilities, and childcare.

Then she goes on from there to write:

Then I decide if I can pay for anything in addition to that, such as healthcare, food, necessities for my child or my home. I knew I would not be able to afford childcare. Luckily, I have the support of loved ones in my life who support me when I fall short. Most do not have this.

Then this single mother goes on to write the following:

All of my family and friends struggle to pay for childcare because we are middle class individuals who make too much money to qualify for childcare assistance or any other programs, but we also don't make enough money to actually afford childcare out of pocket. Oftentimes, we have to choose a childcare based off of a price and not based off of the quality of education they will provide our children at the childcare facility.

Notice what she wrote at the end there. She is making a decision about the childcare she will provide for her children based off only one consideration—the price. It is not based on the quality.

Therein lies the problem that we have to try to solve. If we have millions and millions of families—middle class or who are struggling to get to the middle class—making childcare determinations based solely on the cost, we will all be in trouble over time. That is not what we should be doing. It doesn't mean the price will not be a challenge for so many, and it doesn't mean the price will be irrelevant, but if they are not able to find quality childcare that is affordable, that child will be worse off over time; that community will be; and the rest of us will be. We will not have the high-skilled workforce that we need. We will not be able to compete and win the battle across the world that we need to win, and that is the battle to create the highest skilled workforce in the world and to maintain that advantage.

When I was in Gettysburg this past week, I heard from two parents who had adopted two children, one of whom has significant medical issues and has been in and out of the hospital. They have struggled to find a childcare center that is able to handle the behavioral and developmental needs of their children. The father, who is a small business owner, has had to make adjustments to his work schedule and sell off some of his business assets to make ends meet. He has had to choose between paying for his own health insurance or that of his children. He has had to give up his own insurance to ensure there will never be a lapse in coverage for his children. He makes too much money to qualify for childcare subsidies but lives with constant anxiety over his financial situation.

Part of his testimony and that of his wife was very emotional because of the stress and the pressure on that family—the stress and pressure of the healthcare itself and also of the stress and pressure because of the cost of childcare.

I was grateful he was willing to share his story. In a public setting, it is not easy to talk about the burdens that you live with every day in order to push a policy forward so as to make life better for another family. Like a lot of these parents, I was grateful they were willing to help us better understand those struggles so that we could better propose good policy.

We also heard from a single mom who works long hours as she tries to advance and work her way up the corporate ladder. Prior to her current circumstance, she was waitressing and barely making \$11,000 a year. When she was hardly making any income, she was able to make ends meet with the assistance of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and CCIS, which is our State's childcare program that helps families. Now she is in a different circumstance. She works full time—an achievement that she is quite proud of. She is no longer eligible, though, for these programs because her income has gone up.

The good news is her income went up, and she has a full-time job. The bad

news is that it knocks her out of eligibility. She must pay the full cost of childcare and be away from her children. She doesn't know what she will do during the summer as she will need to increase the time her children are in care, which will result in higher costs when her children are on summer break. So that is the dilemma she faces—working harder and getting a full-time job but then not being able to afford help. She needs help from us as well.

I spoke with a mother in Verona, PA, in Allegheny County, who has an 11-month-old child who is in childcare now. Though both she and her husband work full time, they struggle to afford care. They would like to grow their family, but, again, the cost of childcare is their main reason for not doing so. We know that childcare helps children grow and learn, that it helps parents work and provide for their families, and that it helps employers retain a productive workforce. Yet families across the country are unable to afford care. That is why it is so important that we increase Federal investments in early learning and childcare.

For example, in fiscal year 2018, the Childcare and Development Block Grant program was funded at \$5.27 billion here in Washington. That was an 83-percent increase—the largest single increase in the history of the program. In that same year—the last budget year, the last appropriations year—Head Start received a little more than \$9.8 billion, and that was \$610 million more than the program got in 2017.

Both of those were good results. It doesn't happen every day in Washington, we know. These historic, bipartisan investments were continued in the last fiscal year. So there was an increase in this last fiscal year. It was nowhere near the increase of the prior year, but there were extra dollars to sustain funding. These investments are already making an impact in States like Pennsylvania and across our country, but there is so much more unmet need and so much more work to be done. So it is good news on the block grants, but, of course, that is not the whole story on childcare.

I am pushing for both increased funding for the next fiscal year—the one we are working on now, 2020—as well as two bills that will make high-quality childcare accessible and affordable for low- and middle-income families. The first is the Childcare for Working Families Act, and the second is the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit Enhancement Act. I will discuss them in that order.

The Childcare for Working Families Act would first provide direct financial assistance to working parents to help pay for childcare and early learning to ensure that no parents would pay more than 7 percent of their household incomes for childcare if they earn less than 150 percent of the State's median income.

These numbers change between median household income and median

family income, but if you are just looking at the median household income in Pennsylvania, it is about \$57,000. If you do 150 percent of that, you will be into the eighties, roughly. We don't know where the line would be drawn for certain State by State, but if we can come up with a way to keep costs below 7 percent for folks who are in that income range—say, roughly, in the low eighties down—we can help these families do two things: go to work while providing childcare for their children that is quality childcare and also be able to afford it.

The second part of the bill—and it is, basically, three parts—will be universal access to high-quality preschool programs for 3- and 4-year-olds.

The third part would be to improve workforce compensation by ensuring that all childcare workers are paid a living wage and that early childhood educators are provided parity with elementary schoolteachers who have similar credentials and experience. So there are three parts to that bill—childcare help, early learning help with preschool, and paying the workforce more.

People in both parties say it all the time: We care about our children, and we care about our seniors. But sometimes the folks who provide care to both groups of Americans—those who provide care and early learning to children and those who provide skilled care in nursing homes and other settings to seniors—are among the lowest paid workers in our society. So we say we prioritize those Americans, and we don't lift them up with the kind of workforce that they sometimes need.

The second bill I will talk about—and then I will wrap up—I will soon reintroduce with Congressman DAVIS. It is a proposal to improve and expand an existing tax credit which we know as the child and dependent care tax credit, not to be confused with the child tax credit, the tax credit you may have eligibility for if you have a child. This one focuses on child care and dependent care.

This bill would help families pay for childcare expenses by doing the following: first, increasing the maximum amount of the credit from just over 1,000 bucks—about \$1,050—to \$3,000 per child, and it could go up as high as 6,000 if you have more than one child, making the full tax credit available to most working families with incomes up to \$120,000 a year.

Now, under the current law, that credit starts to lose its value once you hit only \$15,000 of income—not that high of an income level. By raising that number, you are going to get a lot more middle-class families that will benefit, as well as some trying to get to the middle class.

The third part of the bill would ensure that lower income families are better able to benefit from the credit by making it fully refundable.

You have this strange dynamic where folks are working and they have an in-

come, but the income is rather limited and the credit is not refundable. So they don't get anything back from that credit. So it isn't worth much to them in many cases.

The last part of the bill will retain the value over time by indexing the benefits of this child and dependent care tax credit and raise those thresholds based upon inflation.

In conclusion, I think it is pretty simple. All children deserve the chance to learn and succeed, regardless of where they are born or regardless of their family's income. That is why it is so important to make sure that all families have access to high-quality, affordable childcare and early learning. Together, these proposals will help to bring us closer to that reality and, I would argue, closer to meeting our obligation as elected officials at every level of government—this being the Federal level in the Congress, the Senate and the House, meeting our obligation to make sure that the light inside of every child burns to the full measure and shines to the full measure of its potential.

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. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week the Senate conveyor belt of President Trump's judicial nominees grinds on. So far, the President and the Senate leader have an unprecedented pace in confirming Federal judges, especially powerful Federal appellate judges. They seem to have no higher priority.

What is a little weird about this is that nearly 90 percent of Trump's appellate judges and both of his Supreme Court Justices are members of the so-called Federalist Society. On the Supreme Court, Kavanaugh, Gorsuch, Alito, and Thomas all are members. Now, that is a little weird.

What is really weird is that through this Federalist Society vehicle, big, special interests are picking Federal judges.

In effect, there are three Federalist Societies. The first one most lawyers know from law school. It is, for the most part, a debating society made up of like-minded aspiring lawyers drawn to conservative ideas and judicial doctrine. They organize seminars and invite academics, judges, and attorneys to speak. That is terrific—no problem there.

The second Federalist Society is the parent organization of the campus debating society—a sort of highbrow think tank seeking to further conservative and libertarian judicial principles. It convenes fancy forums with

conservative legal luminaries, from Supreme Court Justices to big-name politicians, to renowned legal scholars. It issues newsletters and produces podcasts and policy recommendations. Through this, they hope to "reorder priorities within the legal system" and create a network of members "that extends to all levels of the legal community."

I disagree pretty strongly with the system of law they are trying impose, and their funding is suspiciously obscure, but this debate is a fine thing to have—so no objection there either.

Then there is the third Federalist Society. This one doesn't have much in common with the law school debating society, and it certainly doesn't operate like your run-of-the-mill Washington think tank. This Federalist Society is the nerve center for a complicated apparatus that does not care much about conservative principles like judicial restraint or originalism or textualism.

This Federalist Society is the vehicle for powerful, commercial, and industrial interests that seek not simply to "reorder" the judiciary but to acquire control of the judiciary to benefit their interests. This third Federalist Society understands the fundamental power of the Federal judiciary to rig the system in favor of its donor interests and, as the Kavanaugh confirmation so clearly illustrated, is willing to go to drastic lengths to secure that power.

I am here today to talk about that third Federalist Society.

The story of the third Federalist Society is partly the story of a man named Leonard Leo, the society's executive vice president.

Mr. Leo is now the most influential person shaping America's Federal judiciary. Don't be surprised if you are listening and you have never heard of him. He has never been elected. He is not accountable to any voter. Instead, he is the front man for interests that want to use the Federalist Society and its surrounding network of front groups and PR shops and think tanks to acquire control over our courts.

Renowned court watcher Jeffrey Toobin describes Mr. Leo as "Trump's subcontractor on the selection of Supreme Court Justices." More accurately, Mr. Leo is the subcontractor for a network of big corporate interests and front groups.

In the summer of 2016, it was Leo who delivered the list of potential nominees to fill the vacancy left by the death of Antonin Scalia and the blocking of Merrick Garland. It was Mr. Leo who was involved in the Trump transition, helping to conduct outreach to potential Supreme Court picks, including Neil Gorsuch.

Mr. Leo even orchestrated a \$1 million donation to Trump's inauguration.

The role of the Federalist Society has been confirmed by President Trump's own legal counsel, Don McGahn.

McGahn told a Federalist Society gathering in 2017:

Our opponents of judicial nominees frequently claim the President has outsourced his selection of judges. That is completely false. I have been a member of the Federalist Society since law school, still am, so, frankly, it seems like it's been in-sourced.

Ha-ha, so funny.

The Federalist Society does more than pick the judges. They prepare them. They study the prospective nominees and the Senators who will ask them questions. They gather murder boards for nominees to practice for confirmation hearings.

Mr. Leo is proud of this operation. During the confirmation hearing for Justice Neil Gorsuch, Leo told Toobin, with considerable satisfaction:

You know, the hearings matter so much less than they once did. We have the tools now to do all the research. We know everything they have written. We know what they've said. There are no surprises.

In the Judiciary Committee, we see the result over and over—meaningless committee hearings where nominees parrot empty words about applying law to fact and respecting precedent. Then, once confirmed and on the bench, those nominees deliver dependably for the partisan and corporate donors behind this Federalist Society operation.

It is bad enough that judicial selection has been outsourced—or in-sourced—to a partisan private entity. Worse is how nontransparent this all is. It is hard to find out who is behind it. It is a very nontransparent problem, but here is what we have been able to piece together. The evidence is that the Federalist Society is funded by massive, secret contributions from corporate rightwing groups that have big agendas before the courts.

In 2017 the Federalist Society took \$5.5 million via an entity called DonorsTrust. DonorsTrust has as its sole purpose to launder the identities of donors to other groups so that Americans don't know who the real backers are of the groups. It is an identity removal machine for big donors. Through the hard work of investigators, journalists, and researchers, we have learned that the Koch brothers are among the largest—if not the largest—contributors to DonorsTrust. The Federalist Society's total annual budget is about \$20 million. So this \$5.5 million in funding, laundered through DonorsTrust, provides more than a quarter of its entire budget.

Other shadowy corporate and rightwing organizations also donate millions to the Federalist Society. In 1 year, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, a rightwing trust, gave over \$3 million to the Federalist Society. Koch Industries, several other Koch-network foundations and trusts, and nearly a dozen wholly anonymous donors have given over \$100,000 each to the Federalist Society. Tax documents from 2014, uncovered by the New York Times, show a donation of more than \$2 million from the Mercer family, the secretive donors who helped start Breitbart News and bankrolled the Trump campaign.

How do we know that these groups have a big agenda before the courts? We know that because they also fund a fleet of front groups that file so-called amicus briefs before courts signaling what results the big donors want. The Kochs, the Bradleys, the Mercers, and their ilk spend millions to pursue an anti-regulation, anti-union, and anti-environment agenda, and they use the Federalist Society to stock the judiciary with judges who will rule their way.

The Federalist Society, as a 501(c)(3) organization, is supposed to stay out of politics. The Judicial Crisis Network is a 501(c)(4) organization which can, and does, get involved in politics. The Judicial Crisis Network is led by a disciple of Leonard Leo's, a former clerk for ultraconservative Justice Clarence Thomas. The Judicial Crisis Network has been described in conservative circles as "Leonard Leo's PR organization—nothing more and nothing less." When it comes time to muscle a judicial nominee through Senate confirmation, the Judicial Crisis Network swings into action. Media campaigns, attack ads, and big spending—that is the Judicial Crisis Network's world.

Like its Federalist Society partner, the Judicial Crisis Network gets massive sums of dark money, and it spends massively too. It spent \$7 million on campaigns to block Merrick Garland from getting a hearing on his nomination to the Supreme Court, and it spent \$10 million to support the nomination—blockade enabled—of Neil Gorsuch—and \$7 million and \$10 million—and it received one anonymous donation of \$17.9 million. One donor gave \$17.9 million to this operation to influence our judiciary. I will say that we need to know who that donor was. Because we are in the minority, we are going to be spurned and rejected if we try to get that information. On the House side, where they have the power of subpoena, we need to pursue that. It ought to be public information when one donor can spend nearly \$18 million to influence the selection of a U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

Judicial Crisis Network then got \$23 million from something called the Wellspring Committee. You will have to forgive some of this because it is very obscure. These are peculiar groups that aren't involved in any ordinary business or regular activity. The Wellspring Committee is a Virginia-based entity with ties to—you guessed it—Leonard Leo, and the Judicial Crisis Network then promised to spend as much on the Kavanaugh nomination as they had for Gorsuch.

Add to this mix of peculiarly funded and obscure organizations the BH Group, a shell corporation that gave \$1 million to Donald Trump's inaugural. The BH Group received over \$1 million in something called consulting fees in 2017 from something else called the Judicial Education Project. Who is Judicial Education Project? The Judicial Education Project is—guess what—the

501(c)(3) side of the Judicial Crisis Network. Why does a shell corporation give money to the Trump inaugural and also serve as a consultant to a legal organization fighting for the confirmation of specific Justices? What consulting did they do? Was there any consulting done at all? Great questions. Leonard Leo probably knows the answer. In 2018, he told the Federal Elections Commission that the BH Group was his employer.

While this apparatus may be complex and difficult to track, its goal is simple. Don McGahn explained it succinctly: "Regulatory reform and judicial selection are . . . deeply connected." Translated, that means that the Federalist Society's goal is to pack the judiciary through judicial selection with judges who will deliver what is called regulatory reform, an extreme anti-regulation, anti-union, anti-environment agenda for those corporatist Federalist Society funders.

Let me give you two examples.

The Senate just confirmed Neomi Rao to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. Rao comes right out of the deep bog of special interest dark money. Her bio appears on the Federalist Society website, along with the list of 26 times she has been featured at Federalist Society events—26 auditions, as one might describe them.

This is a person confirmed for the DC Court of Appeals who has never been a judge. She has never even tried a case. What has she done? She served as the Trump administration's point person for tearing down Federal regulations as head of the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Among her greatest hits was taking one of Scott Pruitt's proposed regulatory rollbacks for the climate-change driving-gas methane from the oil and gas industry and tipping that regulation even further in favor of fossil fuel polluters. Out-Pruitting Scott Pruitt for the fossil fuel industry is hard to do. That may have been another audition for the court.

Rao also funded the so-called Center for the Study of the Administrative State at George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School, which is devoted to conjuring ways to roll back as many regulations affecting these corporations as possible and is funded by these same secretive groups.

I asked Ms. Rao about the funders of her center at the Scalia Law School. She claimed in her answers—and, by the way, I will add that these were questions for the record—written questions that she had time to consider, review, and respond to. This was not a surprise attack of an unprepared witness at a hearing. She had weeks to answer. She claimed in her answers that, to the best of her knowledge, her organization had not received any money from the Federalist Society, from Koch Family Foundations, or from anonymous funders.

Well, that was simply not true. A Virginia open records request revealed

that an anonymous donor and the Charles Koch Foundation donated \$30 million earmarked specially for her organization. Guess whose interests she has been conveyed onto the DC Circuit Court of Appeals to protect.

Now consider the case of *Kisor v. Wilkie*, a case currently before the Supreme Court. It hasn't gotten much attention. On its face, it is about an obscure administrative law doctrine, but *Kisor* has been described as a "stalking horse for much larger game"—whether administrative agencies can continue to have the independence they need to regulate in the public interests. At stake could be the power of the EPA to protect our air and water, of the Department of Labor to continue to protect workers in the workplace, and of the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect investors against financial fraud.

Many corporations hate regulation. The problem is regulations are pretty popular. Politicians may talk about cutting redtape, but their constituents really like clean air and clean water. They want safe workplaces and the peace of mind that their investments are sound.

That is where judges like Neomi Rao and cases like *Kisor* come in. For decades we have operated in a system where Congress passes laws and administrative Agencies fill in the details and implement those laws using their regulatory power and their time, patience, and expertise to deal with complex problems. It has worked extremely well. Cases like *Kisor*, however, slowly chip away at that system, shifting more and more power from expert regulatory agencies to courts and to courts filled with more and more judges like Neomi Rao.

The Daily Beast influence reporter Jay Michaelson wrote:

Sometimes thought of as a legal association, the Federalist Society is actually a large right-wing network that grooms conservative law students still in law school (sponsoring everything from free burrito lunches to conferences, speakers, and journals), links them together, mentors them, finds them jobs, and eventually places them in courts and in government.

Within this Federalist Society is this operation I have described, funded by dark money and designed to remake our judiciary on behalf of a distinct group of very wealthy and powerful, anonymous funders. Add to that the dark money funding the so-called Judicial Crisis Network. Add to that the dark money funding the amicus briefs telling these judges what to do. Then look at the outcomes when the Federalist Society-selected appointees get a majority on the court. It is not a pretty sight.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President. I wish to honor the distinguished career of Bruce Benson, the outgoing president of the University of Colorado. Through his tenacity and hard work, Bruce made the university and the State of Colorado a better place. CU is one of the Nation's great universities, and Bruce's contributions, including the record-breaking growth in research funding, have made it a source of statewide pride.

Bruce would admit that he was originally reluctant to take the job and with good reason: He had already enjoyed a long and fruitful career in politics, philanthropy, and business. However, those experiences and relationships were exactly what made Bruce so effective. As only he could, Bruce was able to use these experiences to further CU's standing as one the Nation's prominent public universities and research institutions.

Under Bruce's leadership, the university's research funding reached record levels, surpassing \$1 billion during the last academic year. This money allowed for critical research in biotechnology, healthcare, energy, and aerospace and a number of other fields. Additionally, CU had its 6 best fundraising years during his time at the helm, including a record \$440.4 million between 2017 and 2018. All the while, Bruce guided efforts to implement operational efficiencies, cut bureaucracy, and improve business practices at the university. Successes like these solidify Bruce's legacy and his commitment to the future of Colorado. It is worth noting that he is retiring as the longest serving CU president in more than half a century.

Bruce has always been a tireless champion for Colorado's young people. He worked to make the DPS Foundation into the great civic organization it is today. He has also done extraordinary work at Children's Hospital Colorado.

Bruce has consistently worked to change the lives of children and students across the State of Colorado, from the youngest of kids to college graduates. I know I speak on behalf of all of Colorado when I say that we are all grateful for his service.●

RECOGNIZING TREASURE COUNTY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of congratulating Treasure County for 100 years of

as one of Montana's 56 counties.

Although one of the least populous counties in Montana, Treasure boasts many historic buildings that incorporate the rich history of Big Sky Country from the Yucca Theater with its beautiful Spanish mission style architecture that provided hope and entertainment during the Great Depression, to the 1950s contemporary style courthouse in Hysham. With a population less than a thousand, Treasure County's rich lands provide a bounty for ranchers and farmers alike.

Treasure County is an important part of Montana's cherished history and remains a vital part of our State's landscape. I congratulate the folks down in Treasure County on celebrating 100 years of excellence in local government.●

REMEMBERING SAMYA STUMO

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Samya Stumo, a University of Massachusetts Amherst graduate and resident of Sheffield, MA, was tragically killed aboard Ethiopian Airlines flight 302. Samya, just 24 years old, was a champion of social justice, with a goal of revolutionizing global health. Her undergraduate fieldwork in Peru challenged unjust social services; her master's work in Europe gave a voice to marginalized patient groups living with viral hepatitis; and, most recently, she was working to disrupt the status quo in global health systems to help countries achieve universal healthcare coverage. She strove for all people and patients to be treated as human beings, particularly in context of their culture, family, and individuality. She was a beacon of hope for Massachusetts, the Nation, and all of the lives she has touched.●

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI'S BICENTENNIAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION WEEK

• Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the University of Cincinnati on their bicentennial celebration honoring 200 years of extraordinary research.

In January of 1819, two colleges were chartered by the state of Ohio: the Medical College of Ohio and Cincinnati College. Both are predecessors to today's University of Cincinnati. The opening enrollment of Cincinnati College was roughly 70 students. Today, the University of Cincinnati has an enrollment of nearly 46,000 students, making it one of the largest universities in the Nation. UC stands as a Carnegie Research 1 university, with a living alumni base of more than 300,000; a world-acclaimed campus and top programs in music, health, design, science, and more; plus a \$4.2 billion economic impact in its tristate region of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana.

Next week, UC will be celebrating its Bicentennial Research and Innovation Week. The week will be honoring UC's

past 200 years of extraordinary research by showcasing the impactful, imaginative, and innovative work researchers at UC are doing today. Examples of the research and innovation that will be highlighted during the week include demonstrations of connected autonomous vehicles, presentations on infrastructure to share data in smart secure cities, pitches by student-inventors and entrepreneurs, discussions on partnerships needed for the goal of ending the opioid epidemic, highlights from experts in bioinformatics, neuroscience, and engineering at the University of Cincinnati and its affiliated institutions and how they are pushing the boundaries of clinical and data sciences, and more.

UC is proud of the broad societal impacts the work of our researchers have had on Cincinnati, the region, and beyond. Congratulations to the University of Cincinnati for 200 years of research and innovation excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. RONNIE BOOTH

● Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, today I would like to celebrate the service and achievements of Dr. Ronnie Booth of Anderson, SC, as he approaches his retirement from his position as president of the Tri-County Technical College. Dr. Booth, named the third president of TCTC in 2003, has spent the last 16 years helping to advance the college and community to its current level of unprecedented success.

Under Dr. Booth's leadership, Tri-County Technical College launched three community campuses, three workforce training centers, and economic development, technology and student success centers among different campuses. He also created and established the Bridge to Clemson and Connect to College Programs, which both help to create pathways for students of all backgrounds to achieve their goals. Other notable achievements during his tenure include the Technical Career Pathways Program, Michelin Manufacturing Scholars Program, and I-BEST Manufacturing Pathway Program.

Just this past year, Tri-County Technical College earned the top ranking in student success, transfer, and graduation among the 16 colleges in the SC Technical College System and also ranked in the top 1 percent nationally for successful transfers to 4-year colleges and universities. Community support and partnerships have also grown under Dr. Booth's leadership, truly uniting the Tri-County area for the better.

Dr. Booth has also been an active and engaged citizen, being a member of multiple professional associations, civic groups, and State and national boards. His commitment to improving the lives of his students, school, and community cannot be understated, and he has surely made a resoundingly positive impact on countless students, faculty, staff, and community mem-

bers. His leadership will not be soon forgotten, and I congratulate him on his successes, as well as wish him good fortune, on this next chapter in his life.●

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL B. OLDEN

● Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate of the accomplishments of a fellow Mississippian, Mr. Samuel B. Olden of Yazoo City, on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

Mr. Olden is from Yazoo City, the gateway to the Mississippi Delta, where he was born in 1919, to a family of Mississippi planters. Throughout his youth, he read widely in the B.S. Ricks Memorial Library, the oldest privately funded public library in the State, which greatly contributed to his personal development and admission into the University of Mississippi in Oxford. There, he received a B.A. and M.A., reportedly conversed with Nobel Prize winning author William Faulkner, and was ultimately recruited to Washington, DC, to serve at the Department of State. Prior to American involvement in World War II, Mr. Olden was sent abroad as the Vice Consul at our embassy in Quito, Ecuador, from 1941 to 1943. Upon his return, Mr. Olden enlisted in the U.S. Navy, serving from 1943-46 at posts ranging from Shanghai, China, to Paris, France.

After the war, Mr. Olden transited the north Atlantic on a Liberty ship. A fellow naval officer noted Mr. Olden's fortitude during this stormy passage. While tending to his ailing father back in Mississippi, he received a letter from Washington asking him to consider defending our Nation's freedom, in a third, essential way. Mr. Olden returned to the District of Columbia, where he was invited to join the newly formed Central Intelligence Group. Commencing in 1947, Mr. Olden spent 2 years in the group's Washington office, followed by 3 years in Vienna, Austria, where he defended freedom and democracy against Communist aggression.

Following a decade in public service, Mr. Olden entered the private sector, where he employed his experience abroad for Mobil Oil. From 1952-1957, he was posted in East and West Nigeria, British and French Cameroon, The Congo, Chad, and Gabon. He joined Mobil's government relations department in 1957 and returned to New York. There, he attained Observer status at the United Nations and strode the halls with Adlai Stevenson and Eleanor Roosevelt. Later, he went abroad once more to serve as general manager of Mobil's affiliates in Tunisia, Algeria, Peru, and Spain.

By 1974, Mr. Olden was fluent in English, French, German, and Spanish. He had connections around the world. And where did he go? He chose to retire to the finest place that he had ever lived: Yazoo City. There, he owned and operated a cattle ranch for 15 years, while continuing to pursue his passion

for the study of history. He was twice a board member and was elected president of the Mississippi Historical Society, served 15 years on the State Committee for the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi, and founded the Yazoo Historical Society's remarkable museum, housed in the same Triangle Center building where he had attended elementary school. Even in his 90s, he established and helped to fund the Yazoo Memorial Literary Walkway, which stretches between the Triangle Center and the B.S. Ricks Library. The walkway memorializes more than 100 Yazooan authors that include former U.S. House Minority Leader and U.S. Senator John Sharp Williams, literary critic and editor Henry Herschel Brickell, Governor Haley Reeves Barbour, beloved writers Willie Morris, Teresa Nicholas, Ruth Williams, John Langston, and Caroline Langston Jarboe, and educator Henry Mitchell Brickell. His large collection of pre-Columbian ceramics is now on display in the Mississippi Museum of Art in Jackson and is the focus of Yumi Park's book "Mirrors of Clay."

This remarkable man has served his Nation as a diplomat, military officer, and emissary, during wars hot and cold. He served the world in the energy industry as a global businessman of distinction. He returned to his hometown and has continued to serve his State, his university, and his community as a historian, educator, and philanthropist even into the tenth decade of his life. His friends across the Nation and around the world celebrate with him today.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 297. An act to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1388. An act to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 252. An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of Colonel in the regular Army.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1388. An act to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 297. An act to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 27, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 252. An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-703. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-704. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-705. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mandipropamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9987-25-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-706. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department

of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Scrapie in Sheep and Goats" (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0127) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-707. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Milk Marketing Orders - Amending the Class 1 Skim Milk Price Formula" ((7 CFR Part 1000) (Docket No. AMS-DA-18-0096)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-708. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pecans Grown in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas; Revision of Reporting Requirements" ((7 CFR Part 986) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0019; SC18-986-1 FR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-709. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fresh Fruits, Vegetables and Other Products Inspection, Certification and Standards and Processed Fruits and Vegetables, Processed Products Thereof, and Certain Other Processed Food Products; Removal of Power of Attorney and Other Administrative Changes" ((7 CFR Parts 51 and 52) (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0106)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Budget Blueprint of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2020 received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations.

EC-711. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2018 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the three national security laboratory directors, and the Commander, United States Strategic Command (OSS-2019-0274); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-712. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense support activities provided under the authority of Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004 during fiscal year 2018 (OSS-2019-0206); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-713. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report that includes a fuel budget justification for the upcoming fiscal year, an appendix of all Department of Defense operational energy initiatives, the Joint Staff's progress in implementing the energy Key Performance Parameter, and certification of the Presi-

dent's Budget as adequate for the implementation of the Department's Operational Energy Strategy; to the Committees on Armed Services; and Appropriations.

EC-714. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Syria effective March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-715. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Iraq effective March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-716. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-717. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of six (6) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-718. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eleven (11) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-719. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Program to Encourage Public and Community Service (PACS)" (RIN0790-AK44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order with respect to transnational criminal organizations that takes additional steps to deal with the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-721. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-722. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-723. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-724. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-725. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-726. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-727. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-728. A communication from the Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for the Bank's Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Performance Plan and Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Performance Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-729. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2019 annual report relative to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-730. A communication from the Program Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" (RIN1557-AD84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-731. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN2590-AB01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-732. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities" (RIN2590-AB02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-733. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to OFAC Regulations to Incorporate the List of Foreign Financial Institutions Subject to Correspondent Account or Payable-Through Account Sanctions (CAPTA List)" (31 CFR Parts 561 and 566) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-734. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Freedom of Information Act Regulations" (RIN1505-AC35) (31 CFR Part 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-735. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Capital Plan Rule" (RIN7100-AF41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-736. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FAST Act Modernization and Simplification of Regulation S-K" (RIN3235-AM00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-737. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustments of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2019" (RIN2501-AD90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-738. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Amended Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Power Act" (RIN1902-AF56) (Docket No. RM19-4-000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-739. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf - Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN1014-AA42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-740. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the New Soo Locks Project, Sault Ste. Marie, Chippewa County, MI; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-741. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Attainment Plan for Indianapolis and Terre Haute SO₂ Nonattainment Areas" (FRL No. 9991-10-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-742. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Plumas County; Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9990-34-Region 9) received during adjournment of the

Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-743. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California" (FRL No. 9990-13-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-744. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methylene Chloride; Regulation of Paint and Coating Removal for Consumer Use Under TSCA Section 6(a)" (FRL No. 9989-29-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-745. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units; Technical Amendments" (FRL No. 9991-32-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-746. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Minor Sources Infrastructure Requirement for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide NAAQS" (FRL No. 9991-40-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-747. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2019 Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-748. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2019 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-749. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Under Section 851 Relating to Investments in Stock and Securities" (RIN1545-BN55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-750. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Distributions of Stocks and Securities of a Controlled Corporation" (Rev. Rul. 2019-09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-751. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2019 Calendar Year

Resident Population Figures” (Notice 2019–19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-752. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Amendments to the Low-Income Housing Credit Compliance-Monitoring Regulations” (RIN1545-BL39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-753. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Amendments to the Low-Income Housing Credit Utility Allowance Regulations” (RIN1545-BM28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-754. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Qualified Business Income Deduction” (RIN1545-BO71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-755. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of .50 caliber machine guns to Oman for the Royal Oman Guard in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-053); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-756. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of 5.56mm semi-automatic assault rifles to Oman for the Omani Ministry of Defense in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-087); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-757. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom and Israel to support the development, integration, and support for F-135 propulsion system Organizational Level (O-Level) maintenance field training, and services for the operation and sustainment of the F-35 Lightning II air systems operated by the Ministry of Defense in Israel in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-057); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-758. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment and the export of technical data and defense services, to Israel and Germany to support the manufacture of firearm components, parts, accessories, barrels, blank receivers, and breech mechanisms in

the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-759. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0013 - 2019-0020); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-760. A communication from the Chairman, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, “Thirteenth Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-761. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits” (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-762. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption; Extension of Compliance Dates for Subpart E” ((21 CFR Part 112) (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0921)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-763. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Guidance for the Standard Borrower Defense to Repayment Applications; Institutions’ Notifications of Financial Responsibility Events, Actions, and Conditions; Implementation of the Class Action Bans and Predispute Arbitration Agreements Provisions; the Repayment Rate and Financial Protection Disclosures Provisions of the 2016 Borrower Defense to Repayment Regulations” (RIN1840-AD19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-764. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program” (RIN1840-AD19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-765. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act of 1965, as Amended by every Student Succeeds Act: Providing Equitable Services to Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Families” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-766. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy for the position of Director, Office of Personnel Management, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-767. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-768. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, six (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-769. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of five recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 70th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-770. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office’s Congressional Budget Justification and Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2020, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-771. A joint communication from the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating Officer of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Armed Forces Retirement Home Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2018”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-772. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-773. A communication from a Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “U.S. Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2018–2020”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-774. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-563, “Short-Term Rental Regulation Act of 2018”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Economic Report of the

President together with the 2019 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Joint Economic Committee.

EC-776. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-777. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Victims Compensation Fund established by the Witness Security Reform Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-778. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report from the Attorney General to Congress relative to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-779. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Acquisition Regulation: Construction and Architect-Engineer Contracts" (RIN2900-AQ18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-780. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fertility Counseling and Treatment for Certain Veterans and Spouses" (RIN2900-AP94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-781. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2018"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-782. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2018"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-783. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ELDT; Commercial Driver's License Upgrade from Class B to Class A" (RIN2126-AC05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-784. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Affairs; Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act; Correction" (RIN0648-BI40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-785. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Ground; Sabine Pass, TX" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0388)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-786. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones: Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0156)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-787. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones: Missouri River, Mile Markers 450-625, St. Joseph, MO to Omaha, NE" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0177)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-788. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991" (CG Docket No. 02-278) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-789. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunication Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Withdrawal of the Commission as an Accounting Authority in the Maritime Mobile and Maritime Mobile-Satellite Radio Services" ((FCC 18-186) (IB Docket No. 98-96)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-790. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund" ((FCC 19-8) (WC Docket No. 10-90)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-791. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Cookeville and Franklin, TN" (MB Docket No. 18-383) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-792. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "LPTV; TV Translator, and FM Broadcast Station Reimbursement" ((FCC 19-21) (MB Docket No. 18-214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-16. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 85

Whereas, under current federal law, survivors of deceased military members are required to forfeit part or all of their Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) annuity when they are awarded Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA); and

Whereas, currently, surviving spouses of active duty or retired members who died of a service-connected cause are required to forfeit \$1 of their SBP annuity for each \$1 received in DIC; and

Whereas, for FY 2017, the DIC was approximately \$1,258 a month and the offset wiped out most if not all of the SBP annuity compensation for a majority of survivors; and

Whereas, Congress has made attempts to help some of the survivors by: raising the lump-sum death gratuity for deaths after October 2001; ending the offset for survivors who remarry after age 57; and authorizing the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance (SSIA), a modest monthly rebate (approximately \$310 in FY 2017) to SBP-DIC recipients subjected to this in equity; and

Whereas, however, the lump-sum increases in the death gratuity did not help the 95% of survivors whose spouses died of service-caused conditions before 2001. Forced to forfeit \$1,258 a month, survivors view the SSIA \$310 rebate a poor effort at restitution. Moreover, SSIA will terminate in May 2018 if Congress does not extend the allowance; and

Whereas, in 2007, the Veterans Disability Benefits Commission was asked to review the inequity and determined that when military service causes a member's death, the DIC should be paid in addition to the SBP annuity, not subtracted from it; and

Whereas, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act is currently pending in Congress to: repeal certain provisions that require the offset of money paid in DIC compensation from SBP annuities for surviving spouses under 60 years of age; prohibit requiring repayment of certain monies previously paid to SBP recipients; and require certain military departments to pay the dependent children when there is no eligible surviving spouse; and

Whereas, this House urges Congress to pass the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act because our nation's military personnel risk their lives to defend our nation and our freedoms and they should be able to trust that the benefits they designate for their families will be provided; Now, therefore, be it

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, every member of Congress elected from this State, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

POM-17. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Alaska urging the implementation of an oil and gas leasing program in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, in 16 U.S.C. 3143 (sec. 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), the United States Congress reserved the right to permit oil and gas development and production in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, in 16 U.S.C. 3142 (sec. 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), the United States Congress authorized nondrilling exploratory activity in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas sec. 20001 of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97) requires the United States Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a competitive oil and gas program for the leasing, development, and production of oil and gas in and the transportation of oil and gas from the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas sec. 20001 of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97) requires that at least two lease sales be held by December 22, 2024, and that each sale offer for lease at least 400,000 acres of land with the highest hydrocarbon potential in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, allowing for up to 2,000 acres of federal land, which is equivalent to .01 percent of the 19,300,000-acre refuge, to be covered by production and support facilities; and

Whereas the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge contains an estimated 7,687,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil and 7,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas; and

Whereas the exploration, development, and production of oil and gas in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is predicted to generate 1,430 direct jobs and 6,350 indirect jobs annually and 2,480 direct jobs and 10,100 indirect jobs at peak employment; and

Whereas the estimated potential government revenue from petroleum development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge through 2050, including revenue to the North Slope Borough, the state, and the federal government from royalties, income taxes, production taxes, and property taxes, equals \$104,673,000,000; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has the potential to extend the life of the Trans Alaska Pipeline System and increase throughput, which has declined from a peak of 2,033,000 average barrels of oil a day in 1988 to 509,000 average barrels of oil a day in 2018; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has the potential to enhance the economic viability of the proposed Alaska liquefied natural gas project; and

Whereas oil and gas development on the coastal plain would strengthen national security and provide long-lasting benefits to the national economy by creating thousands of jobs nationwide, generating billions of dollars in government revenue, providing affordable energy to American consumers, and decreasing dependence on foreign energy; and

Whereas advances in extended-reach and directional drilling technology have greatly reduced the impact area of oil and gas activities, including shrinking the average drilling pad size by more than 80 percent, from 65 acres in 1970 to 12 acres today, and increasing the subsurface area accessible from modern drilling pads by nearly 2,000 percent, from three square miles in 1970 to 60 square miles today; and

Whereas safe and responsible oil and gas exploration, development, and production has been demonstrated by over 50 years of

activity on the North Slope of Alaska without adverse effects on the environment or wildlife populations; and

Whereas the state continues to strive to ensure the ongoing health and productivity of the Porcupine and Central Arctic caribou herds and the protection of land, water, and wildlife resources during the exploration and development of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas polling consistently shows Alaskans overwhelmingly support responsible oil and gas development in the non-wilderness portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, while most Alaskans support development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, many do so with the understanding that the state's workforce will be used to the maximum extent possible if the leasing program moves forward; and

Whereas the proposed leasing area of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is located in the North Slope Borough, and many residents of the borough, the population of which is predominantly Inupiat, are supportive of development in the non-wilderness area of the coastal plain; be it further *Resolved*, That the Alaska State Legislature requests that the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, implement an oil and gas leasing program in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as outlined in the December 2018 Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature requests that the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, in its consideration of action alternatives outlined in the December 2018 Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Draft Environmental Impact Statement, take into account the long history of safe and responsible oil and gas development on Alaska's North Slope, the enormous benefits development of oil and gas resources in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would bring to the state and the nation, the advances in oilfield technology that continue to shrink the impact area of oil and gas activities, and the support of residents from the North Slope Borough and across the North Slope of Alaska for oil and gas development in a portion of the coastal plain.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable David Bernhardt, Acting United States Secretary of the Interior; Brian Steed, Deputy Director for Policy and Programs, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior; and Nicole Hayes, Coastal Plain Project Manager, Bureau of Land Management Alaska State Office, U.S. Department of the Interior.

POM-18. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota urging the United States Congress to amend the Social Security Act to allow states to provide Medicaid services to those persons presumed innocent in jail awaiting trial; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, a basic principle of the United States judicial system is that citizens charged with a crime are innocent until proven guilty; and

Whereas, the United States and South Dakota have determined it is right and appropriate to care for our most vulnerable citizens through the Medicaid program, and county jails are populated by many persons

who have serious medical conditions and mental illnesses or who are the parents of small children who qualify for Medicaid benefits; and

Whereas, the jail population in the United States is growing faster than the prison population, and approximately two-thirds of the jail population consists of those pending disposition who remain innocent until proven guilty and who are currently not being treated equally to those awaiting trial who obtained bail and were released awaiting adjudication; and

Whereas, providing Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition will increase the likelihood that the provision of services is continuous once the person reenters the community; and

Whereas, section 1905(a)(A) of the Social Security Act prevents South Dakota from providing Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition who would otherwise be covered under the Medicaid policies of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Ninety-Fourth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Legislature requests the United States Congress to amend the Social Security Act to allow states to provide Medicaid services to those persons presumed innocent in jail awaiting trial; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, and to the South Dakota congressional delegation.

POM-19. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to support a woman's right to make reproductive health decisions and access reproductive healthcare; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, January 22, 2019, marks the 46th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113, which affirmed that every woman has a fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions and to decide whether to [end or to continue pregnancy,] *continue a pregnancy or obtain an abortion*, and is an occasion deserving of acknowledgment; and

Whereas, *Roe v. Wade* has been the cornerstone of women's ability to control their reproductive lives, allowing every woman in the United States the right to decide when, if, and with whom to have children, and how many children to [have:] *have, and has helped facilitate women's economic and societal participation in the United States*; and

[Whereas, Women's ability to control their reproductive lives has helped and facilitated their participation in the economic and social life of our nation; and]

Whereas, *In the years prior to the Roe v. Wade* [has drastically reduced the maternal mortality rate for women terminating their pregnancies in the United States. In the years prior to the] decision, illegal abortion accounted for approximately 17 percent of all reported deaths attributable to pregnancy and childbirth, and many women were severely injured as a result of "back alley" abortion procedures; and

Whereas, Interference with a woman's right to choose causes women to be forced into illegal and dangerous abortions, as they often were in the United States before the

Roe v. Wade decision. Many women are forced to make these decisions today in countries where abortion is illegal and where the unsafe methods of illegal abortion lead to 13 percent of global maternal deaths annually, or eight maternal deaths every hour. Many survivors of an illegal abortion suffer serious and often permanent injuries; hour; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade continues to protect the health and freedom of women throughout the United States; States. National peer-reviewed studies show abortion is a safe medical procedure, increasingly provided through outpatient medication, that nearly one in four women in the United States will access; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade is in serious jeopardy of being overturned or further eroded due to President Donald J. Trump's appointment of two justices to the United States Supreme Court who have a record of being hostile to a woman's constitutional right to choose, Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh; and

Whereas, States are passing legislation that creates barriers to abortion and there are more than a dozen cases limiting abortion rights that could be considered by the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Whereas, Providers of sexual and reproductive healthcare are still under serious, unrelenting attack for providing essential information and services, such as abortion, as evidenced by bomb threats, arson, and vandalism in California and the fact that death threats against abortion providers doubled, and incidents of clinic obstruction tripled, nationally from 2016 to 2017 alone; and

Whereas, The State of California stands in strong support of every woman's fundamental right, as confirmed in Roe v. Wade, to make [her own] decisions regarding [her pregnancy;] pregnancy and commits to boldly advance access to sexual and reproductive healthcare within our state; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to express their support for a woman's fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions, as well as their support for access to comprehensive reproductive [health care,] healthcare, including the services provided by Planned Parenthood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-20. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to pass legislation that would automatically enroll veterans for benefits in the Department of Veterans Affairs system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 163

Whereas, Military service members are eligible for a range of United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) benefits when they are discharged; and

Whereas, Currently, those benefits may include, but are not limited to, healthcare, disability, educational, and employment benefits; and

Whereas, Under the VA pre-discharge program, members are encouraged to apply for each type of benefit they are entitled to prior to their discharge, and are encouraged to work with an accredited representative during this process; and

Whereas, While helpful to service members, the process in place for applying for each type of benefit can be time consuming and burdensome, especially as service members are making a transition from military to civilian life; and

Whereas, Providing for automatic enrollment of veterans for the VA benefits they are entitled to would facilitate this process and ease the transition to civilian life: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the United States Congress to pass legislation to automatically enroll veterans for benefits they are entitled to in the United States Department of Veterans Affairs system.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States Senate, the Senate Minority Leader, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the House Minority Leader, the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, and each member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-21. A petition from a citizen of the State of Ohio relative to tax incentives on American-made automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUBIO for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

*David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

*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.

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. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 886. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 887. A bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 888. A bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 889. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost

of college; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 890. A bill to authorize the Sergeant at Arms to protect the personal technology devices and accounts of Senators and covered employees from cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide payment of Medal of Honor special pension under such title to the surviving spouse of a deceased Medal of Honor recipient, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 892. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 893. A bill to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. 894. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 895. A bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 896. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for reform in the operations of the Office of Government Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. JONES):

S. 897. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "family farmer"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 898. A bill to designate the Manhattan Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the "Margaret Cochran Corbin Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 899. A bill to limit the authority of the President to modify duty rates for national security reasons and to limit the authority of the United States Trade Representative to impose certain duties or import restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 900. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the "Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. JONES):

S. 901. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 902. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of physicians in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 903. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 904. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 905. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 906. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 907. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 908. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 909. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 910. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 911. A bill to require the installation of secondary cockpit barriers on existing aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 912. A bill to require certain public housing agencies to absorb port-in housing choice vouchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 913. A bill to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering health insurance coverage to disclose cost information to enrollees in such plans or coverage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 914. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 915. A bill to prohibit public companies from repurchasing their shares on the open market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 916. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 917. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to prepare and submit periodic reports to Congress on the role of telecommunications in hate crimes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 918. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on broadband networks without authorization from Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 919. A bill to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commer-

cial space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 920. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make available parental leave benefits to parents following the birth or adoption of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HIRONO):

S.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 122. A resolution observing the 25th Anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 123. A resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 124. A resolution condemning the March 15, 2019, terrorist attacks in Christchurch, New Zealand, offering sincere condolences to all of the victims and their families, and expressing and standing in solidarity with the people and Government of New Zealand; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. Res. 125. A resolution designating March 2019 as "National Women's History Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 126. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, as “Public Schools Week”; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 127. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 175

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor 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. 365

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 365, a bill to amend section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to require the Secretary of Defense to initiate investigations and to provide for congressional disapproval of certain actions, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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. 559

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) 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. 665

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to reduce the number of preventable deaths and injuries caused by underride crashes, to improve motor carrier and passenger motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to limit experimentation on cats.

S. 726

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 741

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 741, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for cost sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill’s Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 750, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 771

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors 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 Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) 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. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in logging operations from child labor laws.

S. 824

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 824, a bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 854, a bill to require human rights certifications for arms sales, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to establish an oil spill response and prevention grant program and provide for advances from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the application of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund financing rate, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of not more than 9 justices.

S. RES. 78

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 78, a resolution recognizing the national debt as a threat to national security.

S. RES. 85

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 85, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, and their caregivers and families.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

S. RES. 118

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from

Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors 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 Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) 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 Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 890. A bill to authorize the Sergeant at Arms to protect the personal technology devices and accounts of Senators and covered employees from cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I, along with my colleague Senator COTTON from Arkansas, am introducing the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act to defend the integrity of American democracy by providing cybersecurity protection for the personal accounts and electronic devices of Senators and key members of their staff.

In 2016, hackers working for the Russian government broke into a range of targets, including the network of the Democratic National Committee and the email account of Senator Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign manager, John Podesta. These widely publicized breaches are only the tip of the iceberg. These hacks are widely known today because the emails stolen from these accounts were subsequently weaponized and used as part of a campaign to influence the outcome of several elections—most publicly, the presidential race between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, but also U.S. House of Representatives races in Illinois, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM also reported that his campaign's email was successfully compromised.

While the Russian hacks in 2016 were a watershed moment, these are merely the most visible and disruptive examples of foreign intelligence services

using offensive cyber capabilities to target those involved in our political process. Senior officials from the 2008 Obama and McCain presidential campaigns have publicly confirmed that both organizations were compromised by hackers. In 2017, the media reported that then-White House Chief of Staff John Kelly's personal cell phone had been compromised, possibly for as long as ten months before the malware was discovered. And in 2018, media reports revealed that the personal email accounts of senior congressional staffers had been targeted by the notorious Russian hacking group "Fancy-Bear." These and other events clearly demonstrate the unique threats faced by Senators and their staff. Unfortunately, as I revealed in a letter to Senate leadership last year, the Sergeant At Arms (SAA), which is responsible for the Senate's cybersecurity, informed me that it currently lacks the authority to use official Senate resources to protect the personal devices and accounts of Senators and key Senate staff, even when those staff are being targeted by foreign governments.

Senators COTTON and I are not alone in recognizing the seriousness of this national security threat.

Last year, then-Director of the National Security Agency Admiral Michael Rogers acknowledged in a letter to me that personal devices and accounts of senior U.S. government officials "remain prime targets for exploitation." Likewise, in written responses to post-hearing questions from the Senate Intelligence Committee last year, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats wrote that "[t]he personal accounts and devices of government officials can contain information that is useful for our adversaries to target, either directly or indirectly, these officials and the organizations with which they are affiliated." The Appropriations Committee also noted last year in its report accompanying the 2019 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill that it "continues to be concerned that Senators are being targeted for hacking and cyber attacks, especially via their personal devices and accounts."

Currently, Senators and staffers are expected to protect their own devices and accounts from foreign government hackers. This is absurd. Senators and the vast majority of their staff are not cybersecurity experts, and certainly do not have the training or resources to defend themselves from sophisticated foreign intelligence agencies. Eric Rosenbach, who was formerly Chief of Staff to Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, has endorsed the bill we are introducing today, observing that "Senators and their staff should not be expected to go toe to toe with some of the most sophisticated adversaries in cyberspace; authorizing protection of personal accounts is a critical component of our cyber defense efforts." Likewise, Bruce Schreier, a noted cybersecurity expert has also endorsed the bill, stating that "[i]t is ludicrous to expect in-

dividual senators and their staff to defend themselves from spies and hackers. Hostile foreign intelligence services do not respect the arbitrary line between work and personal technology. As such, the U.S. government must extend its defensive cyber perimeter to include legislators' personal devices and accounts."

Our bill would permit the SAA to provide voluntary, opt-in cybersecurity assistance to Senators and key Senate staff to secure their personal devices and accounts. Any Senate staffer would be eligible to receive assistance, provided that the Senator employing them determines that they are highly vulnerable to cyber attacks and information collection because of their position in the Senate.

There is precedent for extending cybersecurity protection to the personal devices of government officials. Section 1645 of the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act permits the Secretary of Defense to provide personal device cybersecurity assistance to officials whom the secretary "determines to be highly vulnerable to cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities because of the positions occupied by such personnel in the Department." The Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act is also similar to provisions included in the intelligence authorization bill approved by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in 2018, which would permit the Director of National Intelligence to protect the personal devices and accounts of high-risk staff in the intelligence community.

Passage of this common sense, bipartisan legislation would provide Senators and their staff with much-needed protection for their personal accounts and devices, and with them, the integrity of American democracy. I thank my colleague Senator COTTON for his efforts on this bill, and hope the Senate will promptly pass this vital legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. 894. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 894

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) White supremacists and other far-right-wing extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States.

(2) On February 22, 2019, a Trump Administration United States Department of Justice official wrote in a New York Times op-ed that "white supremacy and far-right extremism are among the greatest domestic-security threats facing the United States. Regrettably, over the past 25 years, law enforcement, at both the Federal and State levels, has been slow to respond. . . Killings committed by individuals and groups associated with far-right extremist groups have risen significantly."

(3) An April 2017 Government Accountability Office report on the significant, lethal threat posed by domestic violent extremists explained that "[s]ince September 12, 2001, the number of fatalities caused by domestic violent extremists has ranged from 1 to 49 in a given year." The report noted: "[F]atalities resulting from attacks by far right wing violent extremists have exceeded those caused by radical Islamist violent extremists in 10 of the 15 years, and were the same in 3 of the years since September 12, 2001. Of the 85 violent extremist incidents that resulted in death since September 12, 2001, far right wing violent extremist groups were responsible for 62 (73 percent) while radical Islamist violent extremists were responsible for 23 (27 percent)."

(4) An unclassified May 2017 joint intelligence bulletin from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security found that "white supremacist extremism poses [a] persistent threat of lethal violence," and that White supremacists "were responsible for 49 homicides in 26 attacks from 2000 to 2016 . . . more than any other domestic extremist movement".

(5) Fatal terrorist attacks by far-right-wing extremists include—

(A) the August 5, 2012, mass shooting at a Sikh gurdwara in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 6 members of the gurdwara;

(B) the April 13, 2014, mass shooting at a Jewish community center and a Jewish assisted living facility in Overland Park, Kansas, in which a neo-Nazi shot and killed 3 civilians, including a 14-year-old teenager;

(C) the June 8, 2014, ambush in Las Vegas, Nevada, in which 2 supporters of the far-right-wing "patriot" movement shot and killed 2 police officers and a civilian;

(D) the June 17, 2015, mass shooting at the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 9 members of the church;

(E) the November 27, 2015, mass shooting at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in which an anti-abortion extremist shot and killed a police officer and 2 civilians;

(F) the March 20, 2017, murder of an African-American man in New York City, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly traveled to New York "for the purpose of killing black men";

(G) the May 26, 2017, attack in Portland, Oregon, in which a White supremacist allegedly murdered 2 men and injured a third after the men defended 2 young women whom the individual had targeted with anti-Muslim hate speech;

(H) the August 12, 2017, attack in Charlottesville, Virginia, in which a White supremacist killed one and injured nineteen after driving his car through a crowd of individuals protesting a neo-Nazi rally, and of which former Attorney General Jeff Sessions said, “It does meet the definition of domestic terrorism in our statute.”;

(I) the July 2018 murder of an African-American woman from Kansas City, Missouri, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly bragged about being a member of the Ku Klux Klan;

(J) the October 24, 2018, shooting in Jeffersonton, Kentucky, in which a White man allegedly murdered 2 African Americans at a grocery store after first attempting to enter a church with a predominantly African-American congregation during a service; and

(K) the October 27, 2018, mass shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in which a White nationalist allegedly shot and killed 11 members of the congregation.

(6) In November 2018, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its annual hate crime report, which found that in 2017, hate crimes increased by approximately 17 percent, including a 23-percent increase in religion-based hate crimes, an 18-percent increase in race-based crimes, and a 5-percent increase in crimes directed against LGBT individuals. The total number of reported hate crimes rose for the third consecutive year. The previous year’s report found that in 2016, hate crimes increased by almost 5 percent, including a 19-percent rise in hate crimes against American Muslims; additionally, of the hate crimes motivated by religious bias in 2016, 53 percent were anti-Semitic. Similarly, the report analyzing 2015 data found that hate crimes increased by 6 percent that year. Much of the 2015 increase came from a 66-percent rise in attacks on American Muslims and a 9-percent rise in attacks on American Jews. In all three reports, race-based crimes were most numerous, and those crimes most often targeted African Americans.

(7) On March 15, 2019, a White nationalist was arrested and charged with murder after allegedly killing 50 Muslim worshippers and injuring more than 40 in a massacre at the Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand. The alleged shooter posted a hate-filled, xenophobic manifesto that detailed his White nationalist ideology before the massacre. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern labeled the massacre a terrorist attack.

(8) In January 2017, a right-wing extremist who had expressed anti-Muslim views was charged with murder for allegedly killing 6 people and injuring 19 in a shooting rampage at a mosque in Quebec City, Canada. It was the first-ever mass shooting at a mosque in North America, and Prime Minister Trudeau labeled it a terrorist attack.

(9) On February 15, 2019, Federal authorities arrested U.S. Coast Guard Lieutenant Christopher Paul Hasson, who was allegedly planning to kill a number of prominent journalists, professors, judges, and “leftists in general”. In court filings, prosecutors described Lieutenant Hasson as a “domestic terrorist” who in an email “identified himself as a White Nationalist for over 30 years and advocated for ‘focused violence’ in order to establish a white homeland.”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Director” means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the term “domestic terrorism” has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code, except that it

does not include acts perpetrated by individuals associated with or inspired by—

(A) a foreign person or organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) an individual or organization designated under Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(C) a state sponsor of terrorism as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), or section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(3) the term “Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee” means the committee within the Department of Justice tasked with assessing and sharing information about ongoing domestic terrorism threats;

(4) the term “hate crime incident” means an act described in section 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631);

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(6) the term “uniformed services” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4. OFFICES TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICES TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, INVESTIGATE, AND PROSECUTE DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) DOMESTIC TERRORISM UNIT.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Unit in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be responsible for monitoring and analyzing domestic terrorism activity.

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM OFFICE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Office in the Counterterrorism Section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice—

(A) which shall be responsible for investigating and prosecuting incidents of domestic terrorism; and

(B) which shall be headed by the Domestic Terrorism Counsel.

(3) DOMESTIC TERRORISM SECTION OF THE FBI.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Section within the Counterterrorism Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism activity.

(4) STAFFING.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each ensure that the offices authorized under this section in their respective agencies shall have adequate staff to perform the required duties.

(b) JOINT REPORT ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit a joint report authored by the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the domestic terrorism threat posed by White supremacists and neo-Nazis, including White supremacist

and neo-Nazi infiltration of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and the uniformed services; and

(B)(i) in the first report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that have occurred in the United States since April 19, 1995; and

(ii) in each subsequent report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that occurred in the United States during the preceding year; and

(C) a quantitative analysis of domestic terrorism for the preceding year, including the number of—

(i) domestic terrorism related assessments initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of assessments from each classification and subcategory;

(ii) domestic terrorism-related preliminary investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of preliminary investigations from each classification and subcategory, and how many preliminary investigations resulted from assessments;

(iii) domestic terrorism-related full investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of full investigations from each classification and subcategory, and how many full investigations resulted from preliminary investigations and assessments;

(iv) domestic terrorism-related incidents, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, the number of deaths and injuries resulting from each incident, and a detailed explanation of each incident;

(v) Federal domestic terrorism-related arrests, including the number of arrests from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each arrest;

(vi) Federal domestic terrorism-related indictments, including the number of indictments from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each indictment;

(vii) Federal domestic terrorism-related prosecutions, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each prosecution;

(viii) Federal domestic terrorism-related convictions, including the number of convictions from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each conviction; and

(ix) Federal domestic terrorism-related weapons recoveries, including the number of each type of weapon and the number of weapons from each classification and subcategory.

(3) HATE CRIMES.—In compiling a joint report under this subsection, the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall, in consultation with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, review each hate crime incident reported during the preceding year to determine whether the incident also constitutes a domestic terrorism-related incident.

(4) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public websites of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) DOMESTIC TERRORISM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee, which shall—

(1) meet on a regular basis, and not less regularly than 4 times each year, to coordinate with United States Attorneys and other key public safety officials across the country to promote information sharing and ensure an effective, responsive, and organized joint effort to combat domestic terrorism; and

(2) be co-chaired by—

(A) the Domestic Terrorism Counsel authorized under subsection (a)(2)(B);

(B) a United States Attorney or Assistant United States Attorney;

(C) a member of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice; and

(D) a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) **FOCUS ON GREATEST THREATS.**—The domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall focus their limited resources on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding year required under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. TRAINING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) **REQUIRED TRAINING AND RESOURCES.**—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall review the anti-terrorism training and resource programs of their respective agencies that are provided to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, including the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Program that is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice, and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism and White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of law enforcement agencies. The domestic-terrorism training shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the quantitative analysis in the joint report required under section 4(b).

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—Any individual who provides domestic terrorism training required under this section shall have—

(1) expertise in domestic terrorism; and

(2) relevant academic, law enforcement, or other experience in matters related to domestic terrorism.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and once each year thereafter, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each submit an annual report to the committees of Congress described in section 4(b)(1) on the domestic terrorism training implemented by their respective agencies under this section, which shall include copies of all training materials used and the names and qualifications of the individuals who provide the training.

(2) **CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of each report, posted on the public website of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 6. COMBATING DOMESTIC TERRORISM THROUGH JOINT TERRORISM TASK FORCES AND FUSION CENTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The joint terrorism task forces of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State, local, and regional fusion centers, as established under section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h), shall each, in coordination with the

Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee and the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4(a) of this Act—

(1) share intelligence to address domestic terrorism activities;

(2) conduct an annual, intelligence-based assessment of domestic terrorism activities in their jurisdictions; and

(3) formulate and execute a plan to address and combat domestic terrorism activities in their jurisdictions.

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—The activities required under subsection (a) shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding year required under section 4(b).

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish an interagency task force to combat White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of the uniformed services.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 895. A bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 895

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Hospital Regulatory Relief Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS.

Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(x) **PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS.**—On and after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall continue to apply the enforcement instruction described in the notice of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services entitled ‘Enforcement Instruction on Supervision Requirements for Outpatient Therapeutic Services in Critical Access and Small Rural Hospitals for CY 2013’, dated November 1, 2012 (providing for an exception to the re-statement and clarification under the final rulemaking changes to the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system and calendar year 2009 payment rates (published in the Federal Register on November 18, 2008,

73 Fed. Reg. 68702 through 68704) with respect to requirements for direct supervision by physicians for therapeutic hospital outpatient services) and extended by section 1 of Public Law 113–198, section 1 of Public Law 114–112, section 16004(a) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255), and section 51007 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 115–123), and reinstated for calendar years 2018 and 2019 under the final rule entitled ‘Medicare Program: Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs’ published on December 14, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 59216).”.

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

S. 899. A bill to limit the authority of the President to modify duty rates for national security reasons and to limit the authority of the United States Trade Representative to impose certain duties or import restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today Senator CARPER and I introduced the Reclaiming Congressional Trade Authority Act of 2019. Enacting this bill would restore the role on Congress in overseeing international trade matters.

I have been outspoken against the abuse of executive authorities that have been delegated to the President. Congress has a Constitutional power to oversee international trade. We have recently seen an abuse of this power, as with other executive authorities. This bill would mandate expanded Congressional involvement in international trade decisions by requiring the Trump Administration—and future Administrations—to further analyze, communicate, and justify tariff actions to Congress. Congress would then review new tariffs and if the Administration used national security to justify the tariffs’ need, Congress would be required to approve them.

I am advocating for my colleagues to consider supporting this bill, especially as the damaging effects of the ongoing trade war continue. It’s time for Congress to step in and act on our Constitutional duty.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 900. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the “Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 900

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF TRAVIS W. ATKINS DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC IN BOZEMAN, MONTANA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 300 North Willson

Avenue, Bozeman, Montana, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic” or the “Travis W. Atkins VA Clinic”.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community-based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 906. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to re-introduce the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act.” This legislation would update the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to phase out the use of harmful drift gillnets and replace them with more sustainable fishing gear. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator CAPITO, for once again co-leading this important bill.

Drift gillnets, which are approximately one to one and a half miles long, are intended to catch swordfish and thresher shark off the coast of California. Tragically, nearly 60 other species are frequently caught and killed in the nets, including dolphins, porpoises, whales, sea lions, and sea turtles. These are known as bycatch.

While some of these species can be sold, most are wastefully thrown back into the ocean either dead or seriously injured.

According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, these harmful nets account for 90% of whale and porpoise species killed in West Coast Fisheries. In the 1980s, Congress enacted legislation to end the domestic use of driftnets approximately 1.5 miles or longer. Under President George H.W. Bush, the United States entered binding international agreements banning such nets worldwide.

Driftnets are prohibited or are not utilized off the United States’ Atlantic and Gulf coasts as well as in Washington State, Oregon, Alaska, and Hawaii. Mexico permanently banned the use of these nets in the Gulf of California in 2017.

However, neither domestic nor international law currently includes the drift gillnets used in Federal waters off the coast of California to catch swordfish and thresher shark, despite their significant impact on protected marine life. This California-based fishery is the last place in the United States where these deadly driftnets are allowed.

Last year, the California legislature passed a bill, subsequently signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, to phase out these large-mesh drift gillnets in State waters and establish a buyout program over a four-year period.

The State law requires the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to es-

tablish a voluntary “permit transition program” by March 2020 that will compensate fishermen during this transition process. California has already dedicated \$1 million for the program and another \$1 million is being sought through a public-private partnership.

Now that these nets are banned in State waters, our legislation to ban the nets in Federal waters is more timely than ever. The “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act” would phase out the use of drift gillnets over the five years after enactment. The bill also authorizes the Department of Commerce to assist fishermen in transitioning from driftnets to more sustainable gear types, which studies have shown actually increase profitability.

Updated fishing gear that could replace driftnets is available and has been successfully deployed in the Atlantic Ocean and in trials in the Pacific Ocean. Deep-set buoy gear, for example, allows fishermen to more accurately target swordfish and other marketable species in deep, cold water. The gear alerts fishermen immediately when they have fish on the line, so the fish can be retrieved and delivered to market quickly, thereby garnering a higher price.

In a 2016 poll, California voters overwhelmingly supported efforts to end the use of drift gillnets to catch swordfish, with 87 percent of those surveyed in a poll commissioned by The Pew Charitable Trusts agreeing that fishermen should use less harmful gear.

Our bill enjoys support from a wide range of commercial fishing companies, sportfishing groups, and environmental organizations, including: the American Sportfishing Association, the International Game Fish Association, Coastal Conservation Association of California, Yamaha USA, Okaiwa Corporation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Oceana, Sea Legacy, and Mission Blue.

Our “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act” will protect valuable marine life unique to the West Coast, including several endangered species. This bill will also help fishermen to provide fresher, more profitable, and more sustainable seafood to American consumers.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act.” Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the Floor.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 908. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 908

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fluke Fairness Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Summer flounder is an important economic fish stock for commercial and recreational fishermen across the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic United States.

(2) The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) was reauthorized in 2006 and instituted annual catch limits and accountability measures for important fish stocks.

(3) That reauthorization prompted fishery managers to look at alternate management schemes to rebuild depleted stocks like summer flounder.

(4) Summer flounder occur in both State and Federal waters and are managed through a joint fishery management plan between the Council and the Commission.

(5) The Council and the Commission decided that each State’s recreational and commercial harvest limits for summer flounder would be based upon landings in previous years.

(6) These historical landings were based on flawed data sets that no longer provide fairness or flexibility for fisheries managers to allocate resources based on the best science.

(7) This allocation mechanism resulted in an uneven split among the States along the East Coast which is problematic.

(8) The fishery management plan for summer flounder does not account for regional changes in the location of the fluke stock even though the stock has moved further to the north and changes in effort by anglers along the East Coast.

(9) The States have been locked in a management system based on data collected from 1981 to 1989, thus, the summer flounder stock is not being managed using the best available science and modern fishery management techniques.

(10) It is in the interest of the Federal Government to establish a new fishery management plan for summer flounder that is based on current geographic, scientific, and economic realities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

(2) COUNCIL.—The term “Council” means the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council established under section 302(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)).

(3) NATIONAL STANDARDS.—The term “National Standards” means the national standards for fishery conservation and management set out in section 301(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851(a)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(5) SUMMER FLOUNDER.—The term “summer flounder” means the species *Paralichthys dentatus*.

SEC. 4. SUMMER FLOUNDER MANAGEMENT REFORM.

(a) FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN MODIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Council shall submit to the Secretary, and the Secretary may approve, a modified fishery management plan for the commercial management of summer flounder under title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) or an amendment to such plan that—

(1) shall be based on the best scientific information available;

(2) establishes commercial quotas in direct proportion to the distribution, abundance, and location of summer flounder as reflected by fishery independent surveys conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and State agencies;

(3) considers regional, coastwide, or other management measures for summer flounder that comply with the National Standards; and

(4) prohibits the establishment of commercial catch quotas for summer flounder on a State-by-State basis using historical landings data that does not reflect the status of the summer flounder stock, based on the most recent scientific information.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH THE COMMISSION.—In preparing the modified fishery management plan or an amendment to such a plan as described in subsection (a), the Council shall consult with the Commission to ensure consistent management throughout the range of the summer flounder.

(c) FAILURE TO SUBMIT PLAN.—If the Council fails to submit a modified fishery management plan or an amendment to such a plan as described in subsection (a) that may be approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall prepare and consider such a modified plan or amendment.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the approval under section 4 of a modified fishery management plan for the commercial management of summer flounder or an amendment to such plan, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of such modified plan or amendment that includes an assessment of whether such implementation complies with the National Standards.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 916. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 916

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mothers and Offspring Mortality and Morbidity Awareness Act” or the “MOMMA’s Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Every year, across the United States, 4,000,000 women give birth, about 700 women suffer fatal complications during pregnancy, while giving birth or during the postpartum period, and 70,000 women suffer near-fatal, partum-related complications.

(2) The maternal mortality rate is often used as a proxy to measure the overall health of a population. While the infant mortality rate in the United States has reached its lowest point, the risk of death for women in the United States during pregnancy, childbirth, or the postpartum period is higher than such risk in many other developed nations. The estimated maternal mortality

rate (per 100,000 live births) for the 48 contiguous States and Washington, DC increased from 18.8 percent in 2000 to 23.8 percent in 2014 to 26.6 percent in 2018. This estimated rate is on par with such rate for underdeveloped nations such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

(3) International studies estimate the 2015 maternal mortality rate in the United States as 26.4 per 100,000 live births, which is almost twice the 2015 World Health Organization estimation of 14 per 100,000 live births.

(4) It is estimated that more than 60 percent of maternal deaths in the United States are preventable.

(5) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the maternal mortality rate varies drastically for women by race and ethnicity. There are 12.7 deaths per 100,000 live births for White women, 43.5 deaths per 100,000 live births for African-American women, and 14.4 deaths per 100,000 live births for women of other ethnicities. While maternal mortality disparately impacts African-American women, this urgent public health crisis traverses race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, educational background, and geography.

(6) African-American women are 3 to 4 times more likely to die from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth compared to non-Hispanic White women.

(7) The findings described in paragraphs (1) through (6) are of major concern to researchers, academics, members of the business community, and providers across the obstetrical continuum represented by organizations such as March of Dimes; the Preeclampsia Foundation; the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine; the Association of Women’s Health, Obstetric, and Neonatal Nurses; the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative; Black Women’s Health Imperative; the National Birth Equity Collaborative; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; EverThrive Illinois; the National Association of Certified Professional Midwives; PCOS Challenge; The National Polycystic Ovary Syndrome Association; and the American College of Nurse Midwives.

(8) Hemorrhage, cardiovascular and coronary conditions, cardiomyopathy, infection, embolism, mental health conditions, preeclampsia and eclampsia, polycystic ovary syndrome, infection and sepsis, and anesthesia complications are the predominant medical causes of maternal-related deaths and complications. Most of these conditions are largely preventable or manageable.

(9) Oral health is an important part of perinatal health. Reducing bacteria in a woman’s mouth during pregnancy can significantly reduce her risk of developing oral diseases and spreading decay-causing bacteria to her baby. Moreover, some evidence suggests that women with periodontal disease during pregnancy could be at greater risk for poor birth outcomes, such as preeclampsia, pre-term birth, and low birth weight. Furthermore, a woman’s oral health during pregnancy is a good predictor of her newborn’s oral health, and since mothers can unintentionally spread oral bacteria to their babies, putting their children at higher risk for tooth decay, prevention efforts should happen even before children are born, as a matter of pre-pregnancy health and prenatal care during pregnancy.

(10) The United States has not been able to submit a formal maternal mortality rate to international data repositories since 2007. Thus, no official maternal mortality rate exists for the United States. There can be no maternal mortality rate without streamlining maternal mortality-related data from

the State level and extrapolating such data to the Federal level.

(11) In the United States, death reporting and analysis is a State function rather than a Federal process. States report all deaths—including maternal deaths—on a semi-voluntary basis, without standardization across States. While the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has the capacity and system for collecting death-related data based on death certificates, these data are not sufficiently reported by States in an organized and standard format across States such that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is able to identify causes of maternal death and best practices for the prevention of such death.

(12) Vital statistics systems often underestimate maternal mortality and are insufficient data sources from which to derive a full scope of medical and social determinant factors contributing to maternal deaths. While the addition of pregnancy checkboxes on death certificates since 2003 have likely improved States’ abilities to identify pregnancy-related deaths, they are not generally completed by obstetrical providers or persons trained to recognize pregnancy-related mortality. Thus, these vital forms may be missing information or may capture inconsistent data. Due to varying maternal mortality-related analyses, lack of reliability, and granularity in data, current maternal mortality informatics do not fully encapsulate the myriad medical and socially determinant factors that contribute to such high maternal mortality rates within the United States compared to other developed nations. Lack of standardization of data and data sharing across States and between Federal entities, health networks, and research institutions keep the Nation in the dark about ways to prevent maternal deaths.

(13) Having reliable and valid State data aggregated at the Federal level are critical to the Nation’s ability to quell surges in maternal death and imperative for researchers to identify long-lasting interventions.

(14) Leaders in maternal wellness highly recommend that maternal deaths be investigated at the State level first, and that standardized, streamlined, de-identified data regarding maternal deaths be sent annually to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Such data standardization and collection would be similar in operation and effect to the National Program of Cancer Registries of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and akin to the Confidential Enquiry in Maternal Deaths Programme in the United Kingdom. Such a maternal mortalities and morbidities registry and surveillance system would help providers, academicians, lawmakers, and the public to address questions concerning the types of, causes of, and best practices to thwart, pregnancy-related or pregnancy-associated mortality and morbidity.

(15) The United Nations’ Millennium Development Goal 5a aimed to reduce by 75 percent, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality rate, yet this metric has not been achieved. In fact, the maternal mortality rate in the United States has been estimated to have more than doubled between 2000 and 2014. Yet, because national data are not fully available, the United States does not have an official maternal mortality rate.

(16) Many States have struggled to establish or maintain Maternal Mortality Review Committees (referred to in this section as “MMRC”). On the State level, MMRCs have lagged because States have not had the resources to mount local reviews. State-level reviews are necessary as only the State departments of health have the authority to request medical records, autopsy reports,

and police reports critical to the function of the MMRC.

(17) The United Kingdom regards maternal deaths as a health systems failure and a national committee of obstetrics experts review each maternal death or near-fatal childbirth complication. Such committee also establishes the predominant course of maternal-related deaths from conditions such as preeclampsia. Consequently, the United Kingdom has been able to reduce its incidence of preeclampsia to less than one in 10,000 women—its lowest rate since 1952.

(18) The United States has no comparable, coordinated Federal process by which to review cases of maternal mortality, systems failures, or best practices. Many States have active MMRCs and leverage their work to impact maternal wellness. For example, the State of California has worked extensively with their State health departments, health and hospital systems, and research collaborative organizations, including the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative and the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health, to establish MMRCs, wherein such State has determined the most prevalent causes of maternal mortality and recorded and shared data with providers and researchers, who have developed and implemented safety bundles and care protocols related to preeclampsia, maternal hemorrhage, and the like. In this way, the State of California has been able to leverage its maternal mortality review board system, generate data, and apply those data to effect changes in maternal care-related protocol. To date, the State of California has reduced its maternal mortality rate, which is now comparable to the low rates of the United Kingdom.

(19) Hospitals and health systems across the United States lack standardization of emergency obstetrical protocols before, during, and after delivery. Consequently, many providers are delayed in recognizing critical signs indicating maternal distress that quickly escalate into fatal or near-fatal incidences. Moreover, any attempt to address an obstetrical emergency that does not consider both clinical and public health approaches falls woefully under the mark of excellent care delivery. State-based maternal quality collaborative organizations, such as the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative or entities participating in the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health (AIM), have formed obstetrical protocols, tool kits, and other resources to improve system care and response as they relate to maternal complications and warning signs for such conditions as maternal hemorrhage, hypertension, and preeclampsia.

(20) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that nearly half of all maternal deaths occur in the immediate postpartum period—the 42 days following a pregnancy—whereas more than one-third of pregnancy-related or pregnancy-associated deaths occur while a person is still pregnant. Yet, for women eligible for the Medicaid program on the basis of pregnancy, such Medicaid coverage lapses at the end of the month on which the 60th postpartum day lands.

(21) The experience of serious traumatic events, such as being exposed to domestic violence, substance use disorder, or pervasive racism, can over-activate the body's stress-response system. Known as toxic stress, the repetition of high-doses of cortisol to the brain, can harm healthy neurological development, which can have cascading physical and mental health consequences, as documented in the Adverse Childhood Experiences study of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(22) A growing body of evidence-based research has shown the correlation between the stress associated with one's race—the

stress of racism—and one's birthing outcomes. The stress of sex and race discrimination and institutional racism has been demonstrated to contribute to a higher risk of maternal mortality, irrespective of one's gestational age, maternal age, socioeconomic status, or individual-level health risk factors, including poverty, limited access to prenatal care, and poor physical and mental health (although these are not nominal factors). African-American women remain the most at risk for pregnancy-associated or pregnancy-related causes of death. When it comes to preeclampsia, for example, which is related to obesity, African-American women of normal weight remain the most at risk of dying during the perinatal period compared to non-African-American obese women.

(23) The rising maternal mortality rate in the United States is driven predominantly by the disproportionately high rates of African-American maternal mortality.

(24) African-American women are 3 to 4 times more likely to die from pregnancy or maternal-related distress than are White women, yielding one of the greatest and most disconcerting racial disparities in public health.

(25) Compared to women from other racial and ethnic demographics, African-American women across the socioeconomic spectrum experience prolonged, unrelenting stress related to racial and gender discrimination, contributing to higher rates of maternal mortality, giving birth to low-weight babies, and experiencing pre-term birth. Racism is a risk-factor for these aforementioned experiences. This cumulative stress often extends across the life course and is situated in everyday spaces where African-American women establish livelihood. Structural barriers, lack of access to care, and genetic predispositions to health vulnerabilities exacerbate African-American women's likelihood to experience poor or fatal birthing outcomes, but do not fully account for the great disparity.

(26) African-American women are twice as likely to experience postpartum depression, and disproportionately higher rates of preeclampsia compared to White women.

(27) Racism is deeply ingrained in United States systems, including in health care delivery systems between patients and providers, often resulting in disparate treatment for pain, irreverence for cultural norms with respect to health, and dismissiveness. Research has demonstrated that patients respond more warmly and adhere to medical treatment plans at a higher degree with providers of the same race or ethnicity or with providers with great ability to exercise empathy. However, the provider pool is not primed with many people of color, nor are providers (whether student-doctors in training or licensed practitioners) consistently required to undergo implicit bias, cultural competency, or empathy training on a consistent, on-going basis.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING FEDERAL EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO PREVENTION OF MATERNAL MORTALITY.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATES WITH RESPECT TO REPORTING MATERNAL MORTALITY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this section as the "Director"), in consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall provide technical assistance to States that elect to report comprehensive data on maternal mortality, including oral, mental, and breastfeeding health information, for the purpose of encouraging uniformity in the reporting of

such data and to encourage the sharing of such data among the respective States.

(b) BEST PRACTICES RELATING TO PREVENTION OF MATERNAL MORTALITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the Director, in consultation with relevant patient and provider groups, shall issue best practices to State maternal mortality review committees on how best to identify and review maternal mortality cases, taking into account any data made available by States relating to maternal mortality, including data on oral, mental, and breastfeeding health, and utilization of any emergency services; and

(B) the Director, working in collaboration with the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall issue best practices to hospitals, State professional society groups, and perinatal quality collaboratives on how best to prevent maternal mortality.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(c) ALLIANCE FOR INNOVATION ON MATERNAL HEALTH GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the "Secretary"), acting through the Associate Administrator of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall establish a grant program to be known as the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health Grant Program (referred to in this subsection as "AIM") under which the Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of—

(A) directing widespread adoption and implementation of maternal safety bundles through collaborative State-based teams; and

(B) collecting and analyzing process, structure, and outcome data to drive continuous improvement in the implementation of such safety bundles by such State-based teams with the ultimate goal of eliminating preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—In order to be eligible for a grant under paragraph (1), an entity shall—

(A) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

(B) demonstrate in such application that the entity is an interdisciplinary, multi-stakeholder, national organization with a national data-driven maternal safety and quality improvement initiative based on implementation approaches that have been proven to improve maternal safety and outcomes in the United States.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under paragraph (1) shall use such grant funds—

(A) to develop and implement, through a robust, multi-stakeholder process, maternal safety bundles to assist States and health care systems in aligning national, State, and hospital-level quality improvement efforts to improve maternal health outcomes, specifically the reduction of maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity;

(B) to ensure, in developing and implementing maternal safety bundles under subparagraph (A), that such maternal safety bundles—

(i) satisfy the quality improvement needs of a State or health care system by factoring in the results and findings of relevant data reviews, such as reviews conducted by a

State maternal mortality review committee; and

(i) address topics such as—
 (I) obstetric hemorrhage;
 (II) maternal mental health;
 (III) the maternal venous system;
 (IV) obstetric care for women with substance use disorders, including opioid use disorder;

(V) postpartum care basics for maternal safety;

(VI) reduction of peripartum racial and ethnic disparities;

(VII) reduction of primary caesarean birth;

(VIII) severe hypertension in pregnancy;

(IX) severe maternal morbidity reviews;

(X) support after a severe maternal morbidity event;

(XI) thromboembolism;

(XII) optimization of support for breastfeeding; and

(XIII) maternal oral health; and

(C) to provide ongoing technical assistance at the national and State levels to support implementation of maternal safety bundles under subparagraph (A).

(4) MATERNAL SAFETY BUNDLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “maternal safety bundle” means standardized, evidence-informed processes for maternal health care.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(d) FUNDING FOR STATE-BASED PERINATAL QUALITY COLLABORATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”), acting through the Division of Reproductive Health of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish a grant program to be known as the State-Based Perinatal Quality Collaborative grant program under which the Secretary awards grants to eligible entities for the purpose of development and sustainability of perinatal quality collaboratives in every State, the District of Columbia, and eligible territories, in order to measurably improve perinatal care and perinatal health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women and their infants.

(2) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants awarded under this subsection shall be in amounts not to exceed \$250,000 per year, for the duration of the grant period.

(3) STATE-BASED PERINATAL QUALITY COLLABORATIVE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “State-based perinatal quality collaborative” means a network of multidisciplinary teams that—

(A) work to improve measurable outcomes for maternal and infant health by advancing evidence-informed clinical practices using quality improvement principles;

(B) work with hospital-based or outpatient facility-based clinical teams, experts, and stakeholders, including patients and families, to spread best practices and optimize resources to improve perinatal care and outcomes;

(C) employ strategies that include the use of the collaborative learning model to provide opportunities for hospitals and clinical teams to collaborate on improvement strategies, rapid-response data to provide timely feedback to hospital and other clinical teams to track progress, and quality improvement science to provide support and coaching to hospital and clinical teams; and

(D) have the goal of improving population-level outcomes in maternal and infant health.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$14,000,000 per year for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(e) EXPANSION OF MEDICAID AND CHIP COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(1) REQUIRING COVERAGE OF ORAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)—

(I) by striking “; and (D)” and inserting “; (D)”;

(II) by inserting “; and (E) oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women (as defined in subsection (ee))” after “subsection (bb)”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ee) ORAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women’ means dental services necessary to prevent disease and promote oral health, restore oral structures to health and function, and treat emergency conditions that are furnished to a woman during pregnancy (or during the 1-year period beginning on the last day of the pregnancy).”

“(2) COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—To satisfy the requirement to provide oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women, a State shall, at a minimum, provide coverage for preventive, diagnostic, periodontal, and restorative care consistent with recommendations for perinatal oral health care and dental care during pregnancy from the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.”

(B) CHIP.—Section 2103(c)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397cc(c)(5)(A)) is amended by inserting “or a targeted low-income pregnant woman” after “targeted low-income child”.

(2) EXTENDING MEDICAID COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting “(including oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women (as defined in section 1905(ee))” after “postpartum medical assistance under the plan”;

(II) by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”;

(B) in subsection (l)(1)(A), by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(3) EXTENDING MEDICAID COVERAGE FOR LAWFUL RESIDENTS.—Section 1903(v)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(v)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(4) EXTENDING CHIP COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 2112(d)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 139711(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(5) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1902(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) During the period that begins on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ends on the date that is five years after such date of enactment, as a condition for receiving any Federal payments under section 1903(a) for calendar quarters occurring during such

period, a State shall not have in effect, with respect to women who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan or under a waiver of such plan on the basis of being pregnant or having been pregnant, eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures under the State plan or waiver that are more restrictive than the eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures, respectively, under such plan or waiver that are in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”

(B) CHIP.—Section 2105(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) IN ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR TARGETED LOW-INCOME PREGNANT WOMEN.—During the period that begins on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ends on the date that is five years after such date of enactment, as a condition of receiving payments under subsection (a) and section 1903(a), a State that elects to provide assistance to women on the basis of being pregnant (including pregnancy-related assistance provided to targeted low-income pregnant women (as defined in section 2112(d)), pregnancy-related assistance provided to women who are eligible for such assistance through application of section 1902(v)(4)(A)(i) under section 2107(e)(1), or any other assistance under the State child health plan (or a waiver of such plan) which is provided to women on the basis of being pregnant) shall not have in effect, with respect to such women, eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures under such plan (or waiver) that are more restrictive than the eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures, respectively, under such plan (or waiver) that are in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”

(6) INFORMATION ON BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make publicly available on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services, information regarding benefits available to pregnant and postpartum women and under the Medicaid program and the Children’s Health Insurance Program, including information on—

(A) benefits that States are required to provide to pregnant and postpartum women under such programs;

(B) optional benefits that States may provide to pregnant and postpartum women under such programs; and

(C) the availability of different kinds of benefits for pregnant and postpartum women, including oral health and mental health benefits, under such programs.

(7) FEDERAL FUNDING FOR COST OF EXTENDED MEDICAID AND CHIP COVERAGE FOR POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(i) in subsection (b), by striking “and (aa)” and inserting “(aa), and (ff)”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ff) INCREASED FMAP FOR EXTENDED MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Federal medical assistance percentage for a State, with respect to amounts expended by such State for medical assistance for a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant or having been pregnant that is provided during the 305-day period that begins on the 60th day after the last day of her pregnancy (including any such assistance provided during the month in which such period ends), shall be equal to—

“(1) 100 percent for the first 20 calendar quarters during which this subsection is in effect; and

“(2) 90 percent for calendar quarters thereafter.”

(B) CHIP.—Section 2105(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) ENHANCED PAYMENT FOR EXTENDED ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO PREGNANT WOMEN.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the enhanced FMAP, with respect to payments under subsection (a) for expenditures under the State child health plan (or a waiver of such plan) for assistance provided under the plan (or waiver) to a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant (including pregnancy-related assistance provided to a targeted low-income pregnant woman (as defined in section 2112(d)), pregnancy-related assistance provided to a woman who is eligible for such assistance through application of section 1902(v)(4)(A)(i) under section 2107(e)(1), or any other assistance under the plan (or waiver) provided to a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant) during the 305-day period that begins on the 60th day after the last day of her pregnancy (including any such assistance provided during the month in which such period ends), shall be equal to—

“(A) 100 percent for the first 20 calendar quarters during which this paragraph is in effect; and

“(B) 90 percent for calendar quarters thereafter.”

(8) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter that begins on or after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCEPTION FOR STATE LEGISLATION.—In the case of a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act or a State child health plan under title XXI of such Act that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation in order for the respective plan to meet any requirement imposed by amendments made by this subsection, the respective plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet such an additional requirement before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(f) REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.—Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 399V-7. REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE ADDRESSING IMPLICIT BIAS AND CULTURAL COMPETENCY IN PATIENT-PROVIDER INTERACTIONS EDUCATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with such other agency heads as the Secretary determines appropriate, shall award cooperative agreements for the establishment or support of regional centers of excellence addressing implicit bias and cultural competency in patient-provider interactions education for the purpose of enhancing and improving how health care professionals are educated in implicit bias and delivering culturally competent health care.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a cooperative agreement under subsection (a), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or other nonprofit entity specified by the Secretary that provides educational and training opportunities for students and health care professionals, which may be a health system, teaching hospital, community health center, medical school, school of public health, dental school, social work school, school of professional psychology, or any other health professional school or program at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965) focused on the prevention, treatment, or recovery of health conditions that contribute to maternal mortality and the prevention of maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity;

“(2) demonstrate community engagement and participation, such as through partnerships with home visiting and case management programs; and

“(3) provide to the Secretary such information, at such time and in such manner, as the Secretary may require.

“(c) DIVERSITY.—In awarding a cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into account any regional differences among eligible entities and make an effort to ensure geographic diversity among award recipients.

“(d) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services information submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b)(3).

“(2) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each regional center of excellence established or supported pursuant to subsection (a) and disseminate the findings resulting from each such evaluation to the appropriate public and private entities.

“(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall share evaluations and overall findings with State departments of health and other relevant State level offices to inform State and local best practices.

“(e) MATERNAL MORTALITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘maternal mortality’ means death of a woman that occurs during pregnancy or within the one-year period following the end of such pregnancy.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

(g) SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN.—Section 17(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(3)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking the clause designation and heading and all that follows through “A State” and inserting the following:

“(ii) WOMEN.—

“(I) BREASTFEEDING WOMEN.—A State”;

(2) in subclause (I) (as so designated), by striking “1 year” and all that follows through “earlier” and inserting “2 years postpartum”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—A State may elect to certify a postpartum woman for a period of 2 years.”

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MATERNAL MORTALITY.—The term “maternal mortality” means death of a woman that occurs during pregnancy or within the one-year period following the end of such pregnancy.

(2) SEVERE MATERNAL MORBIDITY.—The term “severe maternal morbidity” includes unexpected outcomes of labor and delivery that result in significant short-term or long-term consequences to a woman’s health.

SEC. 4. INCREASING EXCISE TAXES ON CIGARETTES AND ESTABLISHING EXCISE TAX EQUITY AMONG ALL TOBACCO PRODUCT TAX RATES.

(a) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—Section 5701(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$24.78” and inserting “\$49.56”.

(b) TAX PARITY FOR PIPE TOBACCO.—Section 5701(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$2.8311 cents” and inserting “\$49.56”.

(c) TAX PARITY FOR SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—(1) Section 5701(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$1.51” and inserting “\$26.84”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “50.33 cents” and inserting “\$10.74”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) SMOKELESS TOBACCO SOLD IN DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS.—On discrete single-use units, \$100.66 per thousand.”

(2) Section 5702(m) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or chewing tobacco” and inserting “, chewing tobacco, or discrete single-use unit”;

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “that is not a discrete single-use unit” before the period in each such paragraph; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNIT.—The term ‘discrete single-use unit’ means any product containing tobacco that—

“(A) is not intended to be smoked; and

“(B) is in the form of a lozenge, tablet, pill, pouch, dissolvable strip, or other discrete single-use or single-dose unit.”

(d) TAX PARITY FOR SMALL CIGARS.—Paragraph (1) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$50.33” and inserting “\$100.66”.

(e) TAX PARITY FOR LARGE CIGARS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “52.75 percent” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “\$49.56 per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound but not less than 10.066 cents per cigar.”

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary’s delegate, may issue guidance regarding the appropriate method for determining the weight of large cigars for purposes of calculating the applicable tax under section 5701(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO AND CERTAIN PROCESSED TOBACCO.—Subsection (o) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, and includes processed tobacco that is removed for delivery or delivered to a person other than a person with a permit provided under section 5713, but does not include removals of processed tobacco for exportation” after “wrappers thereof”.

(g) CLARIFYING TAX RATE FOR OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—Any product not otherwise described under this section that has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration through its authorities under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act shall be taxed at a level of tax equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis as determined by the Secretary.”

(2) ESTABLISHING PER USE BASIS.—For purposes of section 5701(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, not later than 12 months after the later of the date of the enactment

of this Act or the date that a product has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate) shall issue final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product that is equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis.

(h) **CLARIFYING DEFINITION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—The term ‘tobacco products’ means—

“(1) cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, and roll-your-own tobacco, and
“(2) any other product subject to tax pursuant to section 5701(i).”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (d) of section 5702 of such Code is amended by striking “cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, or roll-your-own tobacco” each place it appears and inserting “tobacco products”.

(i) **INCREASING TAX ON CIGARETTES.**—

(1) **SMALL CIGARETTES.**—Section 5701(b)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “\$50.33” and inserting “\$100.66”.

(2) **LARGE CIGARETTES.**—Section 5701(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “\$105.69” and inserting “\$211.38”.

(j) **TAX RATES ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION.**—Section 5701 of such Code, as amended by subsection (g), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2018, the dollar amounts provided under this chapter shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

“(2) **ROUNDING.**—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$0.01, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$0.01.”.

(k) **FLOOR STOCKS TAXES.**—

(1) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—On tobacco products manufactured in or imported into the United States which are removed before any tax increase date and held on such date for sale by any person, there is hereby imposed a tax in an amount equal to the excess of—

(A) the tax which would be imposed under section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the article if the article had been removed on such date, over

(B) the prior tax (if any) imposed under section 5701 of such Code on such article.

(2) **CREDIT AGAINST TAX.**—Each person shall be allowed as a credit against the taxes imposed by paragraph (1) an amount equal to \$500. Such credit shall not exceed the amount of taxes imposed by paragraph (1) on such date for which such person is liable.

(3) **LIABILITY FOR TAX AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.**—

(A) **LIABILITY FOR TAX.**—A person holding tobacco products on any tax increase date to which any tax imposed by paragraph (1) applies shall be liable for such tax.

(B) **METHOD OF PAYMENT.**—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations.

(C) **TIME FOR PAYMENT.**—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid on or before the date that is 120 days after the effective date of the tax rate increase.

(4) **ARTICLES IN FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.**—Notwithstanding the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the Foreign Trade Zone Act, 48 Stat. 998, 19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.),

or any other provision of law, any article which is located in a foreign trade zone on any tax increase date shall be subject to the tax imposed by paragraph (1) if—

(A) internal revenue taxes have been determined, or customs duties liquidated, with respect to such article before such date pursuant to a request made under the 1st proviso of section 3(a) of such Act, or

(B) such article is held on such date under the supervision of an officer of the United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to the 2d proviso of such section 3(a).

(5) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 5702 of such Code shall have the same meaning as such term has in such section.

(B) **TAX INCREASE DATE.**—The term “tax increase date” means the effective date of any increase in any tobacco product excise tax rate pursuant to the amendments made by this section (other than subsection (j) thereof).

(C) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(6) **CONTROLLED GROUPS.**—Rules similar to the rules of section 5061(e)(3) of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(7) **OTHER LAWS APPLICABLE.**—All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by section 5701 of such Code shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection, apply to the floor stocks taxes imposed by paragraph (1), to the same extent as if such taxes were imposed by such section 5701. The Secretary may treat any person who bore the ultimate burden of the tax imposed by paragraph (1) as the person to whom a credit or refund under such provisions may be allowed or made.

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) through (4), the amendments made by this section shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the last day of the month which includes the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS AND PROCESSED TOBACCO.**—The amendments made by subsections (c)(1)(C), (c)(2), and (f) shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **LARGE CIGARS.**—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to articles removed after December 31, 2019.

(4) **OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—The amendments made by subsection (g)(1) shall apply to products removed after the last day of the month which includes the date that the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate) issues final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 122—OBSERVING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENOCIDE IN RWANDA

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 122

Whereas 25 years ago, between April and June 1994, an estimated 800,000 Rwandans, most of them members of the minority Tutsi community along with some politically moderate Hutus, were killed in an organized campaign of genocide;

Whereas up to 2,000,000 people fled Rwanda as refugees, 1,000,000 were internally displaced, and of the survivors, 75,000 were children who lost one or both parents;

Whereas the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda was dramatically scaled back as the genocide occurred, with the United States and other nations failing to stop the killings;

Whereas the genocide forced Rwandans to confront core issues of ethnic and national identity, justice, peace, reconciliation, and security;

Whereas the people and Government of Rwanda have taken steps to foster peace and reconciliation;

Whereas Rwanda's position on the United Nations Development Program Human Development Index continues to steadily improve, although the nation remains one of the world's poorest, positioned at 158 out of 189 countries and territories requiring continued development assistance and support; and

Whereas the people and Government of the United States support the people of Rwanda in their aspirations for continued economic growth, improved food security, better health outcomes, protection of biodiversity, and fully accountable governance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) solemnly observes the 25th Anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, which began on April 6, 1994;

(2) recognizes the failure of the international community, including the United States, to provide urgent assistance in preventing and stopping the genocide;

(3) reaffirms that the people of the United States will continue to stand with the people of Rwanda in their ongoing journey towards reconciliation, peace, and open, inclusive, and accountable governance;

(4) reaffirms its commitment to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, done at Paris December 9, 1948;

(5) supports ongoing efforts to educate the people of the United States, and around the world, about the genocide in Rwanda, hoping to prevent the commission of any such future occurrences in Rwanda or elsewhere;

(6) commits to continuing efforts to strengthen and support Rwandan, United States, and other international institutions and tribunals working to bring to justice those responsible for the genocide; and

(7) calls on the United States Government and the international community to seize on the occasion of this anniversary to focus attention on the future of Rwanda, cooperating to prevent and respond to genocide and crimes against humanity in nations across the globe, and to support the people of Rwanda so that they may—

(A) be free from future ethnic violence;

(B) experience full civil and human rights, without fear of violence or intimidation;

(C) peacefully resolve disputes; and

(D) benefit from sustained economic growth and development, which improves the health, prosperity and standard of living of all.

SENATE RESOLUTION 123—SUPPORTING THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND RECOGNIZING ITS 70 YEARS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 123

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded on April 4, 1949, to “safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of [its] peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law”.

(2) The United States Senate approved the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on July 21, 1949, and the United States Government acceded to membership in NATO on August 24, 1949.

(3) NATO is a community of democracies that acts collectively to promote freedom, stability, and peace around the globe.

(4) NATO has continued to welcome into its membership those nations that have evinced a desire to partake in the alliance’s commitment to settle international disputes peaceably, strengthen their free institutions, promote conditions of stability and well-being, and seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies, and which are dedicated to maintaining and developing their capacity to resist armed attack.

(5) The sustained commitment of NATO to mutual defense has made possible the democratic and economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe.

(6) Lasting stability and security in Europe requires the further military, economic, and political integration of emerging democracies into existing European and transatlantic structures.

(7) NATO serves as a force multiplier, whose command structures, training institutions, and multilateral exercises have generated unprecedented multinational contributions to United States national security priorities and enabled European and Canadian soldiers to fight side-by-side with members of the United States Armed Forces.

(8) The allies invoked NATO’s Article 5 collective defense clause and offered military assistance to the United States in responding to the attacks of September 11, 2001.

(9) NATO member nations stood in support of the United States after it was attacked on September 11, 2001, sending tens of thousands troops to fight alongside American soldiers in Afghanistan.

(10) NATO is currently involved in several operations benefiting United States national security, including Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan, NATO’s Kosovo Force (KFOR), Operation Sea Guardian in the Mediterranean Sea (maritime situational awareness, counter-terrorism at sea, and support to capacity-building), the capacity-building NATO Mission Iraq, support for African Union missions, and air policing missions in the member and nonmember nations of Eastern Europe.

(11) NATO members have stood against Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, have supported United States sanctions on that country and imposed their own, have responded, as noted in the NATO Brussels Summit Declaration of 2018, “to the deteriorated security environment by enhancing our deterrence and defence posture, includ-

ing by a forward presence in the eastern part of the Alliance,” and have asserted that “there can be no return to ‘business as usual’ until there is a clear, constructive change in Russia’s actions that demonstrates compliance with international law and its international obligations and responsibilities”.

(12) The NATO Wales Summit Declaration of 2014 pledged, “Allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defence will aim to continue to do so. . . . Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defence is below this level will: halt any decline in defence expenditure; aim to increase defence expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2% guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO’s capability shortfalls.”

(13) Twenty-two NATO nations have increased their military spending since the Wales Declaration of 2014.

(14) The NATO Brussels Summit Declaration of 2018 stated, “We reaffirm our unwavering commitment to all aspects of the Defence Investment Pledge agreed at the 2014 Wales Summit, and to submit credible national plans on its implementation, including the spending guidelines for 2024, planned capabilities, and contributions. Fair burden sharing underpins the Alliance’s cohesion, solidarity, credibility, and ability to fulfil our Article 3 and Article 5 commitments. We welcome the considerable progress made since the Wales Summit with four consecutive years of real growth in non-US defence expenditure. All Allies have started to increase the amount they spend on defence in real terms and some two-thirds of Allies have national plans in place to spend 2% of their Gross Domestic Product on defence by 2024. More than half of Allies are spending more than 20% of their defence expenditures on major equipment, including related research and development, and, according to their national plans, 24 Allies will meet the 20% guideline by 2024. Allies are delivering more of the heavier, high-end capabilities we require and are improving the readiness, deployability, sustainability, and interoperability of their forces.”

(15) NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg has stated, “By the end of next year, NATO allies will add . . . 100 billion extra U.S. dollars toward defense.”

(16) Allies who have recently acceded to NATO are amongst the highest per capita contributors to NATO missions.

(17) At the Bucharest Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in April 2008, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of NATO declared, “NATO’s ongoing enlargement process has been an historic success in advancing stability and cooperation and bringing us closer to our common goal of a Europe whole and free, united in peace, democracy and common values. NATO’s door will remain open to European democracies willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. We reiterate that decisions on enlargement are for NATO itself to make.”

(18) Vice President Mike Pence in June 2017 reiterated that the United States “commitment [to NATO] is unwavering” and that “NATO’s open door must always remain so”.

(19) The Governments, leaders, and parliaments of Greece and the Republic of North Macedonia have ended their dispute and ratified the Prespa Agreement, resolving a long-standing bilateral dispute and establishing a strategic partnership between the two countries and clearing the way for North Macedonia’s accession to NATO.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) lauds NATO for its 70-year maintenance of the alliance and recognizes its singular contributions to maintaining the safety, security, and democratic systems of its members;

(2) calls on NATO member states to continue to fully meet their Wales pledges, more fully share the security burden by increasing their defense spending with a focus on meeting capabilities targets, enhancing interoperability, improving readiness, and modernization to respond to the threats that face the alliance on each of its flanks;

(3) stands in robust support of those NATO members who spend two percent or more of their GDPs on defense, acknowledges the four countries that have met that goal since 2014, and strongly encourages the remainder to strive to quickly reach that goal;

(4) affirms that the Senate stands ready to consider, if all applicable criteria are satisfied, the Republic of North Macedonia’s application to join NATO;

(5) backs the White House’s 2017 affirmation that the United States “stand[s] firmly behind Article 5” of the NATO Treaty;

(6) welcomes former Secretary of Defense James Mattis’ efforts to encourage significant NATO reforms, especially regarding modernization, readiness, command structure adaptation, military mobility, and improving NATO’s speed of decisionmaking to ensure the alliance remains fit for purpose; and

(7) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to NATO’s mission, and its belief that NATO is the most successful security alliance in our Nation’s history and one that will continue to be a cornerstone of United States security.

SENATE RESOLUTION 124—CONDEMNING THE MARCH 15, 2019, TERRORIST ATTACKS IN CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND, OFFERING SINCERE CONDOLENCES TO ALL OF THE VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND EXPRESSING AND STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 124

Whereas, on March 15, 2019, an armed white supremacist murdered 50 Muslims and injured dozens more at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand;

Whereas Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern has said that “[i]t is clear that this can now only be described as a terrorist attack,” noting that many of the victims could be migrants or refugees, and pronouncing it “one of New Zealand’s darkest days”;

Whereas the people of New Zealand are grieving following the terrorist attacks, which targeted and killed innocent men, women, and children;

Whereas the people of the United States and New Zealand stood shoulder-to-shoulder and shared spilled blood in the struggles of the 20th century to combat fascism, racism, and other extremist ideologies;

Whereas New Zealand is among the closest allies of the United States;

Whereas New Zealand is a diverse nation with a proud tradition of immigration with more than 200 ethnicities and 160 languages, and the strength and vibrancy of New Zealand are enhanced by the diverse religious beliefs and tolerance of its citizens, including followers of all major religions, including Islam, Christianity, and Judaism;

Whereas the suspect in the Christchurch killings is a self-described immigrant-hating white supremacist who used a helmet-mounted camera to broadcast live video of the slaughter in an apparent effort to instigate further white supremacist, anti-Muslim, and anti-immigrant violence;

Whereas, over the past several years, there has been a disturbing increase in white supremacist violence around the globe, with dozens of people of faith murdered, including in their places of worship;

Whereas the scourge of white nationalism around the world must be condemned unequivocally; and

Whereas the reprehensible attacks at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques have no place in a peaceful, civilized, tolerant world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific terrorist attacks on the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the victims of those attacks and their families;

(3) expresses solidarity with the people of New Zealand, including the Islamic community of New Zealand;

(4) recognizes the threat posed by white supremacist terrorism and recommitments United States leadership in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant societies; and

(5) calls upon the United States Government to redouble its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of white supremacist terrorism.

SENATE RESOLUTION 125—DESIGNATING MARCH 2019 AS “NATIONAL WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH”

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MCSALLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 125

Whereas National Women’s History Month recognizes and spreads awareness of the importance of women in the history of the United States;

Whereas, throughout the history of the United States, whether in the home, their workplace, school, the courts, or in wartime, women have fought for themselves, their families, and all people of the United States;

Whereas, even from the early days of the history of the United States, Abigail Adams urged her husband to “Remember the ladies” when representatives met for the Continental Congress in 1776;

Whereas women were particularly important in the establishment of early charitable, philanthropic, and cultural institutions in the United States;

Whereas women led the efforts to secure suffrage and equal opportunity for women, and also served in the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, labor movements, civil rights movements, and other causes to create a more fair and just society for all;

Whereas suffragists wrote, marched, were arrested, and ultimately succeeded in achieving the enactment of—

(1) the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, section 1 of which provides that “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex”; and

(2) the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), which extended the protection of the right to vote to women of color and language minorities;

Whereas, in 2019, the United States celebrates the 100th anniversary of Congress proposing the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees women the constitutional right to vote;

Whereas women have been and continue to be leaders in the forefront of social change efforts, business, science, government, math, art, literature, music, film, athletics, and more;

Whereas women now represent approximately half of the workforce of the United States;

Whereas women once were routinely barred from attending medical schools of the United States, but now are enrolling in medical schools of the United States at higher numbers than men;

Whereas women previously were turned away from law school, but now represent approximately half of law students in the United States;

Whereas women have been vital to the mission of the Armed Forces since the American Revolution, serving in volunteer and enlisted positions, with more than 200,000 active-duty servicewomen and 2,000,000 veterans representing every branch of service;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 women own businesses in the United States;

Whereas Jeannette Rankin of Montana was the first woman elected to the House of Representatives in 1916 and Hattie Wyatt Caraway of Arkansas was the first woman elected to the United States Senate in 1932;

Whereas Margaret Chase Smith of Maine was the first woman to serve in both houses of Congress;

Whereas a record number of women were elected to public office in the 2018 midterm elections;

Whereas, in the 116th Congress, a record 25 women serve as United States Senators, and 102 women serve in the House of Representatives;

Whereas President Jimmy Carter issued the first Presidential Proclamation designating March 2 through 8, 1980, as “National Women’s History Week”;

Whereas, in 1987, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced the first joint resolution to pass Congress designating “Women’s History Month”;

Whereas President Ronald Reagan issued the first “Women’s History Month” Presidential Proclamation in 1987; and

Whereas, despite the advancements of women in the United States, much remains to be done to ensure that women realize their full potential as equal members of society in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2019 as “National Women’s History Month”;

(2) recognizes the celebration of “National Women’s History Month” as a time to reflect

on the many notable contributions that women have made to the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe “National Women’s History Month” with appropriate programs and activities.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Women’s History Month to recognize the tremendous achievements women have made for the United States and pay tribute to their tireless efforts to fight for themselves, their families, and all Americans.

We have set aside this month for over 30 years to give us the opportunity to not only reflect on the past and observe the many accomplishments of American women, but to also inspire the next generation of women leaders. I look upon the great courage our foremothers have displayed with great admiration and continue to personally be inspired by those who blazed the trail for women like me.

When I first came to Washington in 1992, they called it the “Year of the Woman.” Only two other women were serving in the Senate, and four women had just been elected to the chamber, myself included. Today, a quarter of the Senate is represented by women and a record 102 women serve in the House of Representatives, including the first woman speaker. I am proud of the progress we’ve made and hopeful we will continue to build on that momentum toward full equality..

Even at record levels, though, the number of women in Congress falls far short of the 51 percent of our Nation’s population that are women. I have great hope in the next generations of women to rise up and help lead the way in building a better California and United States.

As in government, women have been and continue to be leaders in major social change efforts in our Nation. The business world has been transformed by powerful women at the table, as have science, music, film, athletics, literature, and much more. Today, there are more than 10 million women owned American businesses and half of our workforce is made up of women.

Enrollment numbers at medical and law schools are now almost evenly split between men and women. Our women warriors serve in critical roles in the U.S. Armed Forces, with more than 200,000 active-duty servicewomen proudly serving and a growing number of women veterans representing every branch of service.

Women who have selflessly answered the call to duty have served their Nation with honor, courage, and distinction. I have the utmost respect for the dignity and valor they exhibit and they are commended.

As a United States Senator proudly representing California, I ask you to join me in celebrating the stories and greatness of American women who accomplished the unprecedented and honor their legacies by continuing to defend the rights they worked so hard to achieve. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

SENATE RESOLUTION 126—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF MARCH 25 THROUGH MARCH 29, 2019, AS “PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 126

Whereas public education is a significant institution in a 21st-century democracy;

Whereas the public schools in the United States are where students come to be educated about the values and beliefs that hold the people of the United States together as a nation;

Whereas public schools prepare young people of the United States to contribute to the society, economy, and citizenry of the country;

Whereas 90 percent of children in the United States attend public schools;

Whereas local, State, and Federal lawmakers should prioritize support for strengthening the public schools of the United States and empower superintendents, principals, and other school leaders to implement, manage, and lead school districts and schools in partnership with educators, parents, and other local education stakeholders;

Whereas local, State, and Federal lawmakers should support services and programs such as counseling, extracurricular activities, and mental health supports that are critical to help students engage in learning;

Whereas public schools should foster inclusive, safe, and high-quality environments where children can learn to think critically, problem solve, and build relationships;

Whereas public schools should provide an environment in which all students can have the opportunity to succeed beginning in their earliest years, regardless of who they are or where they live;

Whereas Congress should support efforts to advance equal opportunity and excellence in public education and to implement continuous improvement and evidence-based practices;

Whereas every child should receive an education that helps the child reach the child's full potential and to attend schools that offer a high-quality educational experience;

Whereas Federal funding, in addition to local and State funds, supports the access of students to inviting classrooms, well-prepared educators, and services to support healthy students, such as nutrition and after school programs;

Whereas teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals should provide a well-rounded education and strive to create joy in learning;

Whereas superintendents, principals, other school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents make public schools vital components of communities and are working hard to improve educational outcomes for children across the country; and

Whereas the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, would be an appropriate period to designate as “Public Schools Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, as “Public Schools Week”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 127—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 127

Whereas, since its inception in 1994, the AmeriCorps national service program has proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,000,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to “get things done for America” by becoming AmeriCorps members;

Whereas, each year, AmeriCorps, in coordination with State service commissions, provides opportunities for approximately 75,000 individuals across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members have served more than 1,500,000,000 hours nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas, since 1994, more than \$9,200,000,000 in AmeriCorps funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members serve at more than 20,000 locations across the United States, including at nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations;

Whereas AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps campuses in the States of Mississippi, Maryland, Iowa, California, and Colorado strengthen communities and develop future leaders through team-based service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than \$3,700,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members, after their terms of service with AmeriCorps end, have been more likely to remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, teachers, and nonprofit professionals than the average individual;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and to help close the skills gap in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people turning toward problems and working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2019 from March 10 through March 16, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps for making the program possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT TAX-EXEMPT FRATERNAL BENEFIT SOCIETIES HAVE HISTORICALLY PROVIDED AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE CRITICAL BENEFITS TO THE PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas the fraternal benefit societies of the United States are longstanding mutual aid organizations created more than a century ago to serve the needs of communities and provide for the payment of life, health,

accident, and other benefits to their members;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies represent a successful, modern-day model under which individuals come together with a common purpose to collectively provide charitable and other beneficial activities for society;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies operate under a chapter system, creating a nationwide infrastructure, combined with local energy and knowledge, which positions fraternal benefit societies to most efficiently address unmet needs in communities, many of which the government cannot address;

Whereas the fraternal benefit society model represents one of the largest member-volunteer networks in the United States, with approximately 8,000,000 people of the United States belonging to more than 25,000 local chapters across the country;

Whereas research has shown that the value of the work of fraternal benefit societies to society is more than \$3,800,000,000 per year, accounting for charitable giving, educational programs, and volunteer activities, as well as important social capital that strengthens the fabric, safety, and quality of life in thousands of local communities in the United States;

Whereas, in 1909, Congress recognized the value of fraternal benefit societies and exempted those organizations from taxation, as later codified in section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve the evolving needs of their members and the public;

Whereas the efforts of fraternal benefit societies to help people of the United States save money and be financially secure relieves pressure on government safety net programs; and

Whereas Congress recognizes that fraternal benefit societies have served their original purpose for more than a century, helping countless individuals, families, and communities through fraternal member activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the fraternal benefit society model is a successful private sector economic and social support system that helps meet needs that would otherwise go unmet;

(2) the provision of payment for life, health, accident, or other benefits to the members of fraternal benefit societies in accordance with section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is necessary to support the charitable and fraternal activities of the volunteer chapters within the communities of fraternal benefit societies;

(3) fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve their members and the public; and

(4) the exemption from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of fraternal benefit societies continues to generate significant returns to the United States, and the work of fraternal benefit societies should continue to be promoted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 203. Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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.

SA 204. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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.

SA 205. Mr. LEAHY 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.

SA 206. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 207. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 208. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 209. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 210. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 211. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) 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.

SA 212. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. KENNEDY) 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 203. Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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:

On page 55, line 20, insert after "Secretary:" the following: "Provided further, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$150,000,000 shall be allocated to meet unmet infrastructure needs for grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2017 under this heading of division B of Public Law 115-56 and title XI of Public Law 115-123:"

SA 204. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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 end of title V of division A, add the following:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 501. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of assistance provided for DR-4336-PR, DR-4339-PR, DR-4340-USVI and DR-4335-USVI under sections 403, 406 and 407 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emer-

gency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b and 5173) shall be 100 percent of the eligible costs under such sections.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The Federal share provided by subsection (a) shall apply to disaster assistance applied for before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 502. The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall provide assistance, pursuant to section 428 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), for critical services as defined in section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act for the duration of the recovery for incidents DR-4404, DR-4396, and DR-4398 to—

(1) replace or restore the function of a facility or system to industry standards without regard to the pre-disaster condition of the facility or system; and

(2) replace or restore components of the facility or system not damaged by the disaster where necessary to fully effectuate the replacement or restoration of disaster-damaged components to restore the function of the facility or system to industry standards.

SA 205. Mr. LEAHY 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:

Strike all after page 55, line 6 through page 62, line 6 and insert the following:

“(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

“For an additional amount for ‘Community Development Fund’, \$1,491,000,000 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 (except as otherwise provided under this heading) 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 of the amounts made available under this heading the Secretary shall allocate an amount necessary to address unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure for grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2017 under this heading of division B of Public Law 115-56 and title XI of subdivision 1 of division B of Public Law 115-123: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided in the previous proviso, the Secretary’s determination of unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure shall not take into account mitigation-specific allocations: *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 receiving awards for disasters that occurred in 2018, for mitigation activities in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018: *Provided further*, That

allocations under the previous proviso shall be made in the same proportion that the amount of funds each grantee received or will receive under this heading for unmet needs related to disasters that occurred in 2018 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 Act 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 Act: *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.”;

(2) at the appropriate place under title X, insert the following:

“SEC. ____ Of all amounts made available for mitigation activities under the heading ‘Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund’ in Public Law 115-123, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations to all eligible grantees, and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to such allocations within 90 days after enactment of this Act;

“(1) For any plans or amendments addressing the use of any funds provided under Public Law 115-123 and received by the Secretary prior to December 22, 2018, the Secretary shall review pending amendments within 15 days of enactment of this Act and pending plans within 30 days of enactment of this Act;

“(2) After the date of this Act, the Secretary may not apply the statutory waiver or alternative requirement authority provided by Public Law 115-123 to extend or otherwise alter existing statutory and regulatory provisions governing the timeline for review of required grantee plans.”;

(3) at the appropriate place under title VI, insert the following new paragraph:

“In addition, for an additional amount for ‘State and Tribal Assistance Grants’, \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$130,500,000 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 \$119,500,000 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 2, 4 and 6 in amounts determined by the Administrator for wastewater and drinking water treatment works and facilities impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, such funds allocated from funds appropriated herein shall not be subject to the matching or cost share requirements of sections 602(b)(2), 602(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act nor the matching requirements of section 1452(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, each State and Territory shall use the full amount of its capitalization grants allocated from funds appropriated herein 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, for Regions 4 and 6, 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 allocated, each State shall use not less than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent amount of its capitalization

grants allocated from funds appropriated herein 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 \$37,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein for grants to any state or territory that has not established a water pollution control revolving fund pursuant to title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act for drinking water facilities and waste water treatment plants impacted by Hurricanes Irma and Maria: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein shall only be used for eligible projects whose purpose is to reduce flood damage risk and vulnerability or to enhance resiliency to rapid hydrologic change or a 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, for Region 2, notwithstanding section 603(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(f)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds allocated from funds appropriated herein may be used to make loans or to buy, refinance or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after September 20, 2017: *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.”; and

(4) at the appropriate place under title VII, insert the following:

“GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

“SEC. ____ (a) Section 1108(g)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)(5)) is amended—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘and (E)’ and inserting ‘(E), and (F)’;

“(2) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ‘and (E)’ and inserting ‘and (F)’;

“(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F);

“(4) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following:

“(E) Subject to subparagraph (F), for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, the amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for the Northern Mariana Islands shall be further increased by \$36,000,000.”; and

“(5) in subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section)—

“(A) by striking ‘title XIX, during’ and inserting ‘title XIX—

“(1) during’;

“(B) by striking ‘and (D)’ and inserting ‘, (D), and (E)’;

“(C) by striking ‘and the Virgin Islands’ each place it appears and inserting ‘, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands’;

“(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘; and’; and

“(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, with respect to payments to Guam and American Samoa from the additional funds provided under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall increase the Federal medical assistance percentage or other rate that would otherwise apply to such payments to 100 percent.’.

“(b) The amounts provided by the amendments made by subsection (a) 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.”.

SA 206. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) 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:

On page 55, line 7, strike “\$1,060,000,000” and insert “\$2,940,000,000”.

SA 207. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) 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:

On page 20, line 5, strike “\$740,000,000” and insert “\$1,500,000,000”.

SA 208. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) 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:

On page 19, line 11, strike “\$35,000,000” and insert “\$96,000,000”.

SA 209. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) 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:

On page 18, line 5, strike “\$200,000,000” and insert “\$1,180,000,000”.

SA 210. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) 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:

On page 18, line 5, strike “\$200,000,000” and insert “\$1,180,000,000”.

On page 19, line 11, strike “\$35,000,000” and insert “\$96,000,000”.

On page 20, line 5, strike “\$740,000,000” and insert “\$1,500,000,000”.

On page 55, line 7, strike “\$1,060,000,000” and insert “\$2,940,000,000”.

SA 211. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) 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. ____ . AUTHORITY TO BEGIN PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HAZARD MITIGATION PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the term “covered project” means a project—

(A) that will result in protection to property; and

(B) for which an entity initiated planning or construction before or after requesting assistance for the project under a hazard mitigation grant program; and

(3) the term “hazard mitigation grant program” means—

(A) the predisaster hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133);

(B) the hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c); and

(C) the flood mitigation assistance program authorized under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c).

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE FOR INITIATED PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity seeking hazard mitigation assistance under a hazard mitigation grant program shall be eligible to receive such assistance for a covered project if the entity—

(A) complies with all other eligibility requirements of the hazard mitigation grant program; and

(B) complies with all Federal planning and building requirements for the project.

(2) COSTS INCURRED.—An entity seeking hazard mitigation assistance under a hazard mitigation grant program shall be responsible for any project costs incurred by the entity for a covered project if the covered project is not awarded, or is determined to be ineligible for, assistance.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any application for hazard mitigation assistance for a covered project submitted on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 212. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. KENNEDY) 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. ____ 01. For all amounts made available for mitigation activities under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in Public Law 115–123, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register the allocations made to all eligible grantees and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to those allocations.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 9 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 COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing "Our blue economy, success and opportunities."

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 Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Chairman's housing reform outline, part II."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Robert A. Destro, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment), to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, and David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Annual oversight of the Smithsonian Institutions."

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting on pending legislation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION, OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Aviation, Operations, Safety, and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight of commercial aviation."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 28, the Senate proceed to executive session and consideration of Executive Calendar No. 9; further, that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 297

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 297) to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

HIDDEN FIGURES CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 590 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 590) 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.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 590) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1935, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (referred to in this section as "NACA") hired 5 women to serve as the first "computer pool" at the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory where those women took on work making calculations that male engineers had made previously.

(2) During the 1940s, NACA began recruiting African-American women to work as computers and initially separated those women from their White counterparts in a group known as the "West Area Computers" where the women were restricted to segregated dining and bathroom facilities.

(3) Katherine Johnson was born on August 26, 1918, in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.

(4) In 1953, Katherine Johnson began her career in aeronautics as a computer in the segregated West Area Computing unit described in paragraph (2).

(5) As a member of the Flight Research Division, Katherine Johnson analyzed data from flight tests. After NACA was reformulated into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this section as "NASA"), Katherine Johnson—

(A) calculated the trajectory for Alan Shepard's Freedom 7 mission in 1961, which was the first human spaceflight by an individual from the United States;

(B) co-authored a report that provided the equations for describing orbital spaceflight with a specified landing point, which made her the first woman to be recognized as an author of a report from the Flight Research Division;

(C) was asked to verify the calculations when electronic computers at NASA were used to calculate the orbit for John Glenn's Friendship 7 mission; and

(D) provided calculations for NASA throughout her career, including for the Apollo missions.

(6) Katherine Johnson retired from NASA in 1986.

(7) Dr. Christine Darden was born on September 10, 1942, in Monroe, North Carolina.

(8) In 1962, Dr. Christine Darden graduated from Hampton Institute with a B.S. in Mathematics and a teaching credential.

(9) Dr. Christine Darden attended Virginia State University where she studied aerosol

physics and earned an M.S. in Applied Mathematics.

(10) Dr. Christine Darden began her career in aeronautics in 1967 as a data analyst at NASA's Langley Research Center (referred to in this section as "Langley") before being promoted to aerospace engineer in 1973. Her work in this position resulted in the production of low-boom sonic effects, which revolutionized aerodynamics design.

(11) Dr. Christine Darden completed her education by earning a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering from George Washington University in 1983.

(12) While working at NASA, Dr. Christine Darden—

(A) was appointed to be the leader of the Sonic Boom Team, which worked on designs to minimize the effects of sonic booms by testing wing and nose designs for supersonic aircraft;

(B) wrote more than 50 articles on aeronautics design; and

(C) became the first African American to be promoted to a position in the Senior Executive Service at Langley.

(13) Dorothy Vaughan was born on September 20, 1910, in Kansas City, Missouri.

(14) Dorothy Vaughan began working for NACA in 1943. Dorothy Vaughan—

(A) started at NACA as a member of the West Area Computing unit;

(B) was promoted to be the head of the West Area Computing unit, becoming NACA's first African-American supervisor, a position that she held for 9 years; and

(C) became an expert programmer in FORTRAN as a member of NASA's Analysis and Computation Division.

(15) Dorothy Vaughan retired from NASA in 1971 and died on November 10, 2008.

(16) Mary Jackson was born on April 9, 1921, in Hampton, Virginia.

(17) Mary Jackson started her career at NACA in 1951, working as a computer as a member of the West Area Computing unit.

(18) After petitioning the city of Hampton to allow her to take graduate-level courses in math and physics at night at the all-White Hampton High School, Mary Jackson was able to complete the required training to become an engineer, making her NASA's first female African-American engineer.

(19) Mary Jackson—

(A) while at NACA and NASA—

(i) worked in the Theoretical Aerodynamics Branch of the Subsonic-Transonic Aerodynamics Division at Langley where she analyzed wind tunnel and aircraft flight data; and

(ii) published a dozen technical papers that focused on the boundary layer of air around airplanes; and

(B) after 21 years working as an engineer at NASA, transitioned to a new job as Langley's Federal Women's Program Manager where she worked to improve the prospects of NASA's female mathematicians, engineers, and scientists.

(20) Mary Jackson retired from NASA in 1985 and died in 2005.

(21) These 4 women, along with the other African-American women in NASA's West Area Computing unit, were integral to the success of the early space program. The stories of these 4 women exemplify the experiences of hundreds of women who worked as computers, mathematicians, and engineers at NACA beginning in the 1930s and the handmade calculations that they made played an integral role in—

(A) aircraft testing during World War II;

(B) supersonic flight research;

(C) sending the Voyager probes to explore the solar system; and

(D) the United States landing the first man on the lunar surface.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of 5 gold medals of appropriate design as follows:

(1) One gold medal to Katherine Johnson in recognition of her service to the United States as a mathematician.

(2) One gold medal to Dr. Christine Darden for her service to the United States as an aeronautical engineer.

(3) In recognition of their service to the United States during the Space Race—

(A) 1 gold medal commemorating the life of Dorothy Vaughan; and

(B) 1 gold medal commemorating the life of Mary Jackson.

(4) One gold medal in recognition of all women who served as computers, mathematicians, and engineers at the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration between the 1930s and the 1970s (referred to in this section as "recognized women").

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the awards under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike each gold medal described in that subsection with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MEDALS AFTER PRESENTATION.—

(1) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After the award of the gold medal commemorating the life of Dorothy Vaughan under subsection (a)(3)(A) and the award of the gold medal in recognition of recognized women under subsection (a)(4), those medals shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution where the medals shall be—

(i) available for display, as appropriate; and

(ii) made available for research.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medals received under subparagraph (A) available for—

(i) display, particularly at the National Museum of African American History and Culture; or

(ii) loan, as appropriate, so that the medals may be displayed elsewhere.

(2) TRANSFER TO FAMILY.—After the award of the gold medal in honor of Mary Jackson under subsection (a)(3)(B), the medal shall be given to her granddaughter, Wanda Jackson.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under regulations that the Secretary may promulgate, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medals struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the cost of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United

States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck under this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 125, S. Res. 126, and S. Res. 127.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 28; 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.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 10 a.m.