United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019 *No. 54*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, thank You for giving us another day.

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

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

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

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

SALARY EQUALITY

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today because it is absolutely absurd that in the year 2019, women are still paid less than men, 77 cents on the dollar compared to men, but it is even worse for women of color. Latina women make only 53 cents on the dollar.

That is why I was so proud to support the Paycheck Fairness Act, which included our amendment to specifically support women of color.

There are thousands of Latina women in my district who work hard day in, day out, only to be paid half what their male counterparts get. It hurts them, it hurts their families, and it hurts our Central Valley community.

This is an equality issue, but it is also an economic issue. In fact, almost a quarter of the families in the Central Valley have a woman as their breadwinner.

It is 2019. It is time that women, especially Latina women, are not left behind.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to take up this bill and make sure we are lifting up everyone in our communities.

CONGRESS MUST UPHOLD IDEA PROMISE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s, Congress made a commitment to provide a free and appropriate education to students with disabilities.

While we have made tremendous progress, thanks to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we have also failed to fully fund the cost of special education that was promised by Congress at that point in time.

Congress promised to cover 40 percent of the extra cost of special education, but we have never come close to fulfilling that promise. In fact, current funding remains only at 14 percent of the targeted amount.

Mr. Speaker, that is shameful.

This means our students and schools suffer, it means that the programs will be cut, it means schools won't be able to recruit and retain qualified teachers, and above all else, it means that students with disabilities will not be able to succeed, not without the appropriate high-quality services they deserve.

That is why I proudly cosponsored the bipartisan IDEA Full Funding Act, which would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach that full commitment made by Congress of 40 percent by fiscal year 2029 and each subsequent fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and uphold the promise to provide students and schools with the resources they need.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN BERSIA

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

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of central Florida community leader, faculty member, and editorial writer, John Bersia, who recently passed away.

Born and raised in central Florida, John earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Central Florida as well as masters degrees from Georgetown University, American University, and the London School of Economics.

He then returned to our community to begin writing editorials for the Orlando Sentinel. There, he won a Pulitzer Prize for an editorial series that exposed the predatory lending practices of irresponsible payday lenders, leading to legislation that cracked down on that industry.

In 2001, he began teaching at the University of Central Florida, where he helped establish the Center for the Study of Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery. Throughout his career, he inspired his students to pursue a love of travel, new cultures, and humanity-focused work, but his passion spread beyond that campus.

He hosted a weekly TV show on WUCF and chaired different institutions, including the Global Connections Foundation, the World Affairs Council of Central Florida, and the Orlando Area Committee on Foreign Relations.

John sought to broaden people's connections to the outside world while helping us see that global issues can also be local.

For that and much more, he will be truly missed.

CONGRATULATING VINCENNES UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishment of an outstanding group of young men from Vincennes University in Indiana.

For the first time since 1972 and the fourth time in school history, the Vincennes University Trailblazers captured the National Junior College Athletic Association Men's Basketball Championship.

Led by coach Todd Franklin, the Blazers had a benchmark year, ending the season with a record of 34–2 and defeating Ranger College in the championship game by a score of 87–77.

The team's standout in the finals was freshman forward Kevin Osawe, who scored 22 points and had ten rebounds, earning the tournament's most valuable player honors.

Athletics provide a set of skills that will be with these young men for the rest of their lives.

The commitment and follow-through required to come together as a team and win a national championship are rare and should be commended.

Congratulations to the Vincennes University Blazers men's basketball team on a job well done, and good luck next year.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEVE CERNAK

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of a dear friend and remarkable professional, Steve Cernak.

As CEO of Port Everglades in Broward County, Florida, Steve oversaw the largest expansion in the port's history and helped Port Everglades grow to become the number one cruise port in the country.

He had a vision for the port, and he was an incredibly dedicated public servant.

Steve loved his work, community, and family.

He was a loving husband, father, and grandfather, and took any opportunity to share how proud he was of his grandchildren, often sharing photos of them before meetings, to which I can personally attest.

His professionalism was unmatched, and I am grateful for his unwavering commitment to keeping Americans safe.

Although Steve is no longer with us, his legacy will live on through the institution he helped propel into the leading port in our Nation.

Steve Cernak was a selfless, compassionate, and tireless public servant, and he will be profoundly missed, but never forgotten.

HONORING ROCK BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Rock Bridge High School Bruins boys basketball team of Columbia, Missouri, for winning the Missouri State Championship Class 5 Basketball Championship in Springfield.

In winning the school's first boys basketball state title, the Bruins exhibited a never-say-die attitude, staging a comeback after being down by eight points heading into the final quarter against Christian Brothers College High School.

The Bruins came close last year, bowing out in the semi-finals, but this year's team would not be denied.

The long hours of practice paid off, as Rock Bridge came roaring back in the final quarter to win 63–59 and bring home the championship.

This season finale is a testament to the great coaching of Jim Scanlon and the dedication and hard work of all the players, whose determination and teamwork brought home the victory.

So congratulations to the Rock Bridge High School Bruins, state champs from Missouri's Fourth District. We are proud of you and we wish you continued success.

DOUGLAS COUNTY, COLORADO: THE HEALTHIEST COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Douglas County, Colorado, being named the healthiest community in the United States by U.S. News and World Report.

With all due respect to all of my colleagues in this body, there is no State like Colorado. We are home to 300 days of sunshine, the Rocky Mountains, and the best breweries and skiing in the country. And it should be no surprise that it helped make us the seventh fastest growing State in the country.

But this year we have added another accomplishment to our list: community health.

With seven of America's top 25 healthiest communities in Colorado, Douglas County tops that list. Home to countless walking trails, community-building events, 63,000 acres of protected land, and innovative infrastructure, Douglas County is truly a great place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleagues to Douglas County and the rest of our incredible district to see for themselves what makes The Centennial State so great.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE THE TRUTH

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thus far, I have released four transcripts of interviews from the Judiciary Committee into the apparent wrongdoing at the FBI and the Justice Department.

Today, I release the fifth.

The American people deserve transparency, they deserve to know what transpired at the highest levels of the FBI, and the origin of the probe into President Trump's campaign.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request the link, dougcollins.house.gov/nellieohr be placed in the RECORD so the American people can review the transcript of Nellie Ohr's interview.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible.

The American people deserve the truth.

□ 0915

DISPARITIES IN PAY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the disparities in pay between men and women in this country.

Today, women are paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, resulting in a gap of $10,169 each year. The gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns.

This disparity is worse for women of color. On average, Hispanic women are typically paid 53 cents; Native American women, 58 cents; and Black women, 61 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would help to close these punishing gaps by eliminating loopholes in the Equal Pay Act.

The wage gap between America's men and women denies women $900 billion in income each year. Across the country, this disparity directly affects children. In my district of the Virgin Islands, 32 percent of families with children live in poverty. Of that number, 76 percent are headed by a single mother.

We know that families who live in poverty have higher rates of instability and that children living in poverty perform worse in school than their counterparts. By paying each woman the $10,000 they lose per annum to the wage gap, we can do the right thing, and the fiscally responsible thing, and raise millions of families above the poverty line.

OPPOSING BAN ON TRANSGENDER MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 252, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 124) expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 124

Whereas, on July 26, 2017, President Trump announced via Twitter that the United States Government would reverse the existing policy of allowing transgender servicemembers to serve openly in order to implement a ban on transgender people from serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas transgender servicemembers have served openly since 2016, bravely defending our Nation with distinction while preserving unit cohesion and contributing to military readiness;

Whereas a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation found that allowing transgender Americans to serve openly in the Armed Forces would ''have minimal impact on readiness and health care costs'' and ''little or no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness or readiness'';

Whereas thousands of transgender Americans currently serve actively in the Armed Forces and in the Reserves throughout all branches and military occupational specialties;

Whereas the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and three former military Surgeons General each have affirmed the medical efficacy of transition-related care and have expressed opposition to President Trump's discriminatory ban;

Whereas the claims attempting to justify President Trump's ban are based on flawed scientific and medical assertions;

Whereas the Department of Defense report from 2018 falsely asserts there is ''considerable scientific uncertainty'' regarding the efficacy of transition-related care;

Whereas there is a global medical consensus that such care is effective, safe, and reliable;

Whereas the Department of Defense has failed to provide evidence the existing policy has impaired morale, unit readiness, or unit cohesion;

Whereas all five military Chiefs of Staff have testified publicly that the existing policy has had no adverse effect on military readiness;

Whereas, on August 1, 2017, fifty-six retired generals and admirals released a statement affirming, ''This proposed ban, if implemented, would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who would be forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy'';

Whereas at least 18 nations allow transgender people to serve openly and effectively in their armed forces;

Whereas transgender members of the Armed Forces have fought in defense of our freedoms with honor and distinction since our Nation's founding and have been bestowed with such commendations and awards as the Bronze Star and Purple Heart for their courage and sacrifices;

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces targets and stigmatizes a whole class of people; and

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces would affect all transgender members of the Armed Forces and force them to serve under a policy that stigmatizes and devalues their contributions to our Nation's defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly opposes President Trump's discriminatory ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces;

(2) rejects the flawed scientific and medical claims upon which it is based; and

(3) strongly urges the Department of Defense to not reinstate President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces and to maintain an inclusive policy allowing qualified transgender Americans to enlist and serve in the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 124.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very straightforward. The Department of Defense, in cooperation with the White House, recently issued a policy, which will be implemented in a couple weeks, that would, effectively, bar transgender people from being able to serve in the military. We have this resolution to reject that policy. It is that simple and that straightforward.

We believe the policy that the Pentagon is putting forward is unfair, based on ignorance and bigotry, and will actually harm national security. We ask the House, in this resolution, to express the sense of Congress that we oppose this policy from the Pentagon.

Again, what this policy is primarily based on is ignorance and bias against the transgender community. The policies being implemented will make it virtually impossible for them to serve in the military. This is unfair discrimination, and it is also harmful to national security.

The Army last year failed to meet its recruitment quotas. It is a constant challenge in the military to find the people who have the character, the capability, and the ability to serve in our military.

We have the best military in the history of the world. We need high-qualified people to serve. To single out a particular group of people, to discriminate against them and say that they cannot serve, not because they can't meet the qualifications—it is not because they can't run fast enough or shoot straight enough or work hard enough—to be a member of the military, but because of something that literally has nothing to do with their ability to do their job, is bad for national security and is unfair discrimination.

We have heard a lot from people about how difficult it is for unit cohesion to have transgender people in the military, a whole bunch of arguments. The only problem with that is the military leaders who have actually been responsible for this—and I am just going to read one quote. There are many, and some of my colleagues will say it as well.

Army Chief of Staff Milley, who is about to become the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last year said

there are precisely zero reports of issues of cohesion, discipline, or morale as a result of transgender people serving.

There is no issue in terms of readiness, despite what the proponents of this policy will say. It is discrimination, pure and simple, and it is unnecessary.

We also hear opponents say that the policy doesn't ban transgender people from serving and, under certain circumstances, they can. But those circumstances, as described, are so limiting and restricting. Worst of all, as I will explain in a minute, in certain parts, it allows them to serve only if they are willing to deny who they are. That amounts to a ban. If you cannot be who you are and serve in the military, then that is a choice nobody should have to make.

Let's start with the fact that, right now, under this policy, anyone who wants to join the military, if they have transitioned to a different gender, either gone through the surgery or began hormone therapy, this ban says they cannot join. Again, this doesn't say anything about their fitness to serve, in terms of their physical ability or anything. If they have simply had transition surgery or gone through hormone therapy, they are barred from serving.

Worse than that, the people who are already in the military who are transgender are, to a certain extent, grandfathered in. In many different places throughout this policy, it says over and over again that they have to serve in their biological sex. A lot of people go: Well, what the heck does that mean? That gets at the essence, at the very heart, of what it means to be transgender.

This is not something that is just in people's minds. It is a physiological condition that people are born into in which they decide they are more comfortable being in the opposite gender. That is one of the cornerstone difficulties that all these people have to go through: Who am I? What gender do I want to be?

Working with therapists and working with other people, they make that determination. They decide: I know who I am, and this is who I am going to be.

This policy now says: Sorry, we don't care what your doctor says. You cannot be the gender that you know that you are. You have to deny who you are in order to stay in the military.

In many places throughout this policy, that is a consistent theme and points out what is so totally and completely wrong about this policy.

You have also heard, undoubtedly, that there are higher healthcare costs for people who are transgender. There are a number of studies out that show that actually isn't true. Yes, healthcare expense is part of people who serve in the military, and, regrettably, people who join the military have all manner of different healthcare expenses that we do have to pick up, but there is no evidence that this has an increased cost over an average servicemember.

Furthermore, we know that the purpose of this policy is not about cost because one of the first points that I made was about how they are not now going to be allowed to join the military even if they have already gone through transition surgery or hormone therapy. So even if they are all done with that, and there is no additional medical cost to come, this policy says that they are barred and banned from joining the military.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

It makes it perfectly clear that this policy is unfair discrimination based on bigotry and ignorance, and I urge this House to reject it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a sense of Congress resolution that makes no change whatsoever in law or policy. It is a messaging bill rather than legislation that actually does something on a substantive issue.

So, one may ask, why bother opposing a bill that doesn't do anything? I have a couple answers.

Part of the answer, to me, is that we normally do not bring isolated issues in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to the floor.

Part of the reason that a national defense authorization bill has been signed into law every year for 58 straight years under Presidents of both parties and Congresses of both parties is that we try to look at national security as a whole as it relates to the Department of Defense. There have been a few isolated instances where something needed immediate attention, but, generally, we try to look at the whole, not bring isolated issues to the floor. I worry that doing so, even with a messaging bill, undermines that bipartisan approach that has been so successful.

Another part of the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that we also normally try to keep our troops above and beyond politics. Bringing a messaging bill that does nothing to law or policy also threatens to undermine that, and I worry about that.

On its face, the resolution, the messaging bill that is before us, includes a number of statements that are just flat wrong. It says that President Trump reversed the prior policy on transgender individuals in a tweet. In fact, well before any Presidential tweet, Secretary of Defense Mattis had put a delay on implementation of the policy that had previously been announced so that there could be a 6-month review. There was a 6-month review with experts, with uniformed and civilian people from all the services, with medical experts, with a whole variety of folks.

It is serious and thoughtful, despite some of the characterizations that have been made from time to time. I recommend that Members actually read it, because I think they will be impressed. They may not agree with all of the recommendations, but they will see the serious and thoughtful approach that the Department took to this issue.

As a result of this review, the previous policy was modified. It didn't go back to the way it was. Again, those details are in the report.

The resolution before us today says that the Mattis policy is a ban. It is not. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals found, on January 4, 2019, that it is factually inaccurate to call it a blanket ban. In reversing the lower court, the court of appeals said: ''The district court made an erroneous finding that the Mattis plan was the equivalent of a blanket ban on transgender service.''

This resolution before us says that there is a global medical consensus on transgender care. But the World Professional Association for Transgender Health says that they offer flexible clinical guidelines that cannot possibly reflect all the differences and situations which exist.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the substance of the matter for a second, to me, the heart of the issue is contained in the very first sentence to the Department report, which was issued in February 2018. The first sentence says: ''It is a bedrock principle of the Department of Defense that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodations should be permitted to serve.''

Any eligible individual who can meet the standards without special accommodation should be permitted to serve. That is what I believe, Mr. Speaker. I think that is what this policy attempts to achieve.

Now, it is a fair point to say it went too far this way or it didn't go far enough this way. We can have those substantive, serious debates at an appropriate time and place. But a messaging bill is not going to get that job done.

I would say, finally, Mr. Speaker, that our committee heard the day before yesterday a reminder that only 29 percent of Americans aged 17 to 25 are eligible for military service. Only 29 percent meet the physical, mental, and legal requirements to be eligible for military service, even if they want to. That means 71 percent are not eligible, for whatever reason.

There could be, and maybe there should be, a debate that the standards are too high, that we need to lower the standards, that we need to make some changes in the standards so that more people are eligible. But the point is, our view of military service is that anyone who meets those standards should be allowed to serve. If someone

cannot meet those standards, for whatever reason, through no fault of their own, then they are not able to serve. They can serve in a different way, but not in military service.

□ 0930

I think, again, Mr. Speaker, if we were to really be discussing the substance of the issue rather than a messaging bill, then we could talk about the high standards for military service without special accommodation and there would be a substantive discussion. That is not what we are doing today. It is a messaging bill, and that is too bad because there are serious issues that need to be discussed.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I will agree, this is a messaging bill, and the message is this is a bad policy. That is what the House is doing.

I will also agree that, when it comes to crafting the right policy in this area, it should be done in committee, and it will be done in committee. That is why we didn't bring that out here on the floor.

But I think it is important for the House of Representatives to make it clear how wrong we think this policy is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, equal has always been our Nation's North Star.

Endowed by our creator, inscribed by Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence, engraved above the doors to the highest court in our land, codified in our Constitution after a war tore our country apart, it is that pursuit of equality, that journey for a more perfect Union, that sets America apart.

At times, we have stumbled. We have enslaved men, women, and children because of the color of their skin. We have segregated those same families in the first breaths of their freedom.

We have stigmatized fellow Americans based on their race, their ancestry, their god, the nation of their birth, the hand that they hold, and their very identity.

Some willing to die for our freedom fought wars only to meet a government that offered them a handshake and a return to second-class citizenship.

Today, this House has a chance to not repeat the mistakes of our past, to move one step closer to that sacred promise by telling brave trans men and women in uniform that they cannot be banned from military service because of who they are—because that is the very foundation for this policy: targeted discrimination against transgender Americans.

Supporters will say otherwise. It is about unit cohesion, they say—except for the fact that the five chiefs of staff for the military branches have testified that they are aware of exactly zero instances of a transgender servicemember negatively impacting discipline or morale.

It will degrade our military, they say—except that 56 retired generals and flag officers told us that it is the ban that would degrade readiness, ''even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy'' did.

It is science, they say—except that the Department of Defense relied on data nearly half a century old and ignored plenty of other studies.

Just ask the American Medical Association, the American Psychology Association, the American Psychiatric Association.

It is about cost, they say—except that the military spends ten times more annually on erectile dysfunction medication than we have on trans-related care in the past 3 years combined.

It is not a ban, they say. Ask any one of the brave transgender servicemembers or veterans in the gallery today exactly what this ban means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in a country that celebrates freedom, this policy tells our servicemembers that they do not have the freedom to be who they are. Where is the freedom in that?

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to support this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a sharp, young patriot from my district.

She worked hard, earned straight A's, and was accepted into law school to join the JAG Corps. She, however, was denied entry into the military because she had bunions on her feet.

She is an amazing woman and a long-distance runner, but DOD's policy was clear that, due to the risk of future surgery, she could potentially be temporarily undeployable and, so, was denied entrance into military service. She did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

Another constituent was denied service because he had asthma. He, too, wanted to serve his country, but the health risk outweighed the benefits to the military. He did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

DOD's military exception standards state:

> Individuals must be free of medical conditions or physical defects that may require excessive time lost from duty for necessary treatment or hospitalization.

Our all-volunteer military is the greatest military force in the world, and we must allow it—we must allow it—to make the best medical and military judgment about what medical conditions should qualify or disqualify an individual from serving. We should not carve out exceptions for an entire population.

Military service is a privilege, not a right. That is why Secretary Mattis reviewed and issued a new policy on transgender service and the medical condition of gender dysphoria.

The policy is not a ban, and it allows transgender servicemembers to serve in their biological sex. The Mattis policy does not kick anyone out of the military for being transgender, nor does it give preferential treatment to transgender persons. All persons, unless grandfathered or granted a waiver, must serve in their birth gender.

It is a fair policy, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly as long as they are willing to serve in their biological sex and they can meet the medical behavioral standards.

This resolution we are voting on today is riddled with inaccuracies. First, as I just stated, the policy is not a ban.

Second, it claims there is a global medical consensus that transgender care is effective, safe, and reliable. That is not true. RAND, the Mayo Clinic, CMS, and others have all determined that there is not enough quality evidence to be able to say that. And there are valid concerns.

There are costs as well. The Department of Defense announced already that they have spent $8 million on those individuals who have identified as transgender last year, and that money has been spent on psychotherapy, on sex change operations. That is money that could have been spent on bullets, body armor for our troops.

Third, the resolution claims there is not an adverse effect on military readiness. This is false. The individual readiness of those undergoing treatment for gender dysphoria will be impacted. It takes over 260 days just to recover from the surgery.

Individual readiness directly impacts the readiness of our forces, so the diagnosis and treatment for transgender personnel takes them away from their jobs for an indeterminate amount of time. This lost deployment time means someone else will have to step forward and go in their place. This is unfair.

The military has valid reasons for excluding people with certain medical conditions from service. It is not the job of Congress to dictate what medical conditions the military should accept.

We should not degrade the efficiency and lethality of our Armed Forces. This resolution is riddled with false claims, and I urge my colleagues to oppose its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time and, really, for his leadership on this very important issue as to who we are as a nation, how we honor our oath to protect and defend the American people, and, in doing so, recognizing the contribution of all who want

to serve our country. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership.

I also acknowledge the leadership of our colleague JOE KENNEDY, sponsor of this legislation, for his relentless leadership and his forming and chairmanship of the Transgender Caucus that has been so important in making clear, in our policy, that we respect the dignity and worth of every person.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women who step forward to serve in the U.S. military are patriots, all of them, people of great strength and courage whose sacrifice keeps us safe. We owe those heroes our must humbled gratitude and our most steadfast support, and I want to thank our trans friends for their service, their courage, their patriotism in serving our country.

Instead of honoring their service, the President continues to insist on his cruel transgender servicemember ban. This is an act of cruelty.

Let us all salute, again, Congressman JOE KENNEDY, a champion for equality, fairness, and dignity in this Congress, for his firm, moral leadership on this resolution to oppose the President's bigoted ban.

The resolution that our distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague, JOE KENNEDY, are putting forth is bipartisan because protecting transgender servicemembers is a matter of patriotism and it transcends politics.

The President's ban, as I said, is cruel and arbitrary, a decision designed to humiliate the transgender Americans who are risking and giving their lives for the United States of America.

There is no moral justification for this ban, which violates every value of our American democracy and betrays our fundamental belief in fairness, dignity, and respect.

There is no medical justification for this ban, which the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Psychiatric Association all oppose.

And there is no military justification for this ban which would undermine our military readiness and make America less strong and safe, and that is according to our own military.

After the President first unleashed his ban, 56 retired generals and flag officers issued a statement asserting that the ban ''would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who are forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy. As a result,'' they go on to say, ''the proposed ban would degrade readiness even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.''

Other military leaders have spoken out to denounce this ban: Former Joint Chief of Staff, Mike Mullen; Army Chief of Staff, General Mark Milley; Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Karl Schultz; Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jon Richardson; Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Robert Neller.

Yet the President has chosen to ignore the expertise of these military leaders, making clear that prejudice, not patriotism, drives his decisions.

The President's ban, again, is cruel. No one with the strength and bravery to serve in the U.S. military should be turned away because of who they are.

The House will continue to fight this discriminatory action, which has no place in our country. We will never allow hate and prejudice to dictate our national security. I hope we have a resounding ''yes'' vote to reject the President's ban today.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague JOE KENNEDY for his leadership and courage.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, at some point someone has got to tell me what ''engaging in personalities'' means. I have served in this body for a long time. I still don't know what that means.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our transgender servicemembers and to stand against President Trump's proposed ban of transgender people serving in the military.

Transgender troops have been serving openly since 2016—at home, overseas, and in combat zones—without incident.

□ 0945

When I met with transgender servicemembers last month, I was impressed to learn that by serving openly—I want to make a note of that—by serving openly, the quality of their service improved, and, in fact, the obstacles—and there are many obstacles, Mr. Speaker—the obstacles they have overcome informed their greater ability to do their job. Their impressive records speak for themselves, and there is no doubt that each of the servicemembers I met with have served their country with distinction.

As already stated, this ban is blatant discrimination poorly disguised as concerns over readiness, unit cohesion, and medical costs associated with transitioning. We already know that there have been zero reports of issues regarding unit morale or cohesion since the ban was lifted in 2016, a fact that has been supported by the chief of staff of every service. The cost of medically transitioning has also been proven to have minimal impact on the military's healthcare budget.

This administration is resorting to misinformation; misinformation to exclude capable, qualified people from service to their country.

At a time when the Army is failing to meet recruitment goals, and the Navy and Air Force opted to lower their quota in order to reach their own recruitment goals, we cannot be turning away dedicated, able-bodied recruits simply because they happen to be transgender.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution with vigor.

Last month, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel within the Armed Services Committee held a hearing. It was the first time in the history of this Congress that five transgender members of the military were allowed to testify.

Four of them are trans female. One of them is trans male. All five of them have served our country with distinction. All five of them have served more than 12 years in the military. One of them is a West Point graduate. All of them have served either in Iraq, Afghanistan, multiple deployments, and in submarine service.

To the servicemember, all I saw was pride to be in the military, pride to serve their country, pride to put themselves on the line.

The testimony from the administration was like a twisted pretzel. They offered a weak and dithering defense of their cruel policy. Two things became clear at this hearing:

First, the administration policy is a ban. Make no mistake about it. Those who are in the military and serving as transgender can continue to do so. No one can come into the military who is transgender. If you are in the military and transgender and have not identified, you cannot identify. So it is a ban.

Captain Alivia Stehlik put it best:

> Currently, soldiers are allowed to seek care no matter what, trans related or not. If the policy changes, soldiers will no longer be able to seek care, because if you say, I am trans and get a diagnosis of gender dysphoria, regardless of your job performance, you are ineligible and will be terminated.

The policy is a solution in search of a problem. Worse, it discriminates against our servicemembers.

Second, the hearing demonstrated resoundingly that the last 2½ years of open service have been unequivocally successful.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, transgender servicemembers have been there for us. It is time for us to be there for them.

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

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank the ranking member for his service, and his leadership as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the President's executive order and to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). His resolution simply states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true, that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory. It reflects bias. It reflects prejudice. Indeed, it reflects bigotry.

Martin Luther King tried to teach us that what we said in the Declaration of Independence, we ought to live out. He said that all of us—and, certainly, he would have included women as we did yesterday in our Paycheck Fairness Act—are created equal in the image of God.

Martin Luther King said that we ought to judge one another on the content of our character. The President's order does not do that. The President's order is based upon a prejudiced view of somebody because of a distinction that is not the content of their character nor the quality of their performance.

I was proud to be a sponsor of and brought to this floor as majority leader, the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell legislation. That has enhanced our national security, not diminished it.

The President's resolution states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true: that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory; that it denigrates the service of patriotic Americans. That is a facet of their character. They are patriotic, and they want to serve, and the service judges them able to do so.

This resolution, millions of Americans understand, undermines our national defense at a time of serious global threats. This resolution rightfully calls on the Trump administration not to implement such a ban on April 12. To do so would be a blow to our country and the principles it represents.

Let me remind my colleagues that there was a time when we said African Americans ought not to serve with White Americans together because that would undermine morale and undermine the security of our country. That was a manifestation of prejudice and bigotry, not of intellectual honesty, content of character.

Have we not yet learned that lesson? Are we not big enough to live out the premise that all men and women are created equal? This resolution seeks to redeem the best of America's principles, not the worst of our discriminatory past.

I was proud to bring legislation to the floor as majority leader that ended Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and it was overwhelmingly supported in this House and in the Senate, and passed. It has been a benefit, not a detriment.

In the years since, we have seen our military strengthen by the open service of many LGBT Americans who have contributed a great deal to keeping America safe and advancing our national security interests around the world.

To say to transgender servicemembers in uniform that they must leave their units, not because they are not performing well, not because they are not needed, but because of who they are, not the content of their character, not their service, not their performance, but because of who they are, would be a shameful action for our country and deprive us of their talent and contributions.

To deny transgender Americans the opportunity to put on that uniform and wear the flag of the country they wish to serve—as I do every day—would be to diminish that flag, that Declaration of Independence, that Constitution of the United States of which we are so proud.

I hope my colleagues in this body will join in sending a clear message that the House, not Republicans or Democrats, that the people's House reflects the values, the service, and patriotism of our transgender fellow Americans.

Let us today reflect the best of our values, not the worst of our values. Pass this resolution. Make America proud of its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution, and of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s admonition to make our judgments based upon content of character.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, I rise in support of this resolution. When this country first debated the possibility of African Americans, women, or LGBT people serving in our military, the same doubts, the same reports, and the same concerns were raised regarding their service.

One of these misleading claims is that allowing transindividuals to serve could harm our military readiness. Mr. Speaker, allowing patriotic Americans who are willing, capable, and ready to serve their country does not harm readiness.

I will tell you what does: diverting military personnel and billions of dollars in military construction funding to build an unnecessary wall to respond to a nonmilitary fabricated emergency.

I want to ask my friends who support this shameful service ban whether they believe they have the right to deny an individual their right to be who they are, to limit opportunities because of their gender identity? Are these the values America was founded upon?

We as a nation are much better than this. During the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, critics invoked fear upon America saying that it would disrupt unit morale and readiness. Today, 9 years later, we have the most powerful and capable military in the world.

For almost 3 years, transgender troops have been able to serve openly. During that time, there has been no evidence of lack of military readiness or unit cohesion. Unfortunately, in return for their service, we are requiring they suppress their identity. This is absolutely unacceptable and discriminatory.

I believe former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey responded best when he stated:

''The service of the men and women who volunteer and who meet our standards of service is a blessing, not a burden.''

□ 1000

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my vehement opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals because the Trump administration considers transgender identity to be some medically disqualifying condition. Gender identity is not a medical condition; it is who we are as individuals.

Since President Truman desegregated the military, we have torn down barriers to the equal treatment and opportunity of every American to serve. Women now serve in combat roles defending our Nation as Rangers, infantrymen and submariners. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans serve our country openly and with distinction.

In 2016, the Pentagon lifted the ban on transgender Americans, allowing them to serve without having to hide their true identity. The fact that thousands of transgender servicemembers are currently serving, meeting, and exceeding standards and are deployed worldwide speaks volumes about their dedication and contributions to our Nation. We need their skills, their experience, their courage, and their patriotism.

In 1948, many Americans agreed that racial segregation in the Armed Forces was right, but history shows all of us today that they were wrong. Former Defense Secretary Gates said: ''No aspect of Black Americans' quest for justice and equality under the law has been nobler than what has been called the 'fight for the right to fight.'''

My 30 years in the Army leads me to believe that all Americans who want to serve and who can meet our standards should be given the right to fight. My deep belief is shared by General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who reiterated that very belief to me just 2 days ago.

We have an obligation to allow transgender Americans the right to

fight for our Nation. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, settle for this discriminatory policy.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KENNEDY for his leadership on this issue and the members and staff on the House Armed Services Committee for helping bring this important resolution to the House floor.

I served in the Navy during the time of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Too many were forced to live their lives in secret, unable to be true to themselves. In 2016, transgender servicemembers were allowed to serve openly in the United States military, individuals like Lieutenant Commander Blake Dremann, who is still currently on Active Duty and who has deployed 11 times.

During his testimony in the Military Personnel Subcommittee, he stated that his transition meant that he was no longer compartmentalizing parts of his life. He also stated that his decision to transition made him a better officer and a better leader. He has proven it by receiving the Navy Batchelder Award, which is given to Navy top Supply Corps officers.

My support for Lieutenant Commander Dremann and all our transgender servicemembers is unequivocal. They have shown tremendous courage, and it is why I fight for inclusion and equality for the LGBTQ community.

The President's policy is taking not only our military, but our country, backwards. It is unnecessary, and it is purely a discriminatory action against a group of individuals who want to do nothing more than serve their country.

It is a disgusting attack on a community that he once swore to protect. He is attacking servicemembers who have already proven their ability to meet strategic needs and who pose no risk to unit cohesion or military readiness.

As far as I am concerned, any person who has the courage, spirit, and commitment to serve our country in uniform when so many choose not to should be allowed to do so.

I will vote to pass this resolution, and unlike the President, I will continue to advocate for and protect our LGBTQ community. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this resolution and denounce the President's hateful policy toward our servicemembers.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and in opposition to the administration's ban on openly transgender individuals in the armed services.

Throughout history, each time we expand who may join the armed services to better reflect the diversity of our Nation, the same tired and disproven arguments are brought back: that any individual within a new group, regardless of their ability, is unfit to serve and that they will disrupt unit cohesion. We heard these arguments with respect to Black and Latino men; women; and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

But we know that is simply untrue. There are no issues with transgender individuals serving in our military. You don't have to take my word for it. The service chiefs of all five branches of our military have testified that there have been zero instances of transgender servicemembers hurting cohesion or readiness since the ban was first lifted.

The conservative obsession with targeting and attacking transgender individuals in all areas of American life is cruel and immoral. It is astonishing that, after years of ''support our troops'' demagoguery from my colleagues across the aisle, they would choose to turn their backs on Active-Duty servicemembers and vote to specifically deny them medically prescribed care.

After 2½ years of transgender servicemembers serving with no issues, there is one reason and one reason alone for this administration to be bringing back a ban on transgender servicemembers: to force a bigoted agenda on the military that they cannot force on the rest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, much of the history of this country is the history of expanding our understanding of whom the Declaration of Independence meant when it said that all men are created equal. It didn't mean, in 1776, Black men; it certainly didn't mean women; it didn't mean Native Americans; and it didn't mean LGBTQ people. We have come to the point where we understand, at least aspirationally, it means all of those things.

This resolution gives us a choice:

Do we join the march? Do we continue the march to expand the meaning of the Declaration of Independence to declare equality for everyone regardless of specific characteristics, or do we join that dreary procession of slavers, confederates, racists, and misogynists who have dragged this country through the mud and have besmirched the ideals of the Declaration of Independence?

That is our choice today. Let's take the right one.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing opposition to President Trump's decision to ban transgender individuals from serving in the Armed Forces. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and I thank my friend, Mr. KENNEDY, for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

The President's decision in 2017 to prohibit transgender individuals from military service is disgraceful and wrong. Not only is the decision based on ignorance and bigotry, but the evidence shows there is absolutely no need for this discriminatory policy.

America has the strongest and most effective military in the history of the world, and that is because of the brave individuals who serve in uniform. Excluding an entire group of highly qualified and skilled individuals from service undermines our national security.

In 2016, the Obama administration removed the ban on transgender individuals after thoroughly and carefully studying how it would impact the military and military readiness. A year later, President Trump announced he would resume prohibiting transgender individuals from serving in a tweet and didn't even bother to tell his Secretary of Defense about it.

The National Center for Transgender Equality estimates that over 15,000 trans people are currently serving in the military. In 2016, a study by RAND Corporation found that service by transgender individuals does not adversely affect readiness, and, in fact, many military leaders have acknowledged that the ban will degrade military readiness.

This cruel ban seeks to force transgender members of our military back into the closet or out of service. It is a policy that is not based on any factor or any careful deliberation, but merely an attempt to score points with the hard right faction of his political base. By doing this, the President is hurting our military, making our country less safe, and making our country less just.

Transgender individuals who serve our country in the Armed Forces are American heroes. They deserve our thanks, and they deserve more than to be used as a political prop by their Commander in Chief. We as a country are better than this.

Mr. Speaker, quite simply, it is un-American and immoral to deny transgender individuals who want to serve our country in uniform the right to do so simply because of who they are, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership and for yielding time.

I also want to recognize Congressman KENNEDY for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 124, rejecting the President's discriminatory ban on openly transgender servicemembers in the military.

Transgender servicemembers have served with honor and distinction in the defense of our country for decades, yet President Trump announced on Twitter that transgender servicemembers would no longer be allowed to serve, despite the fact that many military leaders concluded that being transgender does not impact our readiness. President Trump's own Chief of Staff said he hadn't received any reports of problems with unit cohesion or morale regarding transgender servicemembers.

The President's cowardly ban makes it clear that prejudice, not patriotism, guides his decisions.

As the daughter of a career military officer who served in a segregated military, I know what it is like for our country to betray our American values. As a person of faith, I was taught to treat everyone equally. As an African American woman, I will fight discrimination wherever it surfaces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member managing this bill, and I thank Mr. KENNEDY for his insight.

We are reminded that we have nothing to fear but fear itself. Franklin Delano Roosevelt offered those great words on the precipice of World War II, the victory with the United States troops standing side by side, some of them African Americans who lived and served in the uniform but in a segregated way. But their blood was the same, and they shared their blood in the same way; they died in the same way.

Do we want victory or defeat?

Let me be very clear. Allowing transgenders to serve and brushing them out is a travesty.

Do you realize that it is clear that the RAND report found that healthcare coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the military total account by less than zero?

In addition, when all of this was banned by the Obama administration, we recognized it is honored, the sacrifices of selfless transgender servicemembers who have endured exclusion, silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBT and military personnel such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell, which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

We must be against these destructive practices.

Do we want victory or defeat?

There is nothing to fear but fear itself.

Support this resolution to stand with those who want to serve and die for their country.

I rise in support of H. Res. 124.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 26, 2017, the fears of the LGBTQ community were confirmed.

In an unexpected move that immediately sent shockwaves through the media and LGBTQ+ community, the President tweeted Wednesday morning that ''the United States Government will not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military.''

Scores of individuals, civil rights groups, and military personnel on all sides of the political spectrum unanimously condemned the President's announcement as an intolerant and irrational violation of the sacred right of Transgender Americans to valiantly serve their country.

In his tweets, the President claimed that ''our military . . . cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail.''

This statement directly contradicts the wealth of rigorous evidence indicating the exact opposite:

According to a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly in the military poses ''little to no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness, or readiness.''

Furthermore, RAND found that health care coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the U.S. military's total annual health care expenditures by a mere 0.04 to 0.13-percent.

The President's illogical ban on transgender military personnel reverses a previous policy set forth by Former Defense Secretary Ash Carter in June, 2016 that allowed transgender troops to serve openly.

This policy under Obama was a significant step forward that made our armed services more inclusive.

It honored the sacrifices of selfless transgender service members who have endured exclusion, silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBTQ+ military personnel such as ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'' which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

Numerous advocacy groups that focus on LGBTQ+ service members and veterans organizations have decried the President's transgender ban announcement and criticized the hypocrisy and poor leadership of the White House.

Officials at OutServe, which provides legal assistance to LGBTQ+ troops and recruits, said Trump's ''pseudo-policy-by-twitter'' demonstrated ''blatant disregard for transgender service members.''

The group then turned the President's hateful rhetoric back on itself: ''The disruptive burden to the military comes from indecision in a White House which itself is not focused on victory if it's targeting service members.

The readiness, effectiveness, and lethality of the Armed Services comes from the commitment of our troops—not the vagaries and bigotry of exclusionary policies.''

The Palm Center, an advocacy group for transgender service members, denounced the President's comments as ''creating a worse version of don't ask, don't tell'' policy.

Vote Vets, an organization dedicated to opening U.S. military services to diverse Americans, correctly assessed that ''removing [transgender service members] weakens our country and our military.''

There are approximately 15,000 transgender service members currently serving in the U.S. military.

The President's announcement offers no clarity on the status of these troops who continue to serve their country with honor, dignity, and excellence.

However, if the President's expression of intent to ''not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve'' entails the removal of these service members from the ranks of the U.S. military—this can only be understood as a direct violation of the rights and principles laid down in the Constitution.

Angela Davis once said, ''If they come for me in the morning, they will come for you in the night.''

Americans of all races, ethnicities, origins, sexual preferences, and gender identities must realize that the reverse is also true: If the President comes for them in the morning, he will come for me in the night.

To the brave transgender individuals who have served, currently serve, or dream of serving in the military: I recognize your commitment to protecting this nation with your very lives.

I oppose the President's unlawful agenda of discrimination. I will not stop until your sacrifices are regarded as equal under the law of the United States.

To all members of the transgender community: I stand with you. I am fighting for you. I will not allow your rights to be stripped away by bigoted men who have lost sight of what it means to be American. That is why I support H. Res. 124.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair whether the gentleman from Washington, the chairman, has any further speakers other than himself.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am prepared to close at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the current House leadership seems rather consumed by Presidential tweets. As a matter of fact, just a few moments ago, the Speaker of the House, herself, was one of those Members who had to be reminded that it is a violation of the rules of the House to disparage the character of the President.

I guess we could do this every day. The President could tweet, and we would have a sense of Congress to comment on it, and the President would tweet. But generally, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a higher and better purpose for this House to work on the

problems that confront the American people.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, this is a messaging bill. It changes no law. It changes no policy. It could also be done down in the House radio-television correspondents' gallery. Somebody could give a speech, and there could be a press conference. It would have the same effect as having this resolution on the floor.

I don't have the time to correct all of the misstatements in the resolution or that have been made on the floor today. I will say this, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to do messaging, then my primary message is that every individual who serves our Nation in the military is entitled to respect and our appreciation—every single individual—and I am among those who are very impressed, by the way, by the transgender individuals who testified in front of our Military Personnel Subcommittee just a few weeks ago.

But on the substance of this issue, I believe the principle for the Department of Defense is that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

□ 1015

Any eligible individual who can meet the standard without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

I think that is the standard. That is not exactly what we have been talking about today, but that is the standard, and it should be the standard.

There may be some differences about what a special accommodation is, about various medical diagnoses and conditions. I understand that. But the standard is, if you meet the standard without special accommodation you should be permitted to serve.

And those who serve deserve our respect and our appreciation. That is the point. But that is not really the point of this resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let's remember one important point. There was no problem. This was not an issue. It was not talked about until the President decided that, in his words, he wanted to ban transgender people from serving in the military.

I hope that is not engaging in personalities. It is simply saying what he said and did. He sent out a tweet saying we should ban people who are transgender. Then the military has had to backfill that tweet with a policy. I feel bad for the members of the military who have had to do that, who have had to waste their time for the last year trying to accommodate the ignorance and bigotry of this presidential policy.

There was no problem. Every single service chief testified there is no impact on unit cohesion. We weren't talking about that until the President decided that he wanted to discriminate against transgender people.

I think the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee is 100 percent correct. Every eligible person who can perform the duties should be allowed to serve.

This policy violates that principle in a whole bunch of different ways, but I will simply mention two.

Even if you have already transitioned, even if you have already gone through all of the healthcare needs and have fully transitioned to a new gender, this policy says you will not be allowed to serve if you are transgender.

That means that fully qualified people—not ones who have potential future surgery or anything—are being banned from serving.

It also says, if you are serving now, you cannot be who you are. And this is where the ignorance comes in.

Wow. What do you mean?

You have got to be the gender you were born in.

That is not the way it works. That is ignorance talking. This policy saying that, No, sorry, you have to be in your ''biological sex'' means you have to deny who you are. And that will also ban people from serving who are otherwise 100 percent qualified.

Without question, trans men and women who are fully qualified to serve in the military will be banned by this policy.

We have already seen the other two arguments: Well, the healthcare costs will go up.

No, they won't. The stats, the evidence, the facts show that transgender people have no greater healthcare costs than the average person serving in the military.

And the unit cohesion argument is an absolute joke. This debate, this policy, prompted by the President, inserting discrimination where it did not belong, is the only thing that has caused any of this issue.

As General Milley said: zero evidence of any unit cohesion issue.

So, let's be 100 percent clear here. This policy is based on ignorance and bigotry.

And why are we doing it on the House floor instead of down in some press conference somewhere? Because the vote of this House matters more than just the individual words of a few Members.

I, as a Member of the United States House and as a citizen of the United States of America, want my Congress to go on record that we will not stand for ignorance and bigotry in our military or anywhere else.

A vote of this House makes it clear just how wrongheaded this policy is. And make no mistake about it, this is not the military that wanted this. The President drove it, and he is causing problems that do not need to be caused. We should reject this policy.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 124 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—8

Abraham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Granger
Palazzo
Ryan
Veasey
Wilson (SC)

□ 1047

Messrs. MEADOWS and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because I was in my District with the Vice-President. I support anyone willing and capable of serving in the U.S. armed forces, including transgender individuals. If I had been present, I would have voted '' yea'' for H. Res. 124.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances on Thursday, March 28, 2019, I was not present to cast my vote on the question of Agreeing to H. Res. 124, a resolution expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals. I agree in the strongest terms with the resolution's denunciation of the ban, and had I been present my vote would have been yea on rollcall 135.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 179, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Courtney
Crist
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
McBath
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Rodgers (WA)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—179

Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Axne
Balderson
Bera
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cisneros
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peterson
Porter
Posey
Reed
Rice (NY)
Riggleman
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Sherrill
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Steube
Stevens
Suozzi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Walberg
Walden
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—35

Abraham
Babin
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gohmert
Granger
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Grothman
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Lamb
Marchant
Marshall
Palazzo
Peters

Ratcliffe	Torres (CA)	Webster (FL)
Rice (SC)	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Ryan	Wagner	Yarmuth
Simpson	Walker	Yoho
Stefanik	Walorski	

□ 1059

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 135 and "yea" on rollcall No. 136.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to a family commitment, I was not present and therefore unable to vote on Thursday, March 28, 2019. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 135 and "nay" on rollcall No. 136.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you of my intention to resign my seat on the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology; effective immediately.

I appreciate your assistance with this request and the opportunity to serve on the Committee in the 115th Congress.

If I may ever be of any help, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

NEAL P. DUNN M.D.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Ms. Herrera Beutler, Miss González-Colón of Puerto Rico.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF GRADE AND PAY OF PODIATRISTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 863) to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 863

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF GRADE AND PAY OF PODIATRISTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) GRADE.—The list in section 7404(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''PODIATRIC SURGEON (DPM)'' and inserting ''PODIATRIST''; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to ''Physician and surgeon grade.'' the following new item:

''Podiatrist grade.''.

(b) PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7431 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''physician and dentist'' each place it appears and inserting ''physician, podiatrist, and dentist'';

(B) by striking ''physicians and dentists'' each place it appears and inserting ''physicians, podiatrists, and dentists'';

(C) by striking ''physician or dentist'' each place it appears and inserting ''physician, podiatrist, or dentist'';

(D) by striking ''physicians or dentists'' each place it appears and inserting ''physicians, podiatrists, or dentists'';

(E) by striking ''Physician and Dentist'' each place it appears and inserting ''Physician, Podiatrist, and Dentist''; and

(F) in subsection (e)(1)(A), by inserting ''podiatrists and'' before ''dentists.''.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—Section 7433 of such title is amended by striking ''physicians and dentists'' each place it appears and inserting ''physicians, podiatrists, and dentists''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of subchapter III of chapter 74 of such title is amended by inserting '', PODIATRISTS,'' after ''PHYSICIANS''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter III and inserting the following new item:

''SUBCHAPTER III—PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, PODIATRISTS, AND DENTISTS''.

(5) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 7433 of such title is further amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b);

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''(1) The Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (2) as subsection (b); and

(C) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''In prescribing'' and inserting ''RECOMMENDATIONS AND VIEWS.—In prescribing''; and

(ii) by striking ''this paragraph'' and inserting ''this subsection''.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, if the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, on behalf of the human beings, babies who leave their mother's—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 1652(b) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, I am pleased to appoint the following Member to the Cyberspace Solarium Commission:

The Honorable Mike Gallagher of Wisconsin

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for two important reasons. One is to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the coming week, and also to inquire of the majority leader the score of the LSU-Maryland basketball game from last week.

I yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I anticipated this was going to be an extraordinarily hostile colloquy.

Louisiana was so incredibly lucky. However, it cost me, I admit to the world, I guess. I hope I don't get in legal trouble. But the Republican whip and I had a little sort of side bet, so I owe the Republican whip a crab dinner for four people. That is the bad news.

The good news is the minority whip will now be eating the best crab in America, not Louisiana crab. It will be Maryland crab that I will be giving him for dinner.

Mr. Speaker, if my friend would like to ask some questions about the schedule—or he did ask me, I am told. But I knew that game was coming.

Mr. SCALISE. I will be happy to ask both questions again.

I look forward to the Maryland crab dinner. I think, as the gentleman from Maryland knows, a lot of times when you go to places and they say it is Maryland crab, it is really Gulf of Mexico crab, because they want the best quality to offer the patrons.

We were excited to see the buzzer beater. I know both of us were waiting in those last 12 seconds to see which team would walk away with the Sweet 16 banner. I am proud that my mighty Fighting Tigers of LSU were in that number. But we will come to D.C., and, hopefully, the gentleman will now be rooting for us so that he can say he rooted for the eventual national champion, LSU Tigers, to win the Final Four.

I yield to the gentleman to hear about the schedule for the coming week in Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it keeps getting worse. In any event, we will move on to the schedule.

I congratulate LSU. They played an excellent game, as did Maryland. It was a really good game. There has to be one winner and one loser, and we lost.

We have the fourth youngest team in the NCAA, so we will be back next year. Maybe we will be able to play LSU again, if they make it.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and recess immediately. The House will reconvene at 11 a.m. for the purpose of receiving a joint meeting with the Senate. His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, the Secretary General for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, will address us. Members are advised to be on the House floor and seated no later than 10:30 a.m. for the joint meeting.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider a major piece of legislation, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. Frankly, that bill should have been reauthorized prior to September 30 of last year in the last Congress. We extended it until February 15 of this year, at which time it lapsed. We are very hopeful and expect that this will pass this next week.

It is sponsored by Representative KAREN BASS. I am pleased to bring this bipartisan bill to the floor, in response to our Nation's crisis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The Violence Against Women Act officially expired on September 30. As I said, it was extended. It is way overdue that we consider a long-term authorization of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that we will bring to the floor legislation regarding the crisis that is occurring in Yemen. There are 22 million people at risk of starvation—22 million people at risk of starvation—noncombatants, women, and children.

We also may consider other legislation, if it comes from the Senate.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the schedule update.

I would like to inquire, we know that there are only 7 legislative days left for Congress to meet its required deadline to provide a budget, the April 15 deadline. What troubles me is that there has been no budget brought through the House Budget Committee. In fact, there have been reports that your majority doesn't plan to bring a budget at all.

Obviously, the budgets are very important to show the priorities of our Congress, to show the priorities of each of our majorities, as we did in 7 of the 8 years we were in the majority, not only doing a budget, but then, this last year, we were able to reach a 2-year budget agreement, so we were able to know with certainty what the budget numbers were that we would actually be working on to draft our appropriations bills. Again, the bills carry out the priorities of Congress, to show the country how we are going to properly fund government at the levels that we, as a Congress, set, which is what the budget does.

As I have seen, there is no current budget agreement negotiation going on that is yielding anything. So, without a budget agreement, does the gentleman plan to at least provide and bring a budget to the House floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It is a very interesting question, Mr. Speaker, that the minority whip asked me.

I would ask, in response, a question: Does the minority whip remember when last year, when you were in charge, you brought the budget to the floor?

Mr. SCALISE. I will be happy to walk through the last 8 years.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman a simple question. He asked me about when the budget was coming, and I asked him when did he bring the budget to the floor last year.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, last year, as the gentleman knows, we were working under a 2-year budget agreement. Typically, we don't have a 2-year budget agreement. You bring one budget, and that is the budget for that year.

For fiscal year 2012, the House passed a budget. In our majority, we passed a budget to establish those numbers to then start the appropriations process.

In 2013, we passed through the House a budget to establish the 2013 budget numbers to work off of.

In 2014, we passed a budget through the House to establish the budget for that fiscal year.

In 2015, we passed a budget through the House to establish a budget for that year.

In 2016, we actually got an agreement, both between the House and the Senate, and passed the budget, of course, through the House and the Senate.

In fiscal year 2017, we passed a budget through the House and the Senate and got a full agreement to do an appropriations process.

In fiscal year 2018, as the gentleman knows, we actually agreed to a 2-year budget agreement to not only set the fiscal year numbers for 1 year, but for 2 years, which was tremendously helpful in making sure that our Nation's defense, which many times had been used as bargaining chips for other budget negotiations, we took that off the table. We made sure our men and women in uniform had the certainty of a 2-year budget agreement, which doesn't happen often. Frankly, it should happen more often, and we should strive toward that, so we achieved that.

In 2019, as the gentleman knows, we passed a budget out of the House Budget Committee, but we already had a budget agreement to work through the appropriations process because we had done a 2-year budget the prior year.

□ 1115

We don't have even a 1-year budget agreement right now. And as the gentleman knows, there are no fruitful negotiations to get a 1- or 2-year budget agreement, so there is no budget number to work off of, which is why you produce a budget.

Last year, we did bring a bill out of committee, but we didn't need to pass a budget because we already had the budget number agreed to from the 2-year deal prior.

And so with that, is the gentleman willing to engage in or come to an agreement on at least a 1- or 2-year budget agreement so that we can actually have an appropriations process that works for the country and shows the priorities of this Nation?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, a lot of words of the minority whip.

He didn't pass the budget last year. There was no fiscal year 2019 budget. He is correct that we had reached a caps deal. That is not the budget, Mr. Speaker.

A budget is a plan that is reported out and brought to the floor and passed and sent to the Senate, and the Senate passes it and we have a budget that is in the same position on each side of the aisle. That is a budget. That has rarely been done in the last 8 years.

A caps deal has been reached. I would like to see a caps deal reached.

I have been talking to Mr. MCCONNELL, who wants a caps deal reached; I have talked to Mr. SHELBY—both of those, Republican leaders. I have talked to the White House about a caps deal.

Unfortunately, I don't think Mr. Mulvaney wants to reach a caps deal. He wants to use it as leverage as opposed to allowing us to proceed in the regular order.

But a budget is a different kettle of fish, I will tell my friend, than a caps deal. A caps deal does, in fact, set the 302 level of discretionary funding for both defense and nondefense spending.

Yes, we reached the 2-year cap deal. I have been trying for the last 2 months to get meaningful negotiations underway to do the same. I have not been successful, largely because the President, apparently, and Mr. Mulvaney are not interested in reaching such a deal. I regret that.

But the Budget Committee is meeting this week—it is going to meet next week, and we are going to be reporting out what will be what the minority whip refers to as a budget. It will certainly speak to the levels of funding that we need to spend.

I want to pass the appropriation bills by June 30. That has never been done, but I want to do it. I think we can do it, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to work towards that objective. It will require reaching what numbers are going to be for discretionary spending.

Unfortunately, the budget that the President of the United States sent down to Congress is totally unreasonable and irrational, and there is not a single person, I think, on this floor who will support his budget.

I will tell the minority whip that I will be glad to give his party the opportunity to vote on the President's budget. If he asks me, I will have it put on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are not able to get to a budget caps deal. We passed and began, in my view, an irrational—and I voted for it, and I am sorry that I voted for it—Budget Control Act, creating the sequester.

''Sequester'' is a complicated word which starts with S, which I tell my people in my district and town, many, stands for ''stupid.'' It was an irrational document that took numbers out of the air without regard to our responsibilities and our opportunities.

But I am hopeful, and I tell the Republican whip, my friend, that we are going to try to—hopefully, working with his party—establish some reasonable, rational numbers for defense and nondefense discretionary funding so that we can move ahead with doing what really makes the difference, and that is the adoption of appropriation bills on this floor; send them to the Senate; have the Senate consider them; and we will have a conference, and we will pass those bills and send them to the President of the United States.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am hopeful that we are able to start an appropriations process and, ideally, to complete it by summer—well in advance of the September 30 government funding deadline—because we shouldn't be operating under deadline after deadline, where we go until the midnight hour.

But as the gentleman knows, you can't start an appropriations process until you actually set what are known as the 302 numbers, the 302(a) and (b) numbers, so that we know what each appropriations bill can target in terms of its overall spending number, to have that caps limit.

Ideally, it would be done through a budget with the April 15 deadline, but maybe the gentleman is going to be able to work with the committee to get a budget passed out of committee before the deadline and, if not, as the gentleman urges, a hopeful desire to get a caps deal. I would like to get a caps deal as well.

I supported the last caps deal because it gave us 2 years of certainty. It was bipartisan. It was an agreement that, while we may disagree on top-line numbers—and we want more money for defense, and some on your side might want more for nondefense discretionary—we finally came to an agreement. That did give tremendous certainty to our men and women in uniform. So over 70 percent of this Federal Government was fully funded for the fiscal year.

Clearly, we had a difference on border security, and that remaining area of our budget wasn't funded. But at least the 70-plus percent of the people of this country who rely on those services and want a strong defense were able to see us achieve that. Hopefully, we can do something like that again well before the deadline. That is the objective.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield simply for clarification?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I want the public, Mr. Speaker, to understand that a caps deal is not a budget. They are two separate items:

A budget is a plan for expenditure on defense and nondefense objectives. A caps deal is to simply set not necessarily those priorities per se, but to set a top level of discretionary spending. That is why it is called a cap.

It has been about $1.1 trillion or $1.2 trillion—now, it is going to be a little over that this year, I presume—for discretionary spending. Most of the budget, of course, is not discretionary spending. Two-thirds of the budget is either mandatory spending or debt payment.

I just want to clarify that we are talking about two separate items. One is a budget, which is a budget plan which can, in fact, include caps within it, but a caps deal is a separate deal.

As the gentleman has pointed out, we have usually made them now for 2 years since the sequester would otherwise have gone into effect. The reason we made that deal is both sides—both sides—are unwilling to follow the sequester because we think the sequester does not make rational sense for the security of our country and for the investments our country needs to make.

The President doesn't want to do that either. The difference is, he wants to borrow an additional $180 billion-plus to fund defense and leave domestic discretionary spending largely at 2010 or 2009 levels. We think that doesn't make sense.

But I will clarify for the gentleman again that the Budget Committee is, in fact, considering what legislation they should bring to the floor in order to facilitate us, as the caps deals did, to facilitate us achieving the ability to mark up our appropriation bills, send them to the Senate, and try to reach agreement between the Senate and the House prior to September 30, and certainly to avoid the historic and very harmful shutdown that occurred at the end of the last Congress and continued into this Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, you have two methods within which to set those caps: You can do it through the budget—which 7 of the 8 years we were in the minority we did—or you can do it through a separate caps deal, which 2 years ago we were able to do for a 2-year period, which is why we didn't do a budget last year. We passed it out of committee and at least showed what our priorities are, but we didn't need to pass a budget to get a caps deal because we had a caps deal in place from the prior year.

The other 7 years there was no caps deal, so the budget laid out that number, and the gentleman's majority has done neither. You don't have a caps deal or a budget, and so at some point you are going to have to produce the number to show what we are going to start the appropriations process using.

The other part of the budget, which isn't talked about as much but is equally important, is the establishment of the priorities for that majority. How do we get back to a balanced Federal budget, for example? We laid that out in our budget multiple times.

We have programs like Medicare. Medicare is going bankrupt if we do nothing. It would be irresponsible for us to let Medicare go to bankruptcy. Actual reports show it could go bankrupt in the next 8 years, which we

think is irresponsible. That is why we put, in our budget, a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

Whatever the gentleman's plan would be to save Medicare from bankruptcy, I would urge him to show it. Show the American people what the priorities are. But they haven't done that.

And why? Why haven't they done that? Because they have spent the last 2 years trying to impeach the President, trying to lay out this foundation that there was collusion.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman will yield in a moment.

But let's be clear, for the last 2 years we heard this clarion call that there was some collusion between the President or his family and Russia. We heard all this talk about impeachment and everything on down from the highest levels, including, now, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, who went multiple times on national TV and said there was more than credible evidence of collusion.

Finally, everybody was waiting on the Mueller report. Many were hanging their hat, saying it is going to show all these things. There is going to be a list of indictments. Go look at all the tapes from every national TV show you can imagine of some of the most outlandish claims that were made. And now the Mueller report comes out, and it is clear those claims are baseless. There was no collusion.

Mr. HOYER. The Mueller report is not out, Mr. Whip.

Mr. SCALISE. There was no collusion.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Mueller report is not out. The only report that is out is the Barr four-page letter report.

Mr. SCALISE. We will see the full Mueller report.

Mr. HOYER. I hope you are right, Mr. Whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, we have seen assessments of it. If the gentleman thinks it is going to show something differently, then please share it, but they made it clear there was no collusion and there will be no further indictments.

In fact, the Attorney General of the United States said this: ''But as noted above, the special counsel did not find that the Trump campaign, or anyone associated with it, conspired or coordinated with the Russian Government in these efforts, despite multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the Trump campaign.''

So multiple times they were offered, they never even came close. There was no collusion.

These conspiracy theories, the witch hunts, it is time for it to end. There was no collusion.

If you or any of your colleagues have proof of collusion, as your chairman of the House Intelligence Committee claims, they need to show that to the Attorney General of the United States, because it completely contradicts what the Attorney General has now said based on the findings of the Mueller report.

There was no collusion.

And so when Chairman SCHIFF says, ''more than circumstantial evidence''—that he has seen—''that associates of President Trump colluded with Russia''—in August, ''I think there is plenty of evidence of collusion or conspiracy in plain sight.''

And even now that the Attorney General makes it very clear there was no collusion, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee will not recant his previous statements that have been discounted.

Today, as the gentleman knows, this morning, every member of the minority party on the House Intelligence Committee called for the chairman of the Intelligence Committee to step down, every member.

So I would ask the gentleman: Will you call for the chairman of the Intelligence Committee to step down as chairman after losing so much credibility in the wild and vicious claims that he has made that have been disputed by the Attorney General of the United States based on this Mueller report after 22 months and over $20 million of taxpayer money that found no collusion?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what it found is six of the President's closest associates—his campaign manager, his deputy campaign manager, his foreign policy adviser, his national security adviser, his lawyer and counsel for over a decade—all committed crimes. All were either convicted or pled to crimes.

Mr. SCALISE. Crimes of collusion?

Mr. HOYER. You had a lot to say. I have something in response.

There is not a person on our side of the aisle who doesn't believe the letter that you issued regarding Mr. SCHIFF isn't totally a partisan distraction from what you hope is not found. There has been no Mueller report yet that we have received.

The gentleman, Mr. Speaker, voted to have the Mueller report, as did every other member on his side of the aisle and every member on our side of the aisle, to be disclosed. Hopefully, it will be.

□ 1130

Hopefully, it will not be just a four-page letter from the Attorney General of the United States appointed by Mr. Trump. Hopefully, we will get Mr. Mueller's full report. That is what the Congress voted to get. That is what we expect to get, and that is what we hope to get.

Let me assure the gentleman that there is not a person on my side of the aisle that believes that Mr. SCHIFF has done anything but act in the highest interest of our government, of the Intelligence Committee, and of full knowledge for the American people, unlike his predecessor who worked hand-in-glove with the White House, not as an independent coequal branch of government, but as an advocate for the White House's position, who clearly should have been removed and was not.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minority whip that Mr. SCHIFF is a member of the highest integrity, highest intellect, and has great responsibility. I expect him to pursue his responsibilities as chairman of the Intelligence Committee to assure that neither Russia nor any other country will in the future be able to interfere in the elections of the United States, as Mr. Mueller concluded the Russians have.

Now, the President hasn't concluded that, but almost every American understands that the Russians tried to, on behalf of the President of the United States, affect the elections. So I tell my friend, I hope that we can have the debate. Let's look at the Mueller report.

Very frankly, there are other investigations that are going on, as the gentleman knows, in the Southern District of New York, as well as in the Government Operations Subcommittee, as well as in the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as in the Financial Services Committee, as well as in the Intelligence Committee.

We still pale in insignificance in the number of investigations that we have had or oversight hearings that we have had when compared to the oversight hearings the Republicans had of the Obama administration and Mrs. Clinton in trying to undermine their credibility, an administration that, by the way, I don't think anybody was put in legal jeopardy and there were no scandals in the Obama administration.

There were disagreements, but I would think the gentleman ought to be very reserved, very frankly, in terms of making conclusions based upon a four-page letter before we have seen the Mueller report, before we have seen the actions of the Southern District of New York, and before we have seen the results of the oversight hearings that are continuing.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there are a number of items that need to be addressed in what the gentleman just said.

First of all, to claim that there was any collusion as you said, ''on behalf of the President of the United States with Russia'' goes in complete contradiction to the findings that were delivered to us by the Attorney General of the United States, and I am going to read it one more time.

As we noted above, the special counsel did not find that the Trump campaign or anyone associated with it conspired or coordinated with the Russian Government.

Anyone who would make a claim to the contrary is either being irresponsible or ought to show the evidence. If there is evidence that the chairman of the Intelligence Committee has, and

let's be clear, he has tweeted things out, here is what we know. This is from Chairman SCHIFF. In 2017, here is what we know: The Russians offered help. The campaign accepted help. The Russians gave help. The President made full use of that help. He has claimed, again, that he has more than circumstantial evidence that there was collusion.

Yet, the Attorney General of the United States, after reviewing the entire Mueller report, which we hope we all see, obviously, within the confines of the law—the law makes it clear how something like that gets reported—I hope the gentleman understands and wouldn't suggest that classified information should be disclosed—but the report ought to be disclosed and show the American people what they have found. But we have seen the summary of it, and, of course, we are going to look at the entire thing.

And maybe then after reviewing the entire thing, if the gentleman does see, as the report summary shows, that there was no collusion with the President of the United States, then maybe this gentleman and all of the other people who have made outrageous claims that the President was in collusion, will maybe acknowledge they were wrong, will maybe offer an apology. Who knows. We can hold out hope for that.

But let's be clear about the statements that were made and the things that were alluded to that aren't true, that weren't the case. Maybe it was wishful thinking and it shouldn't have been. No one should hope that the President of the United States, any President, conspired with a foreign government.

But to suggest it over and over again for 2 years, and then for all of this 22 months of investigation, thorough investigation, multiple countries visited, over $20 million of taxpayer money, more than our committees have to run all of their oversight operations to thoroughly investigate, they found there was no collusion.

Sure, the Russians tried to meddle with elections and they have done it before, and we ought to make sure that it doesn't happen again, and we can work together on that. But to suggest that the President of the United States colluded when he didn't, is irresponsible. And it has happened over and over, and it continues to this day. It has got to stop.

This idea that maybe some other attempt to go and harass the President and his family is going to find something else, it gives credence to the claims it was a witch hunt. It is time for us to focus on the real problems of this country.

It is also time for us to hold people in our intelligence agencies accountable, those who showed up at their job with a partisan agenda.

The FBI, CIA, or any intelligence agency is no place for you to bring your political agenda. We all have political views. But if someone puts that badge on and accepts that responsibility, and then uses that position to abuse power, we all ought to call on it to be rooted out, and I hope it is rooted out.

If there were abuses of the FISA process, which is a very important court that has a very narrow focus to protect the national security of this country, if the FISA court was abused by people in positions of power because they wanted to carry out a political agenda because they didn't like the results of the 2016 Presidential election, that is not the place for it.

The ballot box next year is the place to go carry it out, not wearing the badge and being a member of law enforcement in this country. So I hope that is rooted out, because we want to see the integrity of those institutions like the FBI restored. I want the country to have full faith and confidence that the people working there are carrying out the national security interests of the country, not their own political interests.

There are a lot of questions raised over whether or not that happened. But in the end, when we review the report—we have seen the summary. If people are still hoping that there is some mystery indictment out there—they said there are no further indictments. They said there was no collusion with the Presidential campaign.

So at what time is the gentleman's side going to acknowledge it didn't happen? If you want to change the results of the Presidential election, the results are changed at the ballot box. That is how we resolve it in America. We don't try to go find something on a President that doesn't exist.

We have done oversight. You have done oversight. The Mueller investigation was the ultimate oversight for 22 months and it rooted out and found there was no collusion between the President and the Russians. Maybe some people are disappointed to hear it.

We should all celebrate that as a country, but we all ought to be concerned that no President of the United States is targeted by an intelligence agency, or by a Congress, or a majority, or a minority because they don't like the results of the election, so they are going to abuse power to go and try to take them down. That is not the way we do it.

I hope we can finally focus on the real problems of this country and not continue to use these committees even after they didn't find what they were looking for to keep finding something that is not there.

The former chairman that was alluded to, Mr. NUNES, did a very impeccable job of carrying out his duties to find the facts. It was always about the facts. And if you go and look at how he carried himself and managed his committee, the entire time it was about finding the facts. They looked and we looked. There was no conclusion that we found.

If someone has proof of that conclusion that they keep alluding to, it is time for them to show it. Show the American people what you have. Don't run around hiding saying you have something when the Attorney General says it is not there.

If someone knows about collusion, they owe it to the country to show it. But if it is not there, stop saying it. It is irresponsible, and, hopefully, everybody heeds those words and we get back to focusing on what is important for this country. Express our political differences.

Obviously, if there is a political difference that we have with each other, with the President, with a Cabinet Secretary, we have all kinds of forums to express that opposition to correct it, to bring legislation to the floor.

But if we just don't like somebody personally, that is not what we are here to do. And I hope we can get beyond that.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will respond to all of that, time being of the essence, I suppose.

The gentleman represents a party who held eight hearings, all headed by Republicans, on Mrs. Clinton. All eight reached the same conclusion, but the first one wasn't enough. The second one wasn't enough. The third one wasn't enough. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh weren't enough. So the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Gowdy) was appointed to do one more because it was pretty close to the election then, Mr. Speaker.

The majority leader, now the minority leader of this House, said: Oh, no, they accomplished something. They accomplished the political objective. He said that on television, roundly criticized by his party. Why did you say that? Why did you admit that?

But for the minority whip to say that the Mueller report instigated X millions of dollars spent for political purposes, Mueller was appointed by a Republican, not by a Democrat, and the Attorney General recused himself so the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rosenstein, was the one that appointed him.

Why did he recuse himself? Because he had been involved, contrary to what he testified to in his nomination hearing, with the Russian Ambassador. I don't know if there was anything of substance in this conversation because we don't fully know what that conversation was.

But the fact of the matter is, for the minority whip to be talking about political hearings or oversight, and then to say he has had an opportunity to review the Mueller report, the gentleman has had more than I have had.

He reviewed the four pages of the Barr letter, appointed by Mr. Trump, and what we know is Barr's reading and his conclusion. But, frankly, we knew that before, because he sent a 19-page letter months ago that he thought

this investigation would not reach any conclusion, and that it should not, and that the President could not be held accountable, in any event. That was Justice Department policy.

So I listened to a long discussion, in my view, with all due respect, I tell my friend, the whip, at odds with the performance of their administration and the eight hearings they had in trying to bring Mrs. Clinton down and never finding—never, eight hearings, all led by Republicans—a conclusion that led to anything.

So we will see what the Mueller report says, I hope. And I am pleased that the whip and his party voted to have the Mueller report fully disclosed. He is correct. There are some national security interests that will properly restrict some of that, so we don't out sources or ways and means of discovering information.

But having said that, I say to the whip that we will have a time to debate this. We will have a time to debate it when we have the information. We will have a time to debate it, perhaps months from now, when all of these investigations are through.

But I wouldn't take too much solace in what the Mueller report did. It led to, as I said, the indictment and conviction of the President's campaign manager. It led to the indictment and conviction, either through plea or trial, of five other individuals to date.

That is not something to be very proud of in terms of the President of the United States being so close to and so involved—Mr. Cohen, in particular, brings that information forth to a hearing, and he was apparently his closest legal adviser for over a decade. We will see. But I don't think now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate it. Because the time to debate it will be to see when we see, and the American people see the Mueller report.

I want to say to my friend, so he understands, I am pleased that we don't have a finding that the President of the United States colluded, as he said he did not do. Colluded, of course, is not a legal term. Conspiracy is the gravamen or the essence of a criminal activity, a conspiracy to commit something that is illegal.

But we have a time to debate that and discuss it. And the American people, hopefully, are going to have an opportunity to reach their own conclusion, which, obviously, in the final analysis, will be the most important conclusion.

But the good news is, we are continuing to do the substantive business of the people of the United States. We are continuing to focus on jobs. We had numerous hearings this week on jobs, on wages.

We had numerous hearings on healthcare, and the costs of healthcare, and the costs of prescription drugs. We passed one of the most far-reaching reform bills that we have seen on the floor of this House, H.R. 1. Every Democrat voted for it. Almost every Republican voted against it.

□ 1145

We have passed some rational and reasonable controls on people with criminal records who are on the no-fly list or with mental health problems from not getting weapons to hurt a lot of people quickly. We have seen the tragedy here and around the world.

So we have done a lot of very substantive legislation in a relatively short time, and, very frankly, we would have done more if the Republicans hadn't let the government shut down and repeatedly voted against opening it up for the first month of our session.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously about scheduling, and we are going to continue to bring substantive bills to the floor to respond to the needs of the American people. Yes, we can do oversight as well, but that will not preclude us from pursuing, as the majority, the agenda that we think the American people sent us here to Washington and made us the majority to do.

I hope that my Republican friends will join us in that effort and offer substantive amendments when they think there are differences that they have with that legislation, consider those, and send them to the Senate, because that is really what the people want us to do.

To the gentleman's observation about impeachment, I know he has been here. I know he has voted on efforts by some to move ahead on impeachment, and surely I know that he knows the overwhelming majority of Democrats voted ''no.'' I know that he must have heard Speaker PELOSI say that we are not pursuing impeachment and that we want to focus on the needs of the American people. I am sure he heard that, Mr. Speaker, but he tends to reference otherwise on that. I think that is not accurate.

The American people ought to understand that we are pursuing their agenda: their jobs, their healthcare, and the welfare of their families. That is what our duty is, that is what our responsibility is, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is an ultimate move towards something like impeachment, which I hope wouldn't come, and with all the things we know—there are no high crimes or misdemeanors and there is not even collusion—there are still committee chairmen in the gentleman's own party who are talking about impeachment. It is not something made up. There are leaders in the gentleman's party talking about it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee issued more than 80 subpoenas. Again, the majority can keep looking. Look at the summary of the Mueller report—2,800 subpoenas, more than 500 search warrants, and interviews of approximately 500 witnesses. So the gentleman can talk about people who were indicted who have nothing to do with the collusion and nothing to do with any ties to the President. Maybe somebody had filed a false tax return, then go throw the book at him.

Mr. Cohen came and lied to Congress, and he deserves to go to jail for it. What did the majority do? They brought him back as their star witness, a man who was already guilty of lying to Congress. He came, swore himself in, and likely lied to Congress again. So, again, throw the book at him.

But in terms of what the basis of the investigation was, it was to find collusion, and they found none: no further indictments; no evidence of collusion; in fact, saw the Trump campaign pushing back and even offers for help.

Foreign governments like Russia trying to interfere with our elections clearly happened—not just Russia, other countries too—and we all ought to be concerned about it. We all want to make sure that our defenses are as high as we can make them so that they are not able to collude.

We have seen companies in America that were taken advantage of during that campaign season, and they have taken corrective actions, too, so that Russia can't use social media companies in this Nation to try to take advantage of our electoral system.

But in terms of collusion with the President of the United States and a foreign government, it didn't happen. If anybody has evidence to the contrary, then show it to the American people. Stop alluding behind some cloak-and-dagger conspiracy theory that it happened still to this day when the Mueller investigation concluded it didn't happen.

We will get the full report. I look forward to reviewing it just as the gentleman from Maryland is looking forward to reviewing it, and maybe we will continue this conversation.

But if all of the findings that the Attorney General gave us in his summary are accurate, which I don't discount they will be—I think they will be at the highest level of confidence that the Attorney General's summary is accurate. If it is not, then clearly we will take that up separately. But if it turns out to be accurate, then I think we all ought to celebrate, number one, the fact that there was no collusion, but then move on.

The people who made accusations that turned out to be baseless ought to apologize and recognize there are people's personal lives and integrity that were being questioned. If it turned out they were wrong in making those accusations, then they ought to hold themselves accountable and to a higher standard. Those are the points that I was making.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend: Is he at all concerned that somebody that he didn't mention, Mr. Flynn, was, in fact, indicted and convicted of lying about his relationship with the Russians and his having clients in Europe, in Ukraine, which he failed to disclose?

He was appointed to one of the highest offices, the National Security Advisor to the President, and he lied about

his relations with the Russians to law enforcement, which is a crime, and was convicted and, in fact, pled.

I understand what Mr. Barr has said in a 4-page letter after some 48 hours of review of all of the documents, all of the evidence, that was adduced. None of us really knows. I am not going to make a conclusion until I have an opportunity to review the report. I hope we will have a full debate on that.

All of us are concerned, Republicans and Democrats, about the extraordinary number of people very close to the President—and, most importantly, Flynn, who was the National Security Advisor to the President—who were convicted of lying to law enforcement, some not paying their taxes and cheating the American people and all of us by not paying their fair share of what was due. I think that ought to be of concern to all of us.

These weren't just some people. They were the President's campaign chairman. They were one of the President's foreign policy advisers, Mr. Papadopoulos. It was his personal attorney for 10 years, a so-called fixer, did anything he was told or implied to do. We all ought to have concern about that.

But we ought to also be happy that, hopefully, correctly, Mr. Mueller found that we were not in a conspiracy with—I don't know about that, but colluding with—I don't really know what that exactly means; I have a sense, but it is not a legal issue—that the President did not, because any President who did collude with a foreign government that was clearly not our friend and, indeed, for the most part, our competitor and, yes, enemy, that would be something, I think, of which all of us would be extraordinarily concerned. I am glad that Mr. Mueller didn't find that.

But to think that, as the President says, this was a whitewash and no problems when five or six of your closest allies and friends have been or are about to be sent to jail, that is not something to be happy about.

It wasn't that Mueller didn't find wrongdoing. What Mueller didn't find was, beyond a shadow of a doubt, there was criminal behavior on which he believed he could act. That is what Barr said. And, in fact, Mr. Mueller, in Barr's letter, concluded that the President could not be exonerated or indicted on the basis of obstruction of justice. He made a conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence.

We don't know the answer to that question, but Mr. Mueller says that he could not find beyond a reasonable doubt and, therefore, made no assessment as to whether he did or did not.

In any event, we need to move on, as I said, Mr. Speaker, with the people's business: jobs, healthcare, integrity in government, safety in our neighborhoods, education of our children, and the health of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the whip that I look forward to working with him on such an agenda for the people.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern about addressing those important issues.

I will say, for the five people whom the gentleman referenced, anybody who broke the law ought to be held accountable. But after 500 witnesses are interviewed and over 2,800 subpoenas, all looking to find collusion with the Russian Government, not one of the people the gentleman mentioned had anything to do with colluding with the Russian Government.

If they made misstatements or if they didn't pay their taxes, after 2,800 subpoenas, then make sure that they are held accountable for the things they did, but don't suggest that it had anything to do with collusion with Russia, because it didn't.

Again, Mr. Speaker, go pull 500 names out of the phonebook, and if you put the full weight of the United States Government and 2,800 subpoenas into looking into 500 random people, I am sure not one of them will have done anything wrong—and hopefully not. But if they did and it had nothing to do with what you were initially looking for, let's not try to suggest it had anything to do with collusion, because it didn't.

We will see the full report. We look forward to seeing that. Again, hopefully, if the full report shows what we have already seen in the summary, that there was no collusion, then people who have been claiming there was collusion will also hold themselves accountable and maybe apologize, maybe recant, but surely stop continuing any kind of witch hunt and then focus on these important issues like getting our economy even stronger; working with this President to solve big problems which we have the opportunity to do to get a real trade agreement with our neighbors Mexico and Canada, all of whom want to have better trade relationships with us and help benefit our economy, create more jobs, and have fairer labor standards; something we have in front of us, an opportunity to do in a bipartisan way, maybe get a budget agreement so that we can have, certainly well before the September 30 deadline, how we are going to fund our government in a responsible way, make sure our men and women in uniform don't have to wonder whether or not they are going to get paid while they are deployed in a foreign country; make sure we can focus on lowering healthcare costs; and immigration reform that can solve some of the big problems on border security and some of the other areas.

So, hopefully, we can find agreement on that, and I am sure, in the coming weeks, we will on some, if not all, those issues. I look forward to working with the gentleman to do that.

I appreciate, while we go back and forth sometimes, we can have a little fun with our hobbies, but we also have big, important tasks; and I know that the gentleman carries out his role in the most responsible way to promote the agenda that he thinks is best for this country, as do I, and, ideally, we can find a lot of intersection where we can work together to get really good things done for the American people.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 2019, TO MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, April 1, 2019, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

RECOGNIZING JOHN OSTENBURG OF PARK FOREST, ILLINOIS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Mayor John Ostenburg of Park Forest, Illinois: son, husband, father, grandfather, mayor, trustee, legislator, leader, collaborator, author, teacher, speaker, editor, reporter, environmentalist, unionist, merchant, director, adviser, lecturer, painter, reader, traveler, neighbor, humanitarian, and ubiquitous friend.

''We do not exist for ourselves,'' his mentor once said.

When theologian Thomas Merton uttered those simple words, it likely tickled the eardrums and, certainly, the fancy of our friend, John Ostenburg.

To be clear, John enjoys his various vocations, but it just so happens that many endeavors share a common thread: to serve others for the greater good.

He makes sure everything he does, every role he plays, positively impacts others. That is who he is.

A perpetual student of mankind and relentless advocate of Chicago's Southland, John's omnipotence comes complete with the genuine chuckle of a friend, the wise grin of a mediator, the dignified humility of a monk.

With career highlights too long to list and colleagues too numerous to count, I commend and thank John Ostenburg for his longtime service to residents across the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

On their behalf and on behalf of the Congress of the United States, I wish Park Forest Mayor John Ostenburg Godspeed as he retires from elective office, if not from public service.

HONORING ELAINE EIGEMAN

(Mrs. RODGERS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Elaine Eigeman.

In Congress, every day we have people who come to the Nation's Capitol to advocate for important issues facing people in every community across our country. However, few do this as tirelessly and with as much passion and grace as Elaine.

As the board chair of the Lymphedema Advocacy Group, Elaine has given a strong voice to lymphedema patients all across the country.

She was the driving force behind the Lymphedema Treatment Act, which we will introduce in the House this week, to require Medicare to cover an essential part of lymphedema treatment.

Elaine developed lymphedema in 1999. Throughout her journey, she has made it her mission to support others and to be a voice for all suffering from this disease.

Thank you, Elaine, for your leadership and for creating a vibrant community for patients in the Northwest and beyond. I am proud to be your friend.

HONORING NATIONAL DEAF HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor National Deaf History Month, celebrated March 13 through April 15 each year.

What started as a very small observation at a Washington, D.C., library has grown to a 32-day-long celebration recognizing the countless contributions of deaf and hard-of-hearing Americans and honoring deaf culture.

I was so pleased when one of my constituents, Dawn Watts, an advocate for the deaf community, approached me with an idea of introducing a resolution recognizing Deaf History Month in Congress for the very first time.

I want to thank Dawn, as well as the National Association of the Deaf and the American Library Association, for their insight and support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Americans to take time this month to learn more about deaf Americans who helped shape our country, and I am honored to be able to have introduced this resolution.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, America is built on some core values that everyone should have an equal voice in our democracy, that everyone deserves equal opportunity, and that equal work should mean equal pay.

Right now, however, equal work doesn't mean equal pay. According to the United States Census Bureau, on average, women earn just 80 cents for every dollar earned by men. This wage gap hurts women, of course, but it also hurts their families and our economy as a whole.

Yesterday, we took a major step toward addressing this challenge by passing H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill will help close the wage gap by holding employers accountable for discriminatory practices and making it easier for workers to seek redress.

If we believe that Americans deserve equal pay for equal work—and I believe that as deeply as I believe anything—then this bill is how we put our values into action.

I thank Representative DELAURO for her decades of leadership on this issue, and I urge the Senate to take up this bill. What better way to conclude Women's History Month than by making history for women and for all Americans?

SUPPORTING TRANSGENDER TROOPS

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our transgender troops.

The United States is stronger and safer when our military reflects our Nation's diversity. This administration's transgender ban makes a mockery of that commitment. And let's be clear: This is a ban.

We must not ask transgender servicemembers to go back in the closet or tell them: You are less than other Americans.

I wholeheartedly support every single American who wants to serve our country. My father was a 30-year career marine, and he would never judge another marine on anything other than their ability to complete their mission. Why should there be another standard?

Trans servicemembers meet the same standards as every servicemember, and this was confirmed during a subcommittee hearing when trans troops testified as witnesses. These transgender troops were highly decorated and earned recognition on the basis of the quality of their work.

As all military personnel do, transgender troops deserve our respect. I challenge anyone who favors this kind of discrimination to look at their transgender constituents and tell them they are not fit to serve.

I thank my colleagues for taking a stand for all of our servicemembers today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, the Honorable Brian J. Mast, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BRIAN J. MAST,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT, THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Stephanie Cope, legislative correspondent, the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Stephanie Cope, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE COPE,
Legislative Correspondent,
Office of Congressman Brian Mast.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my honor to yield to my friend from New Jersey, not just a friend, but a brother, ardent pro-life advocate who I have seen has compassion for every baby child.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE AMERICA NEEDS TO HEAR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and

colleague for yielding and for his leadership on behalf of human rights. We have worked on issues in Sudan and other issues over the years. I want to thank him for being such a compassionate person.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, I attended a premiere of the new film, ''Unplanned,'' which opens this weekend in over 1,000 theaters. The movie is extraordinarily well written, well directed, and well acted. Ashley Bratcher is spectacular as Abby Johnson, the key character in the film.

''Unplanned'' tells a largely untold story, a very difficult story, and is packed with insight and a profoundly important message that America and the world needs to hear.

Based on the life of Abby Johnson and her book, ''Unplanned,'' the film chronicles Ms. JOHNSON's work at Planned Parenthood as a student activist, followed by almost 8 years at a large Planned Parenthood clinic in Texas, where over 20,000 abortions were performed.

Working as a counselor and then as actual director of that clinic, Abby says that 10 minutes of participation in an ultrasound-guided abortion shook the foundation of her values and changed the course of her life. She writes in the book, which is powerfully portrayed in the film:

''The details startled me. At 13 weeks, you could clearly see the profile of the head, both arms and legs, and even tiny fingers and toes. With my eyes glued to the image of this perfectly formed baby, I watched as a new image emerged on the video screen.''

''The cannula, a straw-shaped instrument attached to the end of a suction tube, had been inserted into the uterus and was nearing the baby's side. It looked like an invader on the screen, out of place. Wrong. It just looked wrong.''

She goes on to write, and you can see this portrayed on the screen:

''My heart sped up. Time slowed. I didn't want to look, but I didn't want to stop looking either.''

''At first, the baby didn't seem aware of the cannula. The next moment was the sudden jerk of a tiny foot of the baby as it started kicking, as if trying to get away from the probing invader. As the cannula pressed in, the baby began struggling to turn and twist away.''

''And then the doctor's voice broke through, startling me. ''Beam me up, Scotty,'' telling the assistant to turn on the suction.''

The abortion clinic director went on to write:

''I had a sudden urge to yell, ''Stop,'' to shake the woman and say: ''Look what is happening to your baby. Wake up. Hurry. Stop.''

''But even as I thought those words, I thought of my own hand and saw my own hand holding the probe. I was one of them, performing this act of abortion.''

Again, her eyes shot back to the screen, and she writes:

''The cannula was already being rotated by the doctor, and now I could see the tiny body violently twisting with it. For the briefest moment, it looked as if the baby was being wrung like a dishcloth, twirled and squeezed. And then the little body crumpled and began disappearing into the cannula before my eyes.''

''The last thing I saw was the tiny, perfectly formed backbone sucked into the tube, and then everything was gone.''

Abby Johnson writes:

''The image of that tiny, dead baby, mangled and sucked away, kept replaying in my mind.''

''What was in this woman's womb just a moment ago was alive. It wasn't tissue. It wasn't cells. This was a human baby fighting for life, a battle it lost in the blink of an eye.''

She writes in the book:

''What I have told people for years as a Planned Parenthood leader, what I believed and taught and defended, is a lie.''

Mr. Speaker, someday—someday—future generations of Americans will look back on us and wonder how and why such a rich and seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with the capacity to protect and enhance vulnerable human life—the weakest and the most vulnerable—could have so aggressively promoted death to children by abortion.

They will demand to know why dismembering a child like the one that Abby Johnson witnessed—pulverizing an infant with suction or chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals failed to elicit empathy, mercy, or compassion for these victims.

□ 1215

No one is expendable or a throwaway, Mr. Speaker. Every human life has infinite value. Birth is merely an event; it is not the beginning of life. Abortion is violence against children and it is violence against women.

The movie ''Unplanned'' not only moved me, as I believe it will move others, but it also inspired me, as I believe it will inspire others, to care even more for both victims of abortion, the mother, and the child, to love them both, to reach out to post-abortive women. And there are ministries all over this country that say, Yes, an abortion has been procured, but we love you and we want to see you reconcile and find peace and joy again.

This movie makes clear that we need to continue to reach out to the people inside the abortion industry, in the sincere hope that they, like Abby Johnson, will recognize that there is nothing compassionate, benign, or nurturing about abortion.

Abby Johnson has formed a ministry, a nongovernmental organization. It is called And Then There Was None. It is designed to assist abortion clinic workers out of the industry. To date, approximately, 500 abortion clinic workers have left that field of work including seven abortion doctors who now nurture life, rather than kill it.

Abby Johnson is a courageous, selfless woman who spreads truth and compassion. She speaks truth to power. ''Unplanned'' is a truly amazing movie.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman stay for a question.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and touched by everything my friend from New Jersey has had to say. But at one point, my friend said, he really believed that some day Americans will look back on this point in history. And one of my great concerns, because of the love I know is shared between us both for this country; and desperately wanting this country, our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, someday to enjoy our freedoms, one of my biggest concerns is that it won't be Americans that look back; that if we stay on this road where we dismember and kill babies, it may not be Americans that look back, it may be historians in some other country after the United States no longer exists in its present condition that look back and say, Wow, look how degenerate they had gotten, and it just seemed so accepted.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend, have any concerns that, perhaps, if we don't address this problem that it may not be Americans that look back and see this problem area?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do believe that there are deep concerns about the loss of life and what it means demographically, both here and all over the world. I mean, in places like China, sex selection abortion has claimed the lives of so many of the girl children that there are tens of millions of men who will never marry because the women simply have been exterminated through sex selection abortion.

I have held a number of congressional hearings—I have chaired them—where we have talked about the disparity between boys and girls. One estimate posited there are 62 million missing girls in China alone.

One of my witnesses said that if you look at all the women that have been killed in Asia through sex selection abortion alone, and it is worldwide, it equals, equates with the number of all the women and girl children living in the United States of America. I mean, that is a horrific crime, in my opinion, against women. And the disparity in male to female that is a consequence leads to other horrific consequences, like human trafficking.

As my good friend knows, I am the prime author of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and four other laws that combat human trafficking, including the most recently signed, the Frederick Douglass anti-human trafficking law signed by President Trump just a few months ago. I am the author

of those bills; and we watch very closely what is happening all over the world.

In places like China, trafficking has increased because of the missing daughters who have been killed, simply because they happened to be girls and women, young women, young females.

On this floor of the House, as the gentleman knows, because he voted, as did I, we had a bill to ban sex selection abortions. And to this day, I am shocked and dismayed how many of our colleagues—and I respect our colleagues on both sides of this issue—didn't see that discrimination begins in the womb, when a woman is singled out, a girl, girl child, simply because she is a girl and is killed for that reason.

Sex selection abortion is almost never—although it is occasionally for the boy child, it is the girl child who suffers. So when we look back, when our future generations look back, they will also note that discrimination. Why did that bill not become law?

It seems to me there are at least 20 nations around the world where there are disparities; India and China are among the worst, but it is a huge problem. And we need to look at protecting unborn children as a human rights issue.

Killing an unborn child in the womb is the only human rights abuse that dares call itself a human right; and there are people, purveyors of abortion, who do that on a regular basis. They keep saying it is a right; a right to dismember a child; the right to chemically poison a child.

As the gentleman knows, because he was, again, one of the sponsors of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I have re-introduced in this Congress—Trent Franks had introduced it in previous—passed three times here on the House floor. It says that children at least 20 weeks, and maybe earlier, but at least at 20 weeks, need to be protected because they suffer excruciating pain when they are being dismembered, for a couple of minutes. We are not sure exactly how long, but the evidence is very, very clear that they suffer as they are being killed by abortion.

And that legislation passed with good numbers, good—a large number of Members of the House, but it is not law yet.

So, you know, I think when we look back, we are going to say we had all these opportunities. And now the most recent—and I appreciate my friend from Texas yielding this time—the most recent outrage is what is happening with regards to children who are born alive and then are killed after birth.

We just had the mayor—not the mayor—the Governor of New York eviscerating protections for children who survive abortions.

Years ago, the Philadelphia Inquirer did a piece, a big piece, a big article called ''The Dreaded Complication.'' And the dreaded complication were those children who somehow evaded the dismemberment process or some other part of that process and emerged alive. It was usually a hysterotomy abortion in most cases, but other cases as well, to go on and breathe and gasp and cry. And these very weak and vulnerable children should be protected.

We have a bill that has been introduced, the Born-Alive Protection Act. We have asked, as just a few hours ago from this floor many times—I did it as well—asking that our friends in the majority would allow this bill to come up, so at least when these children are born alive, the same regimen of care, the same due diligence would be given to that boy or girl, gasping for breath, to ensure that they are protected and get resuscitation.

Why, in these abortion clinics, are they allowed to die due to exposure, or sometimes to additional effort to just kill them?

This legislation has had a large number of cosponsors in the House and Senate. The Senate had an opportunity to take it up and it was voted down, sadly, by other friends on the other side of the aisle. And again, we reach out to our friends on the other side of the aisle to say this is a human rights issue.

Born alive? I did a speech in 2012 on what is called after-birth abortion. Two ethicists wrote this piece—and I would invite anyone who wants to, read it; it is on my website.

Two ethicists wrote this piece about how we ought to kill babies after birth because, really, they are not really different than the child before birth. They can't dream; they can't talk; they don't have cognitive abilities that say, a 4-year-old or a 5-year-old might have.

You know, birth is an event that happens to all of us. It is a continuum of life, and abortion is violence against children. But after-birth abortion also is violence against children.

Let me just conclude. Many people, like Alveda King, Dr. Martin Luther King's niece, she has had two abortions. And she has said, how can the dream survive—that is to say, her great uncle's dream, I have a dream—if we kill the children and hurt and wound the women?

The pro-life movement, and I have been in it for 47 years, care for both, mother and child; love them both. And, again, this new movie, ''Unplanned,'' chronicles a woman, Abby Johnson, who was right there with the strongest of the pro-abortion activists in this country, including counseling women to get abortions.

And then she was director of a clinic in Texas, as I said earlier, in the gentleman's home State. Then, when she saw that child killed, in real time, on an ultrasound, it shattered the myth that somehow that child is not human and not alive, and she walked out the door and never came back.

There were people praying for her from the 40 Days for Life, a very, very humane organization of men and women who pray for the clinic personnel; they pray for the babies; they pray for the moms. That is their agenda, care, love, compassion.

She then, later on, and as depicted in the movie, was at—you know, trying to reach out to some women as well, so they wouldn't make this irreversible decision.

So I want to thank the gentleman again. But, you know, someday we will recognize that these children—and you know, this millennial generation and others that are coming along, you know, first baby pictures now for parents and grandparents are of ultrasound imaging of their children. That is what goes on the refrigerator. The newborn pictures go on, too, with great smiles and great joy when the child is born. But we now know, before birth when he or she is a girl or a boy. We know just so much, and we have that picture, which is the first baby picture.

And to think—and this is what got to Abby Johnson—she watched as that child was dismembered right in front of her. She was holding the probe; and it just dawned on her, the blind spot was lifted, and she realized, I am participating in the killing of a baby. And she left that clinic, and now she is one of the most courageous pro-life leaders in the country and the world.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate those words from my friend, CHRIS SMITH, and I look forward to seeing that movie.

I was very moved watching the movie ''Gosnell''. It just—I thought about the poets, the inhumanity to man. It is tragic.

Having talked to people that have taught in China, you know, it is a human crisis what is going on with the abortion of so many women. And like my friend, CHRIS SMITH, I can't help but wonder why that is not considered a war on women when you kill a baby in utero simply because the child is female. But apparently, in China, since couples are only allowed normally to have one child, many couples think, well, we would rather have a boy. Discrimination against girls.

As a father who has three girls, they have brought joy to my life in so many ways. I just cannot fathom the thought of ever doing anything to have prevented those girls from being born.

But there are far-reaching implications when you have a gendercide. But as was pointed out by a teacher in China, first of all, the boys don't have as much opportunity to have female friends, making it more difficult to find a heterosexual partner.

But more than that, because it is restricted to one child, you have two sets of grandparents and two parents, six people who have one child to focus on, and it actually—

One of the greatest disciplined groups of children in the world used to be considered from China.

□ 1230

More and more, you have doting grandparents and parents. Since they only have one child to dote on among the six of them, more and more of those Chinese children are being spoiled rotten. It is much more difficult to maintain order, because now that there is one child to spoil among six people, the teacher is never right. The child is always right.

It is interesting, seeing all the far-reaching ramifications of this gendercide against women. I hope and literally do pray that things will change, and babies will no longer be killed just simply because they are female.

FRAUD ON FISA COURT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are four other topics I wanted to touch on.

One, I was greatly surprised to find out about a motion and order by the Obama administration in 2012 before the FISA court, because being on the Judiciary Committee—I wasn't there when the PATRIOT Act was passed; I have been there for reauthorization—I have grave concerns about some of the civil rights there.

My colleagues across the aisle on the Judiciary Committee, many of them had extremely grave concerns when they were in the minority about civil rights and civil liberties, and those seem to have taken a backseat while the President was President Obama.

I am hopeful that, now that there is not a Democrat in the White House, we can get some bipartisan concern again about civil liberties, after the Obama administration really did run roughshod over so many.

One of the things we were assured in reauthorizing the FISA court, the procedures and all, is that no American, and this was in the PATRIOT Act as well, but no American would be caught up in any foreign surveillance or surveillance by our U.S. entities, whether CIA, NSA, whatever, unless the American citizen was engaged in a conversation with a known terrorist, foreign terrorist, or an agent of a known terrorist organization.

Then through this colonoscopy, figuratively speaking, that the Trump campaign and administration were getting, we come to find out things were far more loose in protecting civil liberties and privacy rights.

On the FISA court, unfortunately, we have at least one or more FISA judges that really don't care about the Constitution. They don't care about Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights. They have allowed the Justice Department to run roughshod over those.

I am very concerned about how far this goes back. Did it go back before the Obama administration? Is it a newer invention? Just how many activities once considered unthinkable by the Federal Government are now just ho-hum to FISA judges?

The fact is that we now know the FISA court, at least one, perhaps more courts, were lied to. Since this is basically a Star Chamber where the public is not allowed to know what went on—things are held in secret. The transcripts are held in secret, unless you get them released by WikiLeaks, as the application for warrant, the affidavit on which it was based, and the order regarding Verizon some years back—WikiLeaks released that.

That was the eye-opener for me, because as just an ardent historian when it comes to so many things American, and that includes First Amendment rights, I was shocked, Fourth Amendment, Fifth Amendment.

We know the Constitution is very clear. You can't just say: Give me all the information you have.

It is required that you have some kind of probable cause here, and you have to describe with particularity the area to be searched or the thing to be searched and the specific thing that is being sought for which there is a warrant.

I was overwhelmed to see an affidavit saying: Well, for America's protection, we just need every bit of information that Verizon has on every one of their customers.

I am going, oh, my gosh. During my days as a felony judge in Texas, if an officer had come with an affidavit and an application signed, sworn to, and given that to me, that we need a warrant, I am going, you have got to be kidding. There is no particularity here. It is just saying give me everything you have on every customer this company has.

Are you kidding? You need to go back to school. I am not sure I need to be signing any more warrants for you if that is the way you consider constitutional rights.

Yet, it was just ho-hum for the Justice Department, ho-hum for the FISA court judges.

I mean, unless there is some FISA judge that signed these four warrants regarding the Trump campaign, and individuals with it, who has just completely lost his or her mind and doesn't know what is going on, that judge, or judges, has to be aware they were lied to. There was fraud upon that court.

The fact that we have Federal judges who were confirmed by the U.S. Senate after being appointed by a U.S. President who would not be bothered that the United States Department of Justice and the FBI had people who would come before that judge and lie to that judge, and the judge is not bothered—''oh, well.''

I remember after a bankruptcy hearing many years ago, I really liked this judge, but he said: Louie, you seem bothered that the person who filed bankruptcy got caught in a huge lie. That seemed to bother you. But, Louie, they all lie. You just got to get used to it.

Well, I have still not gotten used to the idea that somebody can come in and lie under oath before a judge without any ramifications coming from that.

The fact that we have one or more FISA judges who are not bothered, have done nothing, and have put no one in jail for the fraud committed in the FISA court tells me we have to either get rid of the FISA courts—go back to the way it was before, when if you had a matter of national security, it was treated differently, but we didn't have special Star Chambers where you came and had secret hearings. You just went to a normal judge and handled things in camera, if necessary. We have to either do that, get rid of the FISA courts, or we have to have some safeguards to make sure that Americans' rights are protected.

But there is a motion and order here. The motion, it was secret, classified, before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. This is from April 23, 2012. It has now been declassified. I had no idea that the Obama administration, the Justice Department, had sought this and gotten it, but apparently, as broadly spread as information was about American citizens whose names were unmasked and about what they were saying when it didn't necessarily involve any foreign terrorist organization—I am still not over the fact that some of us were lied to, in order to get some of the PATRIOT Act reauthorized. That was not the Obama administration I am talking about.

But this is a motion, and the title is: ''Government's Submission of Amendments to Standard Minimization Procedures.'' That is the procedure where, if it is an American citizen who is caught up in a phone surveillance, phone conversations that are being surveilled by our intelligence, the minimization is what the law requires where you mask the name. You minimize the conversation so that the identity and other information is not available for review, because the Constitution protects American citizens and gives them Fourth Amendment and Fifth Amendment rights that otherwise would be abused.

But this says: ''For FBI Electronic Surveillance and Physical Search Conducted Under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and Submission of Revised Minimization Procedures for the National Counterterrorism Center, and Motion for Amended Orders Permitting Use of Amended Minimization Procedures.''

Then I see that it was classified by Tashina Gauhar, Deputy Assistant Attorney General. She answered directly to Rod Rosenstein, I guess still does.

My understanding is, and I was told, that she is one of the key people who was telling Jeff Sessions that he needed to recuse himself. This is an attorney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, who was loyal to Sally Yates, is still loyal to Sally Yates, even though she refused to do her constitutional duty to defend a constitutional act by President Trump. She didn't care for the President, so she wasn't going to carry out her constitutionally mandated duty.

Fortunately, Sally Yates is no longer there, and we have at least some people there who are willing to carry out their obligation under the Constitution.

But when my friend Jeff Sessions was saying he has talked to career people and they have encouraged him, told him he needed to recuse himself, I had heard that Tashina Gauhar was one of those people. You can call her a career person. I hope her career is about ended, at least in the Justice Department.

I also had understood she was someone who was trying to make Jeff Sessions look bad. As the National Security Council liaison, the notices of NSC meetings would go to her for the Attorney General. I was told she would sit on those and not get them to the Attorney General. He would get his notices late. He would be, therefore, the least prepared at the NSC's critical meetings. Sometimes, he would have conflicts because she didn't get him the notices early enough. Yet she, I was told, is one of those who said: Oh, yeah, you have to recuse yourself.

Her loyalties were more to President Obama and Sally Yates than they appear to be, at least to me, to the Constitution itself. Yet she is the one who is also pushing to change the minimization requirements.

What really got me as I read through this lengthy motion, I think this is really the crux of it, over here at page 64.

□ 1245

Over here on page 64—so, obviously, it is a long motion on behalf of the U.S. Government by Tashina Gauhar—it says:

''The following underlined text will be inserted into the first sentence: 'The FBI may disseminate FISA-acquired information concerning United States persons, which' ''—and then here is the underlined part—'' 'reasonably appears to be' ''—and then not underlined—'' 'foreign intelligence information' ''—more underlining—'' 'is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance, or is evidence of a crime being disseminated for a law enforcement purpose.' ''

Look, when you get language like this that could allow the massive distribution of what we were assured during reauthorization of these type procedures—oh, no, it is so restricted.

See, here are the regulations. This is who can find out about an American citizen who was surveilled electronically. It is protected. If somebody—an American citizen—happens to be captured just because of who they are talking to, you know, we have the minimization—nobody gets to know who that person is. The requirements are so tough to reveal the name.

Oh, no, not in this that was filed by Tashina Gauhar, if it reasonably appears it is necessary to understand some intelligence. Good grief, that throws the door wide open. You could justify giving this constitutionally protected information to basically anybody. Well, I think this will be important to help them understand some other intelligence information. This is an outrage.

And I had no idea—I don't know of anybody who did know back in 2012—that the Obama Justice Department was throwing this door open with this kind of vague and ambiguous terminology: Oh, well, if it helps them understand other information, well, then they can see and hear and get all of what otherwise should be constitutionally protected information where the U.S. Government has been spying on U.S. citizens.

As I have said before, I mean, it is becoming more and more clear that the only thing that Orwell got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984. But here, oh, yeah, anything that our DOJ, our intelligence, want to disseminate to their friends, even if it is somebody that may be working at the U.N., we will disclose it to anybody, because it will help them understand other information better.

For everyone's sake, this is such an outrage. And here it is, 7 years—yeah, next month—7 years since this motion and order was filed in order to allow the government to pass around top-secret information that should be not only classified, it should never have been obtained in the first place.

And then, through the investigation of the Donald Trump campaign, we find out that, actually, you don't have to be a terrorist or a member of a known terrorist organization. If you happen to be an ambassador, which, I would imagine, most all of the Members of the House and Senate have met with ambassadors and have talked to ambassadors of foreign countries. And it had never crossed my mind that our Justice Department, or our NSA, CIA, or FBI, that they may say: Oh, here is a Senator or a U.S. Congressman who is having a conversation with a foreign ambassador, so we get to surveil this Member of Congress or Senate.

But, it turns out, if you have a conversation with an ambassador, you can't be sure anymore that you don't have the FBI's electronic intelligence community noting and logging and checking everything that you are doing and saying. That is incredible. That is just almost unfathomable, due to the protections that used to be observed for American citizens. I thought we made progress.

The days when Attorney General Kennedy authorized a wiretap of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Hoover were surveilling so many people that never should have been allowed to be surveilled, I thought we had gotten beyond that. Some of those activities were unconstitutional, were illegal. I thought we had progressed to the point that Members of the House and Senate, both sides of the aisle, should be deeply offended to find out that their government may be spying on them, perhaps when they talk to an ambassador. Even if it is not a terrorist country, it is just extraordinary what we have been finding out in the last 2 years about the extent of abuses of Americans' privacy rights.

I am hoping, though, that we can work across the aisle to rein in some of these abuses, since the Obama administration is no longer there and the protection that seems some of my colleagues were trying to afford them, even though, in my mind, it meant really abuses of Americans' constitutional rights.

And then, somewhat related, my friend RAND PAUL, down the hall, this story from Paul Bedard, yesterday, notes that, ''Senator RAND PAUL escalated his demand for an investigation into former Obama officials who 'concocted' the anti-Trump Russia scandal, revealing that former CIA director John Brennan was the key figure who legitimized the charges and discredited 'dossier' against the President.''

And it is interesting. This term ''dossier'' everybody is using now because of the former MI6, a former FBI informant who became no longer trusted by the FBI, no longer usable, because he was untrustworthy by the FBI, which was never conveyed to the FISA judge, that allowed the judge to keep signing warrants based on this untrustworthy person, but now to have this. As Senator PAUL was reporting in a tweet, he said that he had heard from a high-level source that Brennan helped to validate the dossier in intelligence reports.

''A high-level source tells me it was Brennan who insisted that the unverified and fake Steele dossier be included in the intelligence report . . . Brennan should be asked to testify under oath in Congress ASAP,'' Senator PAUL tweeted.

In an earlier tweet Wednesday, Senator PAUL called for wide investigation into former President Barack Obama and his team. ''Time for Congress to investigate. What did President Obama know and when? How did this hoax go on for so long unabated?''

It goes on to say:

''Brennan has denied in the past that he included the salacious dossier. . . . But at least two other top intelligence officials said he did.''

And we do know, sort of parenthetically here, it is not in the article, but we know Brennan has admitted being untruthful under oath before the Senate. He has admitted perjuring himself when it suited what he wanted to accomplish. And this is a guy that was overrunning the Trump campaign, Donald Trump and his campaign—then Donald Trump, now President Trump—just abusing his position as head of an intelligence agency.

This says, ''And Washington Post editor Bob Woodward also said that Brennan endorsed the dossier from Christopher Steele when he''—Bob Woodward—''got a copy in late 2016. Woodward said that Brennan felt it matched the Russia collusion charges he had heard.''

And I can't help but wonder now if where Brennan heard this was when it came out of his own mouth.

''The dossier was never considered true until it was recognized in intelligence assessments and only after the late Senator John McCain and top Obama officials helped circulate it, said Paul.''

''The dossier was underwritten by the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign. By indicating the Kremlin interfered in the election, it helped to fuel false allegations of foreign collusion with the Trump campaign, leading to 2 years of nonstop investigations.''

'' 'I'm very concerned that it's becoming more clear that the Obama administration was able to obtain a FISA warrant to spy on our campaign based on phony opposition research from the Clinton campaign. Having Federal law enforcement spy on a Presidential campaign based on phony campaign research is really distressing and the true untold story,' he said.''

This is a problem. I know others may feel otherwise.

I like ADAM SCHIFF. He was put in charge of—back when he was in the Judiciary Committee where I was serving, we actually impeached two Federal judges who needed to be impeached, who needed to be removed, and my colleague, ADAM SCHIFF, did a wonderful job in handling that effort. As far as I am concerned, he developed great credibility with me in his professionalism in the way he handled the impeachment of those two Federal judges.

But, over the last 2 years, as he has continued to say we know there was collusion between the Trump administration and Russia and we have evidence and on and on, his credibility when it comes to intelligence matters has now been done great harm, not only here, but abroad. So I think it is time to have a different chairman of intelligence.

It is too important that we have someone who is a chairman that hasn't spent 2 years saying something was true that it turned out wasn't. We need to have a Democrat who has credibility with foreign governments, as well as here in the House, as well as in the Senate, and there are people like that. There are people like that on both sides of the aisle that have that kind of credibility that we know just would not be spreading something that wasn't absolutely true.

So I agree with my friends that are on the Intelligence Committee, and I appreciate my fellow Texan, MIKE CONAWAY, for pointing out this is now a problem and it needs to be addressed.

□ 1300

This article points out something I very much appreciate. The article is from Gregg Re with FOX News. ''President Trump, in an exclusive, wide-ranging interview Wednesday night with FOX News' Hannity''—and that was a great interview my friend Sean Hannity had with the President, really enjoyable, last night. But anyway, it says, '' . . . to release the full and unredacted Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrants and related documents used by the FBI to probe his campaign, saying he wants to 'get to the bottom' of how the long-running Russia collusion narrative began.

''Trump told anchor Sean Hannity that his lawyers previously had advised him not to take that dramatic step out of fear that it could be considered obstruction of justice. 'I do, I have plans to declassify and release. I have plans to absolutely release,' Trump said. 'I have some very talented people working for me, lawyers, and they really didn't want me to do it early on. . . . A lot of people wanted me to do it a long time ago.' '' I was one of those people.

He says: ''I'm glad I didn't do it. We got a great result without having to do it, but we will. One of the reasons that my lawyers didn't want me to do it is, they said, if I do it, they'll call it a form of obstruction.''

Last fall, when I was in the Oval Office along with the President talking for a while, and then his personal attorney came in, it seemed clear to me that his personal attorney was very concerned about declassifying the documents, that it was not the time to do it.

But there is no reason not to do it now, for sure. These things need to come out. We need to see just how badly abused this system was.

My friend JERRY NADLER is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I remember my first term. There was no more vocal advocate on behalf of civil liberties and privacy rights. I really hope that our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will join in with Republicans to try to correct this situation.

Clearly, there are still many people who are working in the Trump administration who don't want President Trump to succeed, don't want the President to succeed with what he is trying to do, what he promised he would do.

I don't think anybody has to worry about President Trump being abusive secretly of somebody's rights. But if this isn't handled now, even though Republicans are not in the majority, if we don't clamp down on what we see are clear abuses within the DOJ, within the intelligence community, with the FISA courts, then we are easily headed for a time when somebody else will come in there and they will see how the system was abused during the Obama administration.

I don't know whether that will be a Democrat or a Republican, but I am telling you, if we don't clamp down on it now, the abuses will allow the arising of a Chavez. It will allow the arising of these people who got elected and then became totalitarian.

I think there is a great deal to the poster that circulated: ''The problem with socialism is, you can vote your way into it, but you have to shoot your way out of it.''

That is what they found in Venezuela. They voted it in, but in order to have true socialism, you have to move toward totalitarian. You have to have such a powerful government. You can take from those who have earned and who have worked and give to those who are more desirable to have it, according to the government.

It is interesting that we have billionaires who are contributing massive amounts of money to move toward socialism. Obviously, they don't know their history well enough to know, that, yeah, they are considered good friends of the movement—thank you; you are a hero—but then when you move either toward communism—which true communism means there is no government. Everybody just shares and shares alike out of the goodness of their heart. You never can get there. You got to have a totalitarian government. That is why communism doesn't work.

Socialism, they welcome the help of all the rich people. But once you move toward real, true socialism, most of the time, the billionaires, they are going to end up in prison or dead and their money confiscated.

So I am amazed that so many billionaires don't realize they are just lackeys who are being appreciated now, but some day, they are going to go under the bus, and their money is going to be relieved from them.

It is a very critical time. As the Mueller investigation has finally concluded, having questioned Mr. Mueller numerous times, having done so much research on the man I feel like I know him very well—obviously, not as well as Eric Holder, who thought he would end up with an indictment to keep going.

I can't help but wonder if we have a new Attorney General who came in and realized there is nothing here. After all these subpoenas, tens of millions of dollars, it is time to wrap it up.

I really do think Mueller, left to his own devices, would have just kept an investigation going until every potential limitation on anything he had done wrong had run out.

But it is time to reform FISA courts, time to reform DOJ, time to reform our intelligence communities so the kind of abuses that have just gone on will not continue and Presidents in the future, whether Democrat or Republican, will not be tempted to abuse the system, as it is now appearing to have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence. At this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 29, 2019, at 2:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

524. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources — Headquarters, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to National Park Service's Research and Monitoring Activities in Southern Alaska National Parks [Docket No.: 180411364-9092-02] (RIN: 0648-BH90) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

525. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace for the following Alaska Towns; Hooper Bay, AK; Kaltag, AK; King Salmon, AK; Kodiak, AK; Manokotak, AK; Middleton Island, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0347; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AAL-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

526. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — External Marking Requirement for Small Unmanned Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1084; Amdt. No.: 48-2] (RIN: 2120-AL32) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

527. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0902; Product Identifier 2018-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-19543; AD 2019-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

528. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0581; Product Identifier 2018-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-19547; AD 2019-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

529. A letter from the Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — ELDT; Commercial Driver's License Upgrade from Class B to Class A [Docket No.: FMCSA-2017-0371] (RIN: 2126-AC05) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

530. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0949; Product Identifier 2018-NE-20-AD; Amendment 39-19484; AD 2018-22-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

531. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division (PW) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0826; Product Identifier 2018-NE-27; Amendment 39-19553; AD 2019-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

532. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0554; Product Identifier 2018-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-19569; AD 2019-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

533. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0788; Product Identifier 2018-NM-004-AD; Amendment 39-19544; AD 2019-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

534. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1126; Product Identifier 2017-SW-125-AD; Amendment 39-19587; AD 2019-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

535. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0793; Product Identifier 2018-NM-057-AD; Amendment 39-19545; AD 2019-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

536. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9189; Product Identifier 2016-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-19578; AD 2019-03-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

537. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31240; Amdt. No.: 3841] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

538. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0162; Product Identifier 2017-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-19542; AD 2019-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

539. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 31241; Amdt. No.: 3842] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

540. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0638; Product Identifier 2018-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-19552; AD 2019-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

541. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Flippin, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0952; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

542. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Beeville-Chase Field, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0917; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

543. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0555; Product Identifier 2010-SW-047-AD; Amendment 39-19537; AD 2014-05-06 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

544. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Williston, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0250; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

545. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.:

FAA-2018-0556; Product Identifier 2018-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-19555; AD 2019-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

546. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0647; Product Identifier 2017-SW-083-AD; Amendment 39-19557; AD 2019-03-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

547. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0048; Product Identifier 2018-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-19556; AD 2019-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

548. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Aerotechnics Oxygen Mask Regulators [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0505; Product Identifier 2017-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-19472; AD 2018-21-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

549. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Corps' report on San Joaquin River Basin, Lower San Joaquin River, CA: Integrated Interim Feasibly Report, Environmental Impact Statement, and Environmental Impact Report for February 2018 (H. Doc. No. 116—24); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

550. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Construction and Architect-Engineer Contracts (RIN: 2900-AQ18) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

551. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services IRB only rule — 2019 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures [Notice 2019-19] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Distributions of Stock and Securities of a Controlled Corporation (Revenue Ruling 2019-9) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1598. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a strategy to improve hiring and retention of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel in rural or remote areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1433. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1590. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KIM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior including in any leasing program certain planning areas, and for other purposes to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1942. A bill to repeal the authority to access on an ongoing basis business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COX of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 1943. A bill to provide funding for Federally qualified health centers and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 1944. A bill to require directors of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to submit annual pamphlets to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the status of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 1945. A bill to suspend United States security assistance with Honduras until such time as human rights violations by Honduran security forces cease and their perpetrators are brought to justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a

period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require voting systems used in elections for Federal office to produce a voter-verified paper ballot of each vote cast on the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 1947. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt transfers of funds from Federal agencies to the Department of Veterans Affairs for nonprofit corporations established under subchapter IV of chapter 73 of such title from certain provisions of the Economy Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VELA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HECK, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GRIFFITH, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COOPER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 1948. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1949. A bill to authorize the court to depart from a statutory minimum in the case of a juvenile offender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1950. A bill to authorize the court to impose a reduced sentence for a youthful victim offender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1951. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize a court to reduce the term of imprisonment imposed on certain defendants convicted as an adult for an offense committed and completed before the defendant attained 18 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1952. A bill to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COMER, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 1953. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. TIMMONS):

H.R. 1954. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1955. A bill to require the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to conduct a study on antipsychotic prescribing practices in nonnursing home settings under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1956. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRADY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize provision to a foreign government of financial assistance for foreign country operations to address individuals who may pose a national security, border security, or terrorist threat to the United States before such a threat reaches the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1960. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that kombucha is exempt from any excise taxes and regulations imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1962. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use on-site regulated medical waste treatment systems at certain Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1963. A bill to expand the research and education on and delivery of complementary and integrative medicine to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 1964. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 1965. A bill to set forth the terms for the admission of the territory of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1966. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to complete a study on barriers to participation in federally funded cancer clinical trials by populations that have been traditionally underrepresented in such trials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and

Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MENG, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 1968. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Shirley Chisholm; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover screening computed tomography colonography as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment for services of radiologist assistants under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 1971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible entities to carry out full-day kindergarten programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1972. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the ''Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to add additional vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the mine rescue team training credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1975. A bill to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security a Chief Information Security Officer Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1976. A bill to require the Director of the United States Geological Survey to perform a nationwide survey of perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 2 years the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1978. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individuals and families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1979. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DEAN, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BARR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 1980. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WILD, Mr. HECK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit payments under the Medicaid program for conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1982. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Women's Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 1983. A bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance including the limitation on dependent care flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1986. A bill to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1988. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the provisions that relate to family-sponsored immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend the National Aviation Heritage Act to reauthorize the National Aviation Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing and securing the fundamental right to life, liberty, and property, which includes housing, health care, education, and nutrition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H. Res. 264. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H. Res. 265. A resolution commemorating the life and legacy of Sojourner Truth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HILL of California, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H. Res. 266. A resolution recognizing March 31 as ''César Chávez Day'' in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H. Res. 267. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2019 as National Kidney Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H. Res. 268. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Cesar Chavez's birthday, March 31, 2019, as National Border Control Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BYRNE):

H. Res. 269. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 2, 2020, as ''Gold Star Families Remembrance Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BUDD):

H. Res. 270. A resolution expressing support for designation of a Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

11. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, requesting Congress to lawfully change the Medicaid eligibility requirements to give states the option to provide Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. NEGUSE introduced a bill (H.R. 1991) for the relief of Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1941.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1942.

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

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 1943.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 1944.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1945.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 1946.

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

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1947.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1948.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1949.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1950.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1951.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1952.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1953.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1954.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for the foregoing Power and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1955.

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

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1956.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1957.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1958.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1959.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1960.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1961.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1962.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1963.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1964.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 1965.

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

Article 1, Section 8, and Article 4, Section 3, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1966.

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

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

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1967.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1968.

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

Article l, Section 8, Clause 18, to make all laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1969.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1970.

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

Article 1, Section 8

[Page H2754]

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 1971.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1972.

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

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

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 1973.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974.

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

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

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 1975.

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

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1976.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1977.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1978.

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

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1979.

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

Article I, Section VIII

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1980.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1981.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 1982.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5: ''To coin Money, regulate the Value there of, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;''

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1983.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1984.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 1985.

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

Article 1. Section 8.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1986.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 1987.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1988.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1989.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises,

to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1990.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1991.

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

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

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 54.

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

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. DINGELL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 20: Mr. PERRY and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 38: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 61: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 95: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 101: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 141: Ms. JAYAPAL and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 434: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 500: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 510: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 535: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 550: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 553: Mr. COMER and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 569: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 587: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 612: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 647: Mr. SIRES and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 759: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 779: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. FULCHER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 784: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 808: Mr. COLE and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 830: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 836: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 864: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 865: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 961: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 962: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1006: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1035: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1049: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1073: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1175: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1182: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1183: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1243: Mr. COSTA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1254: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1260: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1266: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1279: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 1287: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1377: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1379: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1380: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1383: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1386: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1425: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1426: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1471: Mr. WELCH, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1540: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1553: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1570: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. GUEST, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1572: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1579: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1622: Mr. KATKO, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1629: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1644: Mr. STANTON, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1653: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1674: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1684: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1709: Mr. SUOZZI and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1717: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1735: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1739: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1741: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BRADY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. STEIL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1765: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1781: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1837: Mr. KATKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1854: Mr. COLE and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1855: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 1857: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1869: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1889: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1931: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1933: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. ADAMS.

H. Res. 33: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. CRAIG, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H. Res. 54: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 106: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Res. 129: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 214: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 246: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CORREA, and Mrs. MURPHY.

H. Res. 255: Mr. LONG, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ZELDIN.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019 *No. 54*

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

King of our lives, we acknowledge Your sovereignty, believing because of You we live and move and have our being.

Show our lawmakers how to use this day's fleeting minutes to accomplish Your purposes on Earth. Make our Senators Your instruments of deliverance, causing justice to roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. Sanctify their thoughts, words, and deeds throughout this day and all of their tomorrows. Lord, provide them with goodness, grace, and wisdom for the living of these days.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

FLOODING IN IOWA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, Governor Reynolds designated this week as ''Severe Weather Awareness Week'' in Iowa. That goes beyond just a flooding situation; it is because of the catastrophic flooding throughout our State and to tell everybody that it is not over. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has warned of significant spring flooding yet to come.

We are seeing increased flows in the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, and their tributaries. Iowans should review their insurance policies for gaps and consider flood insurance. That is one of the things Governor Reynolds is suggesting. Also, it would be good to have a plan in case it is necessary to evacuate, including important personal belongings and pets. FEMA's website, ready.gov, can help you with that information.

Iowans know severe weather, including massive snowstorms, flooding, tornadoes, and heavy winds. The key is that we prepare, help our neighbors, and stay vigilant.

I thank Governor Reynolds for alerting people to the future, as well as worrying about the past.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

DISASTER FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, in recent months, my home State of Kentucky has been hit by severe weather. Over half of our 120 counties have reported flood damage. Governor Bevin has placed the entire Commonwealth under a state of emergency and mobilized resources to help with recovery. Local, State, and Federal emergency officials have started assessing the flood damage. My staff and I are monitoring the progress to provide assistance wherever we can. I look forward to meeting with the Kentucky emergency management director later today to get the latest updates.

Unfortunately, my State is not alone—far from it. Many States are currently bearing heavy burdens in the wake of powerful natural disasters. Families in Florida and the Carolinas are still picking up the pieces from a damaging hurricane season. In Alabama and Georgia, recovery is just beginning after vicious tornadoes. The effects of serious flooding remain across the Southeast. In places in the Midwest, such as Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, many Americans are still waiting, praying, and working to mitigate the destruction from devastating flooding. Many communities are still literally under water.

I know right now the entire Senate is especially mindful of the destruction in America's heartland, so I am grateful for the efforts of several colleagues to bring forward a package of supplemental disaster relief funds to address the most urgent needs.

The legislation we are considering this week would help growers and producers with storm-related crop losses. It would help local infrastructure—from roads to schools and hospitals—resume full operation. It would help our Nation's military restore readiness at bases and installations that were caught in harm's way.

Thanks to Chairman SHELBY, Senators ISAKSON, PERDUE, SCOTT, RUBIO, and others, we will have the opportunity to deliver critical resources to the communities facing the long road back to normal. I hope each of our colleagues will join me in supporting this measure, which will do just that.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Madam President, on an entirely different matter, this week, the American people saw our Democratic colleagues go on

the record on a truly astonishing policy proposal—a truly astonishing policy proposal.

After months of enthusiastic declarations of support, after tripping over one another to prove their devotion to the far-left core of the new Democratic Party, the vast majority of our colleagues across the aisle were unable to vote against even an obviously ludicrous proposal to tank the U.S. economy and to leave American workers out in the cold.

You might think that after their radical proposal met with such an inglorious end, my colleagues might choose to pause and take stock. Well, think again. Just yesterday, our Democratic colleagues introduced a Senate version of Speaker PELOSI's sweeping legislation to rewrite the rules of American politics to benefit one side—new Washington rules for how citizens can exercise political speech, new Washington systems to funnel taxpayer dollars into the pockets of political campaigns, and an unprecedented Washington intrusion into State and local election law all across our country.

As I have argued before, it conveniently turns out that the vast majority of their proposed changes seem tailored to help more Democrats get elected and stay elected; hence my name for this legislation: the Democratic politician protection act.

Apparently, our friends are under the impression that if Democrats aren't winning as many elections as they would like, then the entire process by which we elect our representatives must certainly be broken. If Democrats don't like an outcome, then the rules themselves need to be tossed aside. This seems to be emerging as a kind of pattern on the other side of the aisle.

When our Constitution, our institutions, or the American people disappoint our Democratic colleagues, instead of taking the hint and perhaps making their own positions more mainstream, they instead look to change the rules.

After they failed to defeat the nomination of Justice Kavanaugh last year, liberal leaders decided the underlying structure of the American judiciary needed to be radically overhauled to suit their whims.

They set out to rehabilitate the absurd notion of ''court-packing''—a term that since the 1930s has been synonymous in American history with the idea of an unprincipled power grab.

The idea that Democrats sometimes lose Presidential elections and that Republican Presidents sometimes subsequently appoint Supreme Court Justices is apparently no longer tolerated. Instead of filling the existing vacancies, why shouldn't the next Democratic President just make up a bunch of new ones—create a bunch of new ones—so the far left can stack the Court? Forget about nine Justices. Forget about judges who don't wear red robes or blue robes but black robes. Forget about interpreting and applying our laws and Constitution the way they are written instead of how partisans might wish they were written. The far left wants to forget about all of that because Democrats would rather rewrite the rules.

So out of the ash heap of history came this talk of ''court-packing''—a notion that would threaten the rule of law and our American judicial system as we have long understood it. It is a truly radical proposal that has been dead and buried by bipartisan consensus for almost a century. But now President Obama's Attorney General, Eric Holder, says: ''We should be talking even about expanding the number of people who serve on the Supreme Court, if there is a Democratic president.'' One of our Senate colleagues, who is currently running for President, called this an ''interesting idea that I would have to think more about.'' The New York Times reported that at a recent campaign event, another Democratic candidate said that he is open to the idea after being asked about it by a member of a new far-left group that is literally named—this is their name; listen to this—''Pack the Courts.''

I hope the lion's share of our Democratic colleagues will speak out forcefully against exhuming this thoroughly discredited idea. I hope my colleagues will have the courage to look these far-left agitators in the eye and tell them that some traditions and some institutions are more important than partisan point-scoring. But given that we have already seen Democrats rush headlong to embrace schemes like the Democratic politician protection act, Medicare for None, and the so-called Green New Deal, I have to say, at this point, that kind of courageous statement would come as a pleasant surprise.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 297

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant bill 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. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

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

The senior assistant 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is on the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 268) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 5, of a perfecting nature.

Schumer Amendment No. 6, of a perfecting nature.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Amendment Nos. 5 and 6.

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

The amendments were withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 201

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] proposes an amendment numbered 201.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Senate amendment No. 201 to H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Richard C. Shelby, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, Mike Rounds, David Perdue, Rick Scot, Lamar Alexander, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, John Thune, John Boozman, Shelley Moore Capito, Tom Cotton, Rob Portman.

AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO AMENDMENT NO. 201

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment at the desk and ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 213 to amendment No. 201.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 214 TO AMENDMENT NO. 213

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 214 to amendment No. 213.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

AMENDMENT NO. 215

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the text of the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 215 to language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 201.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 216 TO AMENDMENT NO. 215

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 216 to amendment No. 215.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

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

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

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thought it was exceptionally good news on Sunday that Special Counsel Robert Mueller did not implicate our President in a criminal conspiracy with Russia to attack our elections. The alternative, of course, would have been nothing short of catastrophic for our Republic.

I also want to express my appreciation to Mr. Mueller and his team for their service to our country for determining the facts of what happened during what was an unprecedented attack on our democracy. This investigation endured relentless attacks during its 22-month existence. In fact, the investigation by Mr. Mueller was attacked 1,100 times by President Trump alone during this time according to the New York Times.

These attacks may have tried to politicize and undermine Mr. Mueller's investigation, but they didn't deter his course. Anybody that knows Robert Mueller would know that he would not be intimidated by anybody, Republican or Democrat. In fact, far from being deterred, Mr. Mueller obtained 37 indictments, including against numerous close aides of the President. That marks this special counsel's investigation as one of the most productive and consequential in our history. The American people and their representatives in Congress now deserve to see the special counsel's work.

The oversight authority of this body is deeply rooted in the Constitution. We would be derelict in our duties if we did not do everything within our power to obtain a full report and its underlying evidence. We already know from the 37 indictments, and from the testimony received by the Judiciary Committee, that this investigation has uncovered serious misconduct. We know the Trump campaign was informed that Russia had stolen Democratic emails months before anybody else. We know that a senior member of the campaign enthusiastically accepted an offer from the Russian Government to provide ''incriminating'' information on Hillary Clinton, and, afterward, he and President Trump blatantly misrepresented that meeting. We know from Roger Stone's indictment that the President was told about a coming release of stolen emails, and the campaign asked Stone to keep them apprised of developments with future releases. And we know that during all of this, the President was hiding his pursuit of a lucrative business deal in Moscow.

Now, these activities may not amount to a crime, but they certainly amount to serious misconduct that reached the highest levels of the campaign and this administration, and they certainly raise questions about the President's baffling relationship with Russia and Vladimir Putin. This relationship has been baffling to both Republicans and Democrats.

That doesn't even touch on obstruction of justice. Attorney General Barr's letter revealed that there is still nonpublic evidence of the President's attempts to interfere with this investigation. The special counsel did not conclude whether the President's obsessive interference in this investigation qualifies as obstruction. Yet he stated that his report does not exonerate the President—does not exonerate the President. That is an extraordinary statement.

Apparently, Attorney General Barr believes there is insufficient evidence to charge obstruction, but Mr. BARR also believes that it is not obstruction for a President to interfere with an investigation by exercising his Article II powers. Regardless, he believes that the only mechanism for holding a sitting President accountable is through Congress.

Let's accept all of that. I don't necessarily accept all of it, but let's assume he is accurate in that. Then I would hope he would agree that it is the judgment of Congress and of the American people that is of the utmost importance in this moment. There is simply no justification for hiding even a portion of the Mueller report. The President has claimed it totally exonerates him.

With respect to the collusion investigation, grand jury secrecy can be waived by the courts when there is a particular need that outweighs the interest in secrecy. With respect to the obstruction investigation, executive privilege cannot be used to hide evidence of a potential crime. In fact, if you want to hide evidence of a potential crime under executive privilege, all they have to do is look at a Supreme Court case where that was tried called United States v. Richard Nixon. Any claim would likely not survive a challenge under United States v. Nixon. It is hard to imagine that such hypothetical claims were not waived when administration witnesses talked to the special counsel's office.

Transparency is really the touchstone of our democracy. Any attempt to hide swaths of the Mueller report from public scrutiny is only going to fuel suspicions that President Trump's Justice Department, which represents not President Trump but all the United States, is instead playing the role of President Trump's defense team. If no person, however powerful, is truly above the law, then no person should be permitted to conceal the results of such a critical national security investigation from public view.

I hope that in the days and weeks ahead, the Senate has something to say about that. Everyone, Republican and Democrat alike, has a stake in knowing what is in that report and seeing the whole report. After months and months of work and all the investigations, all the indictments, and all the grand jury hearings, to say we have to rely on just a four-page summary is not enough. I don't accept that. I would hope that no Senator, Republican or Democrat, would accept it.

I note that the House of Representatives voted unanimously—every Republican and every Democrat—to have the report released. I note that when we tried to have a similar resolution here, it was blocked by the Republican leader. I think the Republican leader should turn to all of us and say: Let the American people know the facts.

H.R. 268

Madam President, I do not see anybody else seeking recognition. I would note, on another matter, the disaster supplemental appropriations legislation has been filed, and there will be discussions on that. The House of Representatives has a bill which does a great deal for the disaster relief for all Americans who were hurt by the recent disasters in our country. I proposed some modification of it, which would include all Americans and believe the House would have accepted it.

I am concerned now that we have before us a bill that excludes a large number of Americans, those in Puerto Rico, people who served nobly in our military and helped this country and other Americans. They should not be excluded for whatever reason. So we will have a debate on that next week.

I hope very soon, for the American people, that we can have an honest and clear resolution that will bring relief to those who suffered from disasters such as fires, hurricanes, and floods throughout our country.

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

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, when Republicans took office after the 2016 Presidential election, we had one goal in mind: make life better for American families. We knew a big part of that was getting our economy going again.

After years of sluggish economic growth, family budgets were stretched thin. Getting ahead had frequently been replaced by getting by. Wages were stagnant and jobs and opportunities were often few and far between.

So the Republicans and the President got right to work. We repealed burdensome regulations that were hamstringing economic growth, and we passed a comprehensive reform of our outdated Tax Code.

You might ask, Why the Tax Code? Well, the Tax Code has a huge effect on American families' prosperity. It helps determine how much you bring home in your paycheck and how much you have left over to spend or save. It helps determine what kind of jobs, wages, and opportunities are available to you. A small business owner struggling to afford a heavy tax bill is unlikely to have the money to hire a new worker or to expand her business. A larger business is going to find it harder to create jobs or improve benefits for employees if it is struggling to stay competitive against foreign businesses paying much less in taxes.

Prior to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code was not helping American workers. It was taking too much from Americans' paychecks, and it was making it difficult for businesses to grow and to create jobs. We passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to put more money in Americans' pockets, spur economic growth, and expand opportunities for American workers.

We cut tax rates for American families, doubled the child tax credit, and nearly doubled the standard deduction.

We lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which, up until January 1 of last year, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We expanded business owners' ability to recover the cost of investments they make in their businesses, which frees up cash they can reinvest in their operations and in their workers, and we brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so American businesses are not operating at a competitive disadvantage next to their foreign counterparts.

Now we are seeing the results. Our economy is thriving. Economic growth in the fourth quarter of 2017 to the fourth quarter of 2018 was 3.1 percent, the strongest growth we have seen literally in 13 years. The unemployment rate dropped to 3.8 percent in February, the 12th straight month the unemployment rate has been at or below 4 percent. That is the longest streak in nearly 50 years. The number of job openings has once again exceeded the number of job seekers. In fact, the Department of Labor reports that January was the 11th straight month with more job openings than people looking for work.

The economy has added more than 5.3 million jobs since President Trump was elected. Job growth has averaged 209,000 jobs a month over the past 12 months, exceeding the 2017 average by 30,000 jobs a month. Wage growth is accelerating. Wages are growing at a rate of 3.4 percent—the seventh straight month in which wages have grown at a rate of 3 percent or greater. Median household income is at an alltime high. Business investment is up, which means more jobs and opportunities for American workers. U.S. manufacturing is booming. Small business hiring recently hit a record high, and the list goes on.

This is a big turnaround.

After years of economic stagnation during the Obama administration, some were predicting that sluggish economic growth would be the new normal. When President Trump took office, the Congressional Budget Office predicted the economy would grow at a rate of 2 percent in 2018 and 1.7 percent in 2019. After Republicans cut burdensome regulations and passed a historic tax reform bill, the Congressional Budget Office substantially revised that projection, predicting 2.9 percent growth in 2018 and 2.7 percent in 2019—and the economy has delivered on that prediction.

Importantly, the benefits of our thriving economy are being spread far and wide. The lowest wage earners saw the fastest wage growth in 2018. The Wall Street Journal recently reported:

> All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education, and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and in many cases experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups. They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities, and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment.

Tax cuts and other Republican economic policies are making life better for American families. So what do Democrats want to do? Continue with the policies that are bringing relief to American families? That would make sense.

Unfortunately not. Democrats want to raise taxes—by a lot—to pay for the socialist fantasies they are now embracing. Plans such as the Green New Deal and Medicare for All would result in massive tax hikes on just about everyone. Our economy would suffer and American families would see a permanent reduction in their standard of living.

It is deeply alarming that the Democratic Party is rapidly turning into the Socialist Party. It is vitally important that we ensure that hard-working Americans never have to live under Democrats' socialist fantasies.

Republicans are committed to protecting Americans from any attempt to

undo the economic progress we have made, and we will continue working to strengthen our economy even further.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on Monday the Trump administration doubled down on their assault on American healthcare by supporting an effort to completely eliminate the healthcare law through the courts. People scratched their heads, saying: Are they really doing this after trying for 2 years unsuccessfully and after losing the election?

Yes, they are. The action is no small matter. The Trump administration's radical support for the wholesale elimination of the healthcare law would send our healthcare system into certain chaos. If the Trump administration has its way, it would send premiums soaring for millions of Americans. It would revoke coverage for tens of millions more who gained coverage through medical expansions. It would strike protections for an estimated 133 million adults in America who have preexisting medical conditions, even people who get coverage from their employer.

Let me say that again. There are 133 million Americans who have preexisting medical conditions. If the Trump administration has its way, the insurance company could just tell those 133 million and their families: We cut you off. We don't want to pay for your insurance anymore because it is too expensive. Your daughter has cancer. Your wife has severe diabetes.

It is a disgrace. Let's not forget that the system would impose billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs on seniors in Medicare. The consequences are dire. That is why we are introducing an amendment to ensure that not a dime of the American people's money goes to the Trump administration's fight to destroy the entire healthcare system. Not one cent of the Department of Justice should be used to hurt Americans like this.

Donald Trump campaigned on ''End ObamaCare.'' Then, the Republican Party—and even we thought Trump himself—saw they had no replacement. This repeal and replace had no replacement. They couldn't come up with one.

What is the Republican Party now standing for? Here it is. ''The Republican Party will become the party of healthcare,'' says Donald Trump. Absolutely not. Here is what his tweet should say if he is being honest and telling the truth to the American people: The Republican Party will become the party that ended your healthcare.

You cannot have a situation in the Trump administration where President Trump says one thing and their Attorney General goes to court to do the opposite. You cannot or should not have a situation where Republican Senators get up and say we need to expand healthcare for people, and then they say not a peep when their own President tries to strip it away from them.

President Trump says the Republican Party wants to be the party of healthcare. Well, I say, God help the middle class if Republicans are the party of healthcare. What, dare I ask, is their plan? Let me ask Leader MCCONNELL and every Republican Senator, and I hope their constituents will ask them, too, because this is the No. 1 issue across the country.

We should ask our Republican friends and the President: What is your plan to deal with prescription drug costs?

Costs are at an alltime high. Instead, they are supporting this lawsuit that would impose billions of dollars in prescription drug costs on seniors.

We should ask President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL: What is your plan to get more people covered on high-quality health insurance that they can actually afford at a time when premiums are still rising because of sabotage by the Trump administration? How will they bring relief?

Instead, our Republican colleagues, by their silence, are assenting to a lawsuit that would kick tens of millions of people off insurance.

I ask President Trump, Senator MCCONNELL, and our Republican colleagues: What is your plan to protect people with preexisting conditions?

Over and over again, the Republicans say they support keeping safeguards for preexisting conditions. Instead, they are supporting this lawsuit or, by their silence, assenting to their party's President's lawsuit that completely wipes away the protections for preexisting conditions.

The American people deserve answers because President Trump insisted yesterday that he has a ''plan that is far better than ObamaCare.'' We all know that that is not true. He just talks off the top of his head. He said it at the lunch.

President Trump, what is your plan that is better than ObamaCare? You may not have all of the details, but give us the main points.

When you are President, you have a responsibility, as people's lives are at stake. They need healthcare. It is not for you to simply say ''we have a better plan,'' file a lawsuit that gets rid of the existing plan, and then give people no inclination—no clue—as to what that plan is.

Why is this happening?

One, we know that President Trump has no fidelity issues. He talks off the top of his head. He doesn't know what the issues are all about. Regarding issues, he is the least informed President we have ever had in American history. He just says what he thinks sounds nice at the moment, and then his administration does the hard-right thing all of the time—the extreme thing—that has a narrow special interest but is not in the interest of the American people.

MICK MULVANEY

Madam President, President Trump's actual administration seems to be far to the right of even the mainstream of the Republican Party. Why does that happen? Well, here is one reason.

Mick Mulvaney is now Chief of Staff and was the head of the OMB, but he still has a lot of say over that Agency. It was reported last night that it was Mick Mulvaney, against the advice of others, who convinced President Trump to take this radical position on healthcare. So we all know who is holding the strings, who is putting in President Trump's head these hard-right ideas that his administration continually effectuates and of which he almost never backs off. We now seem to be living in the Mick Mulvaney administration.

He is the same person who said we need to end Medicare as we know it. That should send a chill down every American's spine. Let me repeat that. The Mick Mulvaney administration, of which President Trump is a willing follower, if you will, says: We should end Medicare as we know it.

Do Americans believe that? No. Do Republicans believe that? Most of them do not. Yet this man, Mulvaney—not elected—puts ideas in President Trump's head, and that is what President Trump does. Make no mistake about it—the ultimate responsibility is President Trump's, but when you wonder why the words the President says differ from so many administration policies—and it is the policies that are hurting Americans—the reason is Mulvaney.

Here is what the Mulvaney administration looks like: extreme budget cuts to the programs that the middle-class families depend on—cuts to the Departments of Education and Transportation; severe cuts to the Office of Science; severe cuts to the EPA; cuts to programs that are most in need, SNAP; faster cuts to Medicare; and repeated government shutdowns. It was reported yesterday that the administration is considering no more Fannie and Freddie—no more help for the middle class to buy a home. This is another great Mulvaney idea.

Mick Mulvaney was one of the five most hard-right people in the House of Representatives. He was one of the authors of the previous shutdown. His views are far, far away from the average American's. Donald Trump, who gets full blame for Mulvaney's ideas because he is enacting them, seems to be following him lock, stock, and barrel. If the President had actually campaigned on these Mulvaney ideas in 2016, he would have been roundly defeated.

If he goes to Michigan tonight and talks about these Mulvaney ideas, he will get booed even by his own supporters, for he enacts the Mulvaney ideas. His Justice Department is now suing to get rid of healthcare, which is something Mulvaney has always advocated for.

President Trump, your administration is now the Mulvaney administration.

That should terrify every single American, and it should terrify any thoughtful Republican Senator.

Make no mistake about it—Donald Trump's hard-right administration, which so hurts the middle class and so helps the narrow, wealthy, special, and corporate interests—the brain child of many of these ideas—comes from Mr. Mulvaney. He puts it into the cipher of Donald Trump. Donald Trump enacts it, and the American people suffer.

PUERTO RICO

Madam President, on Puerto Rico, it has been 18 months since Hurricane Maria and Hurricane Irma devastated the people of Puerto Rico and the surrounding islands.

These were extraordinary disasters that required an extraordinary response, but President Trump has hardheartedly said that the island of Puerto Rico has received too much aid. He complained that the U.S. Government had already given $91 billion in relief.

Mr. President, stop making up your own facts, for $90 billion is the amount of damage these storms caused. The people of Puerto Rico are suffering. They have received a sliver of the funding they need.

It is hard to fathom the depths of cruelty that it takes for the President to treat the people of Puerto Rico this way. They are American citizens.

The Democrats have taken action. The House passed a comprehensive disaster bill 2 months ago. It would have provided aid to Puerto Rico and to the other States that are hurt. We want to help all of those States, as that is what Americans do, but Donald Trump has told our Senate Republicans: No aid for Puerto Rico. Instead of standing up and saying that it is wrong, that it is not fair, they seem to be going along. This is shameful. We have an opportunity to change that by fixing the disaster bill that is currently on the floor.

I would tell our Republican friends that we want to help people in the States where there is flooding in the Midwest, where there are wildfires in the West, where there are droughts, but the bill they are trying to pass here is never going to pass the House. They know that. To get disaster aid for the country, which is well needed in so many places, our Republican friends are going to have to tell Donald Trump his cold, cruel-hearted, and divisive policy must fall, his policy of not letting any of the already allocated aid be distributed to Puerto Rico.

MUELLER REPORT

Madam President, on one final matter—Mueller—yesterday and for the second time this week, Leader MCCONNELL blocked our request that was made by the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, to make public the full report authored by Special Counsel Mueller.

I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for making the request and for standing up for transparency. As Senator FEINSTEIN said, a four-page summary from a political appointee is hardly a sufficient substitute for Special Counsel Mueller's 2-year investigation. There were reports this morning that the Mueller report is over 300 pages. All we have gotten is a four-page summary by someone who was appointed by the administration and who, before he took office, felt the President could never—almost never—be called for obstruction of justice, which is one of the main parts of the Mueller investigation.

For Mr. Barr to quickly issue a four-page report in his attempt to try to exonerate President Trump and now to delay the release of an over 300-page report that has been written by Mueller so that the American people and we Senators and Congressmen cannot see what was written has too much of the odor of political expediency to help the man who appointed him, President Trump.

The American people have a right to know the full scope of the facts behind Russia's interference in our election. The American people have a right to come to their own conclusions about actions taken by this administration. The American people deserve to have full confidence in the integrity of our system and in the impartiality of the rule of law, and only the full release of the report can affirm that.

What I am saying here shouldn't be controversial. In the House, it passed 420 to nothing—the resolution to make the full report public—voted for by such partisan defenders of the President's, like Representative JORDAN and Representative MEADOWS.

Transparency, we all know, is all the more important because the Attorney General has made no secret of his antipathy toward this investigation and appears intent on holding the report secret for as long as possible. I guess his hope is to let the dust settle, and then no one will pay attention. Well, he is wrong about that. He is prolonging this. Remember, this Attorney General made clear that he was hostile to the special counsel and was opposed to Mueller's inquiry into obstruction of justice. Then he opines about it 2 days later without showing anybody any backing? That is so wrong.

According to press reports, in his phone call yesterday with Mr. NADLER, Mr. Barr would not even commit to releasing the whole report at any time. He wouldn't commit to a date. He was not even willing to disclose how many pages were in the special counsel's report, as if that were some kind of state secret.

As I said, since that conversation, there have been reports that it is over 300 pages. If it is, it is just disgraceful for Mr. Barr, who was able to read through it and summarize it in 48 hours, to now say he can't release it because he is busy culling it.

The Attorney General must end the stalling and the secrecy. It is not going to be a happy opening chapter for the Attorney General when history looks back on what he has done. We should make the report public now.

I yield the floor.

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

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 928 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM R. EVANINA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, another thing that I shouldn't have to come to the floor to talk about—and it will only take me about 3 or 4 minutes—is that I am still hearing questions about my intent to object to the nomination of William Evanina. These are the same questions I heard last year when I initially placed my hold on Evanina.

By the way, my hold is printed in the RECORD, and the rules of this Senate require all Members who put a hold on a nomination or a bill, within 2 days after doing that, to put something in the RECORD, and most Senators aren't following that rule of the Senate. So if you have some disagreement about something and you put a secret hold on and somebody wants to sit down and talk with you to see what is wrong, how are they going to know who it is? That is why, in 2011, on a vote of 96 to 4, Senator WYDEN and I got these rules, so there should be no secret holds in the U.S. Senate.

So I am back here again. This statement will be the fourth time since June 4, 2018, that I have publicly expressed my reason for this hold here on the Senate floor. It seems to me no one has been listening to what I have been saying, but what is unusual about that?

As I have said repeatedly, the Judiciary Committee has experienced difficulty in obtaining relevant documents and briefings from the Justice Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein personally—I want to emphasize—personally assured me that the Judiciary Committee would receive equal access to information provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with regard to negotiations about the pending subpoenas from that committee related to the 2016 election controversies.

I haven't received equal access, as promised.

On August 7, 2018, I wrote to the Justice Department and pointed out that the House Intelligence Committee received documents related to Bruce Ohr on May 8, 2018, that the Judiciary Committee did not receive.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter inserted in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, August 7, 2018.

Hon. ROD J. ROSENSTEIN,
Deputy Attorney General,
U.S. Department of Justice.

DEAR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROSENSTEIN: As we have discussed on several occasions, you agreed to provide the Judiciary Committee equal access to documents produced to the U.S. House of Representatives, including those pursuant to requests and subpoenas from the Select Committee on Intelligence related to 2016 election controversies.

Unfortunately, even though you gave me your word that the Committee would receive equal access, the Department has failed to deliver. On July 12, 2018, the New York Times reported that the Trump Administration ordered ''more lawmakers be given access to classified information about an informant the F.B.I. used in 2016 to investigate possible ties between the Trump campaign and Russia . . .'' The article also reported that, ''[t]he F.B.I. files about the informant will now be available to all members of the Senate and House Intelligence Committees, instead of to just a group of congressional leaders known as the Gang of Eight.''

As you are aware, in the authorizing resolution that created the Senate Intelligence Committee, the Senate explicitly reserved for other standing Committees, such as the Senate Judiciary Committee, the independent authority to ''study and review any intelligence activity'' and ''to obtain full and prompt access to the product of the intelligence activities of any department or agency,'' when such a matter ''directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.''

This Committee has jurisdiction over all federal courts, including the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC). Based on public reporting, the new information provided to the Intelligence Committees appears to be relevant to an application to the FISC, which is an issue that has already been subject to extensive oversight by this Committee. Some of that oversight has been public, when possible. However, as you know, the Committee has also conducted its oversight responsibilities through classified letters, briefings, and document reviews. We have respected the limitations necessary to protect national security information. The Department has been responsive to the Committee's previous oversight requests and has provided access to the FISA application and some of the relevant background materials on more than one occasion, which is appreciated.

Yet, my Committee staff have attempted to informally work with the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs to obtain the equal access you promised to all of the relevant materials, but to no avail. For example, on March 23, 2018, the House Intelligence Committee requested the records of nine individuals related to Steele, his dossier, or campaign-related applications to the FISC. The nine individuals are:

1. James Comey,
2. Andrew McCabe,
3. Peter Strzok,
4. Lisa Page,
5. Sally Moyer,
6. Bill Priestap,
7. Greg Brower,
8. James Baker,
9. Bruce Ohr.

The Department produced records to HPSCI related to Bruce Ohr on May 8, 2018, but initially withheld them from this Committee and denied that any records relevant to these topics had been provided to HPSCI. Only after Committee staff confronted Department staff with the misrepresentation were the Ohr documents finally produced to this Committee on May 21, 2018.

Accordingly, no later than August 14, please produce all records previously produced to HPSCI pursuant to its request and answer the following questions:

1. Are the 63 pages of Ohr-related records produced to this Committee on May 21, 2018, the sum total of all responsive Ohr documents in the possession of the DOJ or the FBI? If not, when will production of records responsive to this request be complete?

2. When will DOJ and FBI begin producing documents to this Committee pursuant to this request from the other eight individuals?

3. When will the Department provide in camera review on equal terms for the material referenced in the New York Times article?

Please send all unclassified material directly to the Committee. In keeping with the requirements of Executive Order 13526, if any of the responsive documents do contain classified information, please segregate all unclassified material within the classified documents, provide all unclassified information directly to the Committee, and provide a classified addendum to the Office of Senate Security. Although the Committee complies with all laws and regulations governing the handling of classified information, it is not bound, absent its prior agreement, by any handling restrictions.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this request. If you have questions, please contact Jason Foster of my Committee staff.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Department flatout denied that those records had been provided to the House Intelligence Committee.

That wasn't the truth.

After my staff confronted the Department, we eventually received some documents.

There is no reason for stonewalling; there is no reason for lack of cooperation—plain and simple.

In that August 2018 letter, I asked for additional documents based on my equal access agreement with Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein. To date, the Department still hasn't provided a response.

I later learned that the Justice Department has taken the position that Director Coats has prohibited them from sharing the requested records with the committee.

Then, in addition to the outstanding records request, in May 2018, the Director of National Intelligence and the Justice Department provided a briefing in connection with the pending House Intelligence subpoena, to which no Senate Judiciary Committee member was invited.

The Judiciary Committee's attempt to schedule an equivalent briefing has been ignored.

The lack of cooperation, then, obviously, as any one of the 100 Senators would do—the bureaucracy, the faceless bureaucrats, are forcing our hand. Congressional oversight is a constitutional requirement. It seems that in every administration—Republican or Democratic—I am forced to remind them of that constitutional responsibility of oversight, and that responsibility cuts both ways.

The executive branch can't hide documents from one congressional committee, especially one that clearly has oversight jurisdiction over the matter, and at the same time provide those very same documents to another committee.

In this case, my colleagues on the Senate Intelligence Committee have received these documents. I don't blame them at all for getting that information. I say to them: full speed ahead with whatever you need to do.

However, that doesn't mean this Senator has to stand down. It is quite the opposite. I am going to fight until I get what has been promised to me but, more importantly, promised to 21 members of the Judiciary Committee.

I think it is worthy of note that the authorizing resolution that created the Senate Intelligence Committee made clear that other committees still have authority to review intelligence documents.

For example, S. Res. 400 explicitly reserves for other standing committees, such as the Judiciary Committee, independent authority to ''study and review any intelligence activity to the extent that such activity directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee'' and ''to obtain full and prompt access to the product of the intelligence activities of any department or any agency'' within that jurisdiction.

The information I seek is connected to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. That court is within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

Now, to be fair, the Justice Department has provided access to FISA applications and some of the relevant background materials on more than one occasion. One must give credit where credit is due. However, if they have provided the Judiciary Committee access to that information, what is holding them back from showing us the rest? The secrecy just doesn't make any sense, and it is secrecy that often prevents accountability.

I will not release my hold until the Justice Department upholds its equal access agreement with me and the Judiciary Committee.

In no way am I questioning Mr. Evanina's credentials. Director Coats and others have spoken highly of him. The fact is, if they really do believe in his credentials, then they should produce the requested documents they have promised me more than once.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

H.R. 268

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am glad to have been here to hear the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee talk about the oversight and the responsiveness that the executive branch agencies owe to the U.S. Senate and its committees.

In doing so, I am having a similar problem with the State Department as it relates to getting information about actions that have taken place with reference to political reprisals and firings at the State Department and subject to being investigated right now by the inspector general of the State Department and special counsel. So I can share in his concerns about the inability to get information from the executive branch as a legitimate exercise of oversight.

I rise today, as I have so many times in my career, to be the voice for the people of Puerto Rico in the U.S. Senate.

On September 20, 2017, Hurricane Maria—a powerful category 5 storm—ripped through the center of the island of Puerto Rico, wiping out its electrical grid and leaving millions of American citizens disconnected and in the dark. This was preceded by Hurricane Irma, which also struck the island—a double body blow. What ensued were months of absolute darkness, hunger, despair, and death.

While the President played golf in Mar-a-Lago, thousands of our fellow Americans were dying due to the lack of electricity to power oxygen tanks, dialysis centers, or refrigerated medications—problems that, as I said at the time, could not be solved with paper towels.

I will never forget this moment, one of the most insulting moments to the people of Puerto Rico—a people who are a part of the United States, 3.5 million U.S. citizens who have served and worn the uniform of this Nation, whose names on the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington are disproportionate to the number of their population. The President said:

> [They] want everything to be done for them. . . . I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you are throwing our budget out of whack.

No other American citizen in any other of the areas of disaster heard anything—anything—near to that.

Today we know that nearly 3,000 Americans perished in what is now known as one of the worst natural disasters to strike our Nation in all of American history.

Now, let me be clear. We know that a President cannot prevent a natural disaster, but when the lives of Americans are on the line, we expect our Commander in Chief to do everything in their power to come to their aid. These are the moments that are supposed to reveal the very best of America. In the face of disasters of this magnitude, we do not turn our backs on our fellow citizens. We face the challenge head-on. We save as many lives as we can. We strive to stem suffering, and we lend a helping hand. That is the American way.

Just imagine how many lives could have been saved had President Trump directed the Federal Emergency Management Agency to give Puerto Rico ''the A Plus treatment'' he called for, for our fellow citizens in Alabama. For the majority Latino, Spanish-speaking island of Puerto Rico, there was no A-plus treatment. They got the F-minus treatment.

The painful reality is, nothing can ever bring the thousands of Americans who died in Hurricane Maria back, but that doesn't mean the President shouldn't try to make things right. He has many opportunities to atone for his cruel and unfair treatment of the Puerto Rican people. Instead, President Trump seems intent on kicking Puerto Ricans when they are down.

Just last week, he hosted a group of my Republican colleagues at the White House and proceeded to complain about how much Puerto Rico has received. What is so disappointing is that none of my colleagues even dared to check the President on this issue. They didn't receive what he said. They received a fraction of what he said.

This President continues to behave as if the people who call Puerto Rico home are not real Americans. It is almost as if he views himself as the real victim here, not the 3,000 American mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters who perished in Hurricane Maria's wake.

We in the Senate have an obligation to do what is right with this disaster supplemental.

So let me say first that I am glad everyone here agrees Puerto Rico needs a fully funded Nutrition Assistance Program for the next fiscal year. Still, it is appalling to hear the White House call the House of Representatives bill's inclusion of an additional $600 million for nutrition assistance as ''excessive and unnecessary.''

There is nothing excessive or unnecessary about helping 1.35 million struggling, low-income Americans in Puerto Rico—many of them with small children—avoid going hungry. We are talking about $649 a month for a family of four, just $160 or so a week for the people who need it the most.

Let's turn for a moment to what is missing from the Senate legislation.

First, Hurricane Maria created 6 million cubic yards of debris for the island. A year and a half later, the island still has approximately 168,000 cubic yards of debris stored in temporary sites waiting to be removed.

To put that in perspective, a large dump truck can carry 10 cubic yards. That means it would take 16,800 dump trucks to remove all the garbage created by the hurricane on a small island that barely measures 100 miles long by 35 miles wide.

Make no mistake, Puerto Rico has made significant progress, but the crippled economy has made everything that much harder. This legislation should help them get the job done, not set them back.

Second, there remains hundreds of open FEMA projects for emergency protective measures. We are talking about short-term locations for government Agencies to provide vital services as they await the completion of permanent reconstruction.

We should also allow for the continued use of generators to power critical facilities on the island. This would help keep the public safe and provide stability to Puerto Rico's power grid while it is repaired. We can do this by increasing the Federal cost waivers for categories A and B to 100 percent, just as the House of Representatives' bill does.

Congress has done this many times before—this is not new—after Hurricanes Katrina, Wilma, Dennis, and Rita, and Puerto Rico deserves no less.

In the bipartisan Budget Act we passed last year, we specifically authorized FEMA to waive Stafford Act requirements so they could replace and repair facilities in a way that reflects today's industry standards, not their previous subpar condition. Yet I keep hearing of FEMA's nickel-and-diming over what it may fix and what Puerto Rico may not fix.

So let's end the ambiguity. Let's fix this language. Let's send a clear message that it was always Congress's intent to rebuild Puerto Rico stronger and more resilient than ever.

No one wants to face the same kind of damage next hurricane season. As it is said, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

So let's properly fund the Army Corps of Engineers so they can help rebuild the Cano Martin Pena, which continues to flood over with raw sewage, imperiling 26,000 American lives with unsanitary conditions and breeding grounds for mosquito-transmitted diseases like Zika.

These are the kind of measures that would be stripped from the House bill by the pending substitute. It is just not right. It is just not right. These 3.5 million U.S. citizens have worn the uniform of the United States, have defended this Nation, going back to when Congress gave the all-Puerto Rican regiment, the ''Borinqueneers,'' the highest commendation it can, the Congressional Gold Medal, but that doesn't mean anything if you turn your back on 3.5 million U.S. citizens. It doesn't mean anything if you treat them as second-class citizens. It is just fundamentally biased and wrong.

Come September, we will have to congregate once again to talk about the island's crumbling medical infrastructure and the need to provide Puerto Rico with additional Medicaid funding. We can solve that problem today by adding critical Medicaid funding for the territories.

Puerto Rico is clearly a subject of angst and resentment for the President. I don't know why, but it is clearly so. So I suggest we do him a favor,

spare him the worry, and get the job done ourselves today. Let's do what is right.

I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture on the substitute, let the underlying bill stand, and let us move forward so we act in the name of our Nation. It is the United States of America. We leave no American behind, and we should leave none of the 3.5 million Americans in Puerto Rico behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

HURRICANE HARVEY AMENDMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in 2017, I said on the Senate floor that we needed to come together to help rebuild in the wake of Hurricane Harvey in the Houston area and that our work was not complete and more work needed to be done. That, unfortunately, still is true today.

It is true also for the damage caused by other natural disasters during the same timeframe that was appropriated by Congress but has not yet found its way to the intended beneficiaries. Although we voted to send billions of dollars to help Texans still reeling from Hurricane Harvey, some of those funds are still needlessly caught up in bureaucratic redtape.

This is not just a phenomenon that affects my State. It affects all of our States. This is not acceptable to me, and it isn't acceptable to the people I represent—all 28 million of them—and it shouldn't be acceptable to Members of the Senate.

This storm ravaged the Texas coast and was the largest rain event in American history, with parts of Southeast Texas seeing 60 inches of rain over about a 5- or 6-day period. It destroyed people's homes, their businesses, and our communities.

In the wake of the storm, we all pulled together in Congress, in an unusually bipartisan manner, to provide billions of dollars in disaster aid. Like I said, it wasn't just for Texas. It was for Florida, Puerto Rico, for wildfires out in California, and other places that suffered from natural disasters.

The dollars we appropriated, and were signed into law by the President, have helped Texans get back to some sense of normalcy, and I am grateful to my colleagues for working together with us to make that happen. What has not been helpful, however, are the unnecessary delays on the part of the Office of Management and Budget in getting the roughly $4 billion in mitigation funds into the hands of State and local communities that desperately need them.

I have searched in vain in the Constitution for where the Office of Management and Budget has the power to veto appropriations bills passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. I can't find it. Yet they are still the impediment to the execution of Congress's intent to get the money to the people who need it.

The intent of Congress was crystal clear in the February 2018 disaster supplemental, when we appropriated about $12 billion of community development block grants for disaster recovery.

As I said, the undue delay is unacceptable, and I am filing an amendment to the disaster relief that is on the floor of the Senate this week to ensure that these funds and other like funds are properly disbursed.

Last month, Governor Abbott, Senator CRUZ, and I wrote a letter to the OMB to stop stalling, but so far all we have heard is crickets.

The amendment we will file will start a timer on when the Federal Government must release funds appropriated by Congress. It will give the government bureaucracy up to 90 days to get the money untangled from all the redtape and to get it to the communities that desperately need it. This 90-day rule wouldn't just apply to this particular block of funding; it would apply to any funds that are now being withheld by the Office of Management and Budget that Congress appropriates to these States.

As I said, last time I checked, Congress had the power of the purse, not the Office of Management and Budget. I don't know about the rest of my colleagues, but I am not OK with letting OMB dictate when and how duly appropriated funds are released to the intended beneficiaries.

The disregard of those who are still struggling to rebuild and prepare for future storms by the bureaucrats is appalling. They know the kinds of hardships my constituents are facing, and they know that Hurricane Harvey will not be the last hurricane to hit Texas. It is time to do what is right by our State and local communities who have seen their livelihoods rot in a fleet of floodwater.

It has now been more than a year since President Trump signed a bill that would have sent roughly $4 billion to Texas. Imagine what could have been accomplished with that money in the meantime. They could have repaired wastewater treatment facilities that haven't been fully restored. It could have led to important economic revitalization projects in decimated areas. They could have even relocated or elevated damaged facilities to prepare for the next storm. But, no—those projects are still on hold because the OMB has refused to release the funding.

The 2019 hurricane season is fast approaching, and it is critical we get work done on long-term projects to protect my State and the Texas coast against future storms.

It is difficult to plan for the future with the resources we need being caught up in bureaucratic limbo. We have been waiting to get to the place where before Harvey and after Harvey isn't such a stark difference.

With the inclusion of my amendment, the clock will start ticking on the Office of Management and Budget to do its job and ultimately release these hurricane recovery funds. Texas communities have waited long enough.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, I want to draw attention to another group of people who need our help, and those are the officers and agents of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Yesterday, Commissioner McAleenan announced that Customs and Border Protection is facing an ''unprecedented humanitarian and border security crisis all along our Southwest border,'' and he provided some alarming statistics.

Yesterday morning, CBP had more than 13,000 migrants under their care. Under normal circumstances, a high number is 4,000. They consider 6,000 to be a crisis, and now they have more than double that. Yesterday, the Commissioner said that we are at a ''breaking point'' along the border.

Frankly, because the American people aren't acquainted with some of the details, they may think that CBP can easily handle 13,000 people in their custody on a given day, but, unfortunately, that is not the case.

CBP's detention facilities are relatively small, built for the short-term detention of single adults. The current immigrant surge from Central America is primarily of children and family units and has put these small facilities at overcapacity levels. Processing times have slowed due to the large number of people being processed and the lack of Border Patrol personnel to process them.

As the Chief of the Border Patrol has testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, this is intentional on behalf of the transnational criminal organizations that are responsible for transporting people from Central America to our borders. This is a moneymaking proposition. If you can charge $5,000 or more a head for every person you deliver to our border, that is a big, big deal. These people are not just involved in transporting immigrants. They are engaged in trafficking of human beings for sex or involuntary servitude, and they are also engaged in trafficking drugs.

I will remind all of us that last year, 70,000-plus Americans died from drug overdoses—70,000 Americans died from drug overdoses last year—according to the Centers for Disease Control. A substantial portion of that was part of the opioid crisis, not just prescription drugs but also synthetic fentanyl as well as heroin. Ninety percent of the heroin that comes into the United States comes across the U.S.-Mexico border. As President Obama himself said in 2014, this is truly a humanitarian and security crisis, but it is on steroids today.

On Monday, CBP had the highest totals of apprehensions in more than a decade, and on Tuesday, they broke that record. Daily averages for border apprehensions are higher than we have seen at any time since 2006.

Last month, CBP apprehended 76,000 people in 1 month on our southern border—the highest monthly total in over

a decade. Yesterday, Commissioner McAleenan, announced that, in March, they are on track to beat that record with 100,000 apprehensions along our southwest border. That is 76,000 apprehensions in February and an estimated 100,000 in March.

As a result of the surge, because the Border Patrol has to do something, 40 percent of the Border Patrol's manpower is now spent processing immigrants and providing care and transportation. In other words, they are not engaged in their primary mission, which is border security, because they are busy handing out juice boxes and diapers to children, as well as processing the immigrants who are providing other transportation.

The Border Patrol simply doesn't have the resources, nor should it be expected to have the resources, to handle this crisis and perform their primary duty, which is to protect our border. We know that detention centers are at or over capacity, and local charities and nongovernmental Agencies are strained, as well, and all of our border communities are being overrun by humanity.

Recently, Senator CRUZ and I were down at the Sarita checkpoint to name that checkpoint after a heroic Border Patrol agent who was killed by two illegal aliens. We were approached by the chief of police from McAllen—somebody who is well respected in law enforcement circles in our State—who said that because the Border Patrol is simply unable to process all of these people, and they are being released into those communities or put on a bus and sent to places like San Antonio, they are increasingly worried about public safety. That is notwithstanding the fact that many of our border communities are extraordinarily safe, at least on our side of the border. If you go on the Mexican side of the border, they are some of the most dangerous cities in our hemisphere.

This is having a profound impact on our local communities, on the men and women of the Customs and Border Patrol. Frankly, it should be an embarrassment to us here in this country that we haven't dealt with this in a more timely and more effective way.

Because the cartels have figured this out, people crossing the border today are largely families and unaccompanied minors because of the special way they have to be processed and because of a consent decree called the Flores decision, which says you can't detain them for more than 20 days. That is not enough time to get them in front of an immigration judge in order to adjudicate their asylum claim, so they are released into the interior of the United States. Guess what. Overwhelmingly, they don't show up for their court hearings because they realize they have beat the system. The cartels know that because of the money they make. They are exploiting these vulnerabilities in our laws and in our infrastructure. The only people who can fix that are Congress and the President, working together in a bipartisan way.

I know we have had a big debate over border barriers—walls, fences, you name it—but, frankly, you could build all the barriers you want along our southwest border, and it will not stop this flow of unaccompanied minors and family units because, frankly, they are showing up at the border, and they are turning themselves in. So we need to act.

Two weeks ago, Ms. Nielsen, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, said: ''The situation on our southern border has gone from a crisis, to a national emergency, to a near system-wide meltdown.''

Our Democratic colleagues have called this a fake emergency. They have opposed treating this crisis for what it is. It is even more than an emergency; it is a total system failure, and the only people who can fix it are Congress, working with the President. I am not sure how much longer our Democratic colleagues could be in denial when we see this flood of humanity coming across in higher and higher numbers every day.

The issue is staring us in the face. The numbers confirm what we have said all along: This is a border security and humanitarian crisis.

Secretary Nielsen made an important point that our communities, our members of law enforcement, and the immigrants themselves are paying the price for our inaction.

We have heard it from people at the border who know how to fix the problem, and we need to listen. They have told us time and again that it will take a combination of technology, physical infrastructure, and boots on the ground. It will also take legislative action to fill the gaps in our laws that we know exist and are being exploited by the cartels.

I want to commend the men and women of Customs and Border Patrol for working around the clock in a thankless job but in an important job. Frankly, I am embarrassed that they haven't seen more support by the people who represent them in Congress.

We have sent them out on a losing battle unless we can work together here in Congress to give them the resources and the legislative fixes they need.

I want to assure these dedicated men and women that we are trying, but we need their help to talk to their elected Representatives here in Congress. We need Ms. PELOSI to consider this the same humanitarian crisis that President Obama identified back in 2014, when he called it a humanitarian and security crisis. By any measure, it has gotten much, much worse. We need to give this crisis the serious attention that it deserves.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to discuss transparency in our democracy and security for our elections.

It has been nearly a week since Special Counsel Mueller's report was completed and submitted to the Attorney General of the United States. We still have not seen the report. I have urged the Department of Justice to release the report, and the administration should not delay in producing the report to Congress. We know the American people want to know what is in the report. According to some public opinion polls, nearly 90 percent of them have said they want to know what is in the report. We also know that 420 Members of the House of Representatives voted that the report should be made public.

We cannot get ourselves out of the mode of remembering that a foreign power invaded our election. Some people call it meddling. That is what I do when I call my daughter on a Saturday night and ask her what she is doing. I call it an invasion of our democracy.

We have learned from the intelligence heads under both Barack Obama and Donald Trump, including former Senator Coats, who told us that this has happened, and, in fact, the Russians are getting even bolder. That is what he told us. That is why I think it is very important, putting everything else aside, that we find out the facts in this report.

There have been indictments that have come out of this investigation—dozens of indictments. They made it clear that the unprecedented interference in the 2016 election was designed by the Kremlin with the goal of making Americans lose faith in our election system, whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, or an Independent.

We know from the intelligence heads and from some of the indictments that have been made public that they did this in many ways. We have learned that the Russians tried to hack into the actual election equipment of 21 States and that in Illinois, they got as far as the voter files. What does that mean? If we could get more facts about that since that was actually—the hacking of the campaigns and elections was referenced in Attorney General Barr's four-page letter. Well, if we knew more facts, it might help Senator LANKFORD and me to pass our bill, the Secure Elections Act. We have the support of Senator BURR and Senator WARNER, as well as Senator HARRIS and Senator GRAHAM. Maybe it would help us convince the leader that we should have a vote on the simple concept of having backup paper ballots and audits. Maybe

it would help us convince the public to put pressure on the White House not to block that bill.

It doesn't matter what political party you are in—we all want to have secure elections. None of us want to have a situation where there is one county or one State in which elections get screwed up because someone hacked into them.

The other thing that we learned and got confirmed in the four-page letter was that we know there was hacking into a political campaign, right? Well, we want to know the facts about that.

Again, as people have noticed, there are a lot of people running for office—not just for President but for the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives—and certainly the American people and the people who work in the Congress have the right to know exactly what happened. That was one of the major reasons we had this investigation in the first place.

There was something else that was mentioned in the four-page letter that we all want to have more details about; that is, another way Russia tried to influence our election was through the spread of false propaganda on the internet, right? We have now seen the ads. We have seen them in sworn hearings. One of the ones that I will never forget is one that was Russian sponsored, which was a picture of an African-American woman, and it basically said—I am paraphrasing—''Why wait in line? You can text your vote for Hillary Clinton,'' with a texting number on it. That is a crime. That is illegal. That was one of the ads the Russians put into our system.

We know that they put false issue ads out there to divide Americans—sometimes from the left, trying to make it like they were looking from the left, and sometimes from the right. They were simply trying to sow discord in our great democracy.

Our democracy is fragile. Our democracy is something that we cherish. Our democracy must be protected. That is why, if we could get this full report, that would help us greatly to perhaps step back and look at the Honest Ads Act. That is a bill which I had with Senator McCain and Senator WARNER, and we have a number of Republicans who are actually cosponsoring it in the House of Representatives.

I think getting more details here would help to make the case that before the 2020 election—we know that in 2016 alone, $1.4 billion was spent on internet advertising, on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter, and we didn't know who was paying for it. We later found out that some of it was in rubles. How obvious can you get? And then also we didn't even know what the ads were because they just vanished from the internet.

So when we first proposed this bill, people said: Oh, you are trying to regulate. Well, guess what. Things changed after Cambridge Analytica, and we suddenly got growing support for this idea that the same rules that apply to newspaper and TV and radio should apply to internet platforms. Now, a number of the major platforms are doing it themselves, although they vary in what they do and it is a patchwork. Also, major CEOs of these companies are saying they now support this bill.

The time has come—in fact, we are running out of time—to put the rules in place on issue ads and candidate ads. I believe it is not just selfishly what I want to get done; it is something that a lot of people in this Chamber want to get done, and that is, making sure our next election is protected from foreign influence on the propaganda side, on the election security side, and on the hacking side. Getting the full report will help us make the case. It will help us figure out exactly what happened.

As I mentioned, there are many people—420 in the House of Representatives—who said they want to see it. Congress should be able to see the full, unredacted report without delay. We are a coequal branch of government and have received unredacted grand jury and classified information in the past. But more than Congress, the public should be able to see this. That is why the House voted 420 to 0—we don't get that kind of vote on a volleyball resolution—in support of publicly releasing the report. Members standing in the way of this report becoming public will have to explain why to the American people.

We know we can do two things at once in this Chamber or maybe 20 things at once. We know the importance right now of making sure we don't repeal the Affordable Care Act, which is why 2 nights ago I was here at this very desk until late at night reading 100 letters from people who opposed repealing the Affordable Care Act because of the protection it gives them to not get kicked off their health insurance. We know how important it is to finally do something about prescription drugs. We know how important it is to work on advancing an optimistic economic agenda for the people of this country. At the same time, we also have to protect the public's right to know. We have to protect the security in many ways—security of our country abroad, our military—and make sure we are protecting the very democracy that is at the core of this country. The way to do that is to make sure no foreign power messes with our election.

There are hundreds of pages in this report. There are hundreds of people who were interviewed. All of us are a little in the dark, especially those people who are not on the committees that receive classified information. There are many people who would like to know exactly what went down. If I were the secretary of state in one of our States, whether it be the State of Arkansas or the State of Arizona, I would want to know what happened because I, if I am the secretary of state, am responsible for my State's election security.

We urge the Attorney General to do everything he can to make this report public. Now that the special counsel has completed his investigation, we must see the report.

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, 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?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, I think we all want transparency. I think we all want reports to be revealed. We think the American people deserve to know what happened with the Russians hacking into Democratic emails and with the Russian involvement in trying to affect the outcome of our elections. I think we all want that.

What do we know so far? We know that we spent $30 million to investigate this, and they have decided and concluded—after doing hundreds of interviews and thousands of subpoenas, they have concluded that President Trump did not collude with the Russians, did not conspire with the Russians, did not commit a crime with the Russians, and the President has said repeatedly he never talked to the Russians. We do know that. That is what we know so far.

But now that we know that, in addition to the Mueller report, we also need to know: Was there malfeasance? Was there misuse of government power? Did President Obama's administration get involved in an election to actually try to manipulate and infiltrate the Trump campaign to entrap them or try to spread information that was incorrect? We need to know that.

So I am asking the Senator by unanimous consent to accept my amendment, which would say that not only will we see the Mueller report, but we will also see the communications between John Brennan, known to have already lied to the Senate about spying on Senate computers, and James Clapper, also known to have lied to the Senate in testimony over the bulk collection of phone records, and their communications with James Comey, who is known to have illegally leaked information about this investigation to the press—that their communications become known to all of us.

We need to know why they decided that the fake Russian dossier was real. The country had concluded it wasn't. No media outlet would produce the Russian dossier because it was so unverifiable. Yet the FBI head and the CIA head kept sending the dossier out to people, having it come back to them again, saying: Oh, my goodness, look at what this Senator gave us. It was what

they already had that nobody was believing and nobody was discounting and now the Mueller report has said was fake, was made up. The dossier was not true, but that is what began this entire investigation.

Why should we know about this? Because we don't want this to happen every 2 to 4 years. I don't care whether it is a Democrat President or Republican President. We should not waste the time of the entire country sending spies into campaigns, making false accusations, and tying the country in knots for 2 years. Tying us in knots such that people are at each other's throats and will not talk to each other because we spread this false narrative that President Trump had something to do with the Russians. It was not true. We spent $30 million and now we know it is not true.

So I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be added to the current resolution.

We will agree to see the Mueller report as long as the other side will agree to show us the communications that took place in deciding to promote this fake allegation against the President. We want to know whether there was misuse of their office. If that is allowed, then I will agree to the consent request.

I would ask unanimous consent that my amendment be added to the Senator's resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Reserving the right to object, I would simply point out that this entire investigation was started by the Justice Department under the Republican administration, and then, of course, guided by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, who was appointed by the President.

I will note that this is a simple resolution to just get the report. We may not agree with the foundation of this investigation, but we are simply trying to get the fruits of the investigation, which I believe will be helpful to this Chamber to figure out what we should do to protect our national security.

We are simply trying to adopt and consider the House resolution, which again was voted on 420 to 0, including all Republicans present. The House voted 420 to 0 to see the report. That is why I was simply hoping that we could do this on a bipartisan basis and try to see the report ourselves.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. The Senator made one point that the investigation was begun under Republicans of this dossier.

The Mueller report and the Mueller aspect of this was begun under Republicans, but the actual investigation—the promoting, the passing around of the fake Russian dossier—occurred under President Obama's administration.

What we need to discover and what we do not yet know is, Was President Obama involved? Was this done for partisan purposes? Was this done to try to elect Hillary Clinton? Was this done with mal intent?

We need to know the truth, and to get to the truth, we need not only the Mueller report, but we need every ounce of information about the people at the very top of our intelligence community who were promoting the inclusion of this fake dossier that most American media outlets had discounted as unverifiable and that turned out to be unverifiable.

We based this investigation on a lie. We should investigate who the liars were.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, if my Republican colleagues don't want to read the report and they want to rely on a summary, that is their right, and they can make requests in the future. I am sure they can get all of that in the future, but all I am simply asking for right now is that whether you agreed with this investigation or not, the public have the right to see the hundreds of pages that may well help us understand what Russia did.

I believe our constitutional duty requires us to have the report and the American people do not deserve to be left in the dark about what the report says.

I hope that it will be made public very soon, and I hope the Attorney General of the United States understands there are a number of us who would like to see a full unredacted report, and there are a whole lot of people who would like to see it as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MOMMA'S ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if you had to pick a country—anywhere in the world—where you faced a serious illness, you are likely to pick the United States. Here we have some of the greatest hospitals, doctors, and some of the greatest research institutions in the world. In some other countries, they certainly have good medical care, but if you could only pick one, I certainly would pick this country, the United States of America. That is why it is kind of surprising to learn that when it comes to some basic indicators of how well we are doing in the United States compared to other countries, there are some surprising answers.

We are facing a public health crisis in this country today that is often overlooked and ignored, and it is one I am sure will touch each and every one of us. It is the issue of maternal and infant health.

Too often in our country, new mothers and their babies—especially women and babies of color—are dying from completely preventable health complications. Take this statistic to heart: The United States is only 1 of 13 countries in the world where the death rate of new mothers is worse today than it was 25 years ago. How can it be possible that in the United States of America, mothers are dying at a rate worse than it was 25 years ago? Nationwide, more than 700 women die every year as a result of pregnancy. More than 70,000 others experience severe, near-fatal complications. In my State of Illinois, 73 women die every year due to pregnancy-related complications, and 70 percent of those deaths are preventable.

Not only are we losing these new moms, we are losing their babies. Every year, more than 23,000 infants die in the United States largely due to factors that could be prevented. Some of them are birth defects which could be detected in utero, preterm birth, low birth rate, and maternal complications. Here is a startling statistic. The United States of America—our home; this great Nation of plenty—ranks 32 out of 35 wealthy Nations when it comes to infant mortality. Is it possible? If so, what are we going to do about it?

The tragedy of maternal and infant mortality is even more pronounced when you look at mothers of babies of color. Black infants in America are twice as likely to die as White infants. That racial disparity is greater today than it was in the year 1850. Nationwide, women of color are three to four times more likely than White women to die as a result of their pregnancy. In Illinois, African-American women are six times more likely than White women to die of pregnancy-related complications.

Something has to be done. That is why, this week, I joined with Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, Senator DUCKWORTH, and others introducing what we call the MOMMA's Act. First and foremost, our bill would expand the length of time a new mom can keep her Medicaid healthcare coverage. More than half of the babies born my State of Illinois are to mothers who are covered by Medicaid—health insurance for those who are not wealthy and don't have access to private health insurance. The Medicaid Program covers more than half of the babies and mothers as they go through the birthing process.

Do you know what happens to Medicaid under the current law? Two months after the baby is born, the

mothers are cut off. Our bill would expand that to a year. Given that 60 percent of maternal deaths occur in the weeks and months after delivery, it is imperative that these new moms have the protection of Medicaid longer than 60 days.

We understand that many States' Medicaid Programs, including my own, are strapped for cash. Our bill will pay for itself by increasing Federal tobacco taxes. That is right. This Senator just called for an increase in taxes. You bet I did. The last time we dramatically increased the Federal tobacco tax was to create the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Is it worth it for kids to be born healthy and live to their full terms in life? Of course.

Given that Big Tobacco and its vaping interest have made billions of dollars at the expense of children and, I might add, of the African-American community, we believe they should help pay for this undertaking. As I said, in 2009 that is exactly what we did to create the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Next, the MOMMA Act would improve access to doulas. Too often, Black women are not listened to or taken seriously by healthcare providers. Doulas can help to provide education, advocacy, and support for women whose voices are often ignored.

To this point, our bill would also improve implicit bias and cultural competency training among healthcare providers. Sadly, the United States is still struggling with racial bias in healthcare.

Finally, our bill would improve hospital coordination and the reporting on maternal health outcomes, and it would ensure the widespread adoption and implementation of services to improve care.

If you have listened to the speech so far, you are probably thinking there is one thing he didn't mention—that many of those African-American women are in poverty, that they are low-income women. That probably explains why they don't have adequate care during their pregnancies or adequate care for their new children.

That is what I had concluded, but it is wrong. The statistics I have given you about racial disparity do not link up with one's economic status. Even African-American mothers who have high incomes and high educations are facing the same threats of maternal mortality. It is not driven by income or poverty. There is something more to the story. Don't we owe it to ourselves to look at it?

There are issues that divide this Chamber, and one of the issues, of course, is abortion. There are people with differing views on both sides of the aisle. It is always a contentious debate, but can't we all agree—pro-choice and pro-life—that we ought to focus on this, on the mothers who are delivering babies, to make sure that the mom survives and that the baby survives? That is what this act is all about, the MOMMA Act.

There are 23,000 infants and 700 new moms who die each year in the United States—some of the worst statistics in the world. We could prevent them with screenings, interventions, and the right healthcare. On a bipartisan basis, I can think of no better way to help babies and moms than to keep them alive and healthy, and that is what the MOMMA Act would do.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. President, on June 26, 1913, on a beautiful day in Springfield, IL, Governor Edward Dunne signed into law a bill making Illinois the first State east of the Mississippi where women could vote.

It was not equal voting rights, to be sure.

The new law gave Illinois women the right to vote only for Presidential electors and most local offices—but not for Governor, State representatives or Members of Congress. Still, it was historic.

Word of the milestone sped around the world.

When the legendary Chicago humanitarian Jane Addams—the first American woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize—announced the news at an international suffragette conference in Budapest, delegates roared with approval.

The suffragettes' battle to achieve even limited voting rights was long—it took nearly 60 years—and bitterly fought.

The first time the suffragettes took their campaign to Chicago's street corners, in 1910, they were ignored by some and derided by many—including many women.

When Illinois suffragettes traveled by train to Washington in 1913 to lobby President Woodrow Wilson for voting rights for all American women, their train stopped at Harper's Ferry, WV—this same place where fiery abolitionist John Brown made his stand against slavery.

As they spoke publicly for voting rights, the women were pelted with snowballs by men and boys, but they didn't back down.

In Washington, D.C., suffragettes from Illinois and other States encountered angry mobs and police who refused to intervene.

More than 100 women ended up in hospitals. Still, the women didn't retreat.

In 1914, 200,000 women registered to vote in Chicago, and eight women ran for aldermanic seats.

Five years later, on June 10, 1919, Illinois became the first State in the Nation to ratify the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution, giving all American women the right to vote in all elections.

That is a distinction we are proud of. By 1920, the 19th Amendment was ratified by the necessary two-thirds of States.

Next year, we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the women's right to vote in America.

As this Women's History Month draws to a close, I want to take a few moments to recall the courageous women who have helped advance the cause of freedom in my State and in our Nation and the women who continue to shape our Nation's shared destiny.

This Congress—the 116th Congress—includes more women than any Congress in our Nation's history. In the House, America's first woman Speaker, Nancy Pelosi, returned to her leadership post with 102 women as her colleagues.

Here in the Senate, we now have 25 women Senators—the most in our Nation's history.

The congressional delegation from my home State of Illinois also has more women members than ever before—including the youngest African-American woman ever elected to Congress: Representative Lauren Underwood, but we still have a long way to go to reach true gender equality in America.

This Congress may include record numbers of women, but women still make up only 25 percent of the Senate and less than that—a little over 23 percent—in the House. Those numbers ought to be higher.

The number of women serving in State legislatures has quintupled since 1971. Women now make up nearly 29 percent of State legislatures today.

In Illinois, women make up one-third of the General Assembly. That's progress, but all States—including Illinois—can and must do a better job of recruiting, supporting, and electing women leaders.

Women are making history in other professions and other ways, too.

More than 200,000 women serve in the U.S. military today, and America has 1.6 million women veterans. My friend and fellow Senator from Illinois, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, is one of those veterans. She is amazing. She lost both legs when a Blackhawk helicopter she was co-piloting was shot down in Iraq. As soon as she healed from her injuries, she asked: ''What else can I do to help other veterans and help my country?''

I encourage the Department of Defense to do more to harness the patriotism and talent of American women by opening more combat roles to women.

It has been said before, and I agree: You can measure a nation's character and its hopes for a better future by how it treats women and girls.

While America has made great progress, in gender equality, especially in the last two generations, we still have far to go.

It has been nearly 60 years since President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963. Yet American women in general still earn only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men. For women of color, the gap is even greater; African American women earn only 61 cents, and Latina women earn only 53 cents for every dollar a White

man makes. These disparities persist even among women and men who do the same or comparable work. That is wrong, and we need to close the pay fairness gap.

Many women across the country still lack access to affordable healthcare, including reproductive health care services.

Roe v. Wade was decided more than 40 years ago, but attacks on access have limited a woman's right to choose in many States, and too many women, especially women of color, are dying during or shortly after childbirth.

Here is a sobering fact: The United States is one of only 13 countries in the world where the maternal mortality rate is worse now than it was 25 years ago. Every year, more than 700 women in our Nation—most of them women of color—die as a result of their pregnancies, with more than 60 percent of these deaths being completely preventable.

This is unacceptable. Having a baby anywhere, especially in the United States, should not be a death sentence. We must do better.

The Equal Rights Amendment has been waiting for passage since the 1920s. My home State of Illinois finally ratified it last year.

Here is an idea. Let us work together to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment in this Congress.

For the 100th anniversary of women's voting rights in America let's pass the ERA. If we truly believe in gender equality, let's put it in writing in the U.S. Constitution.

Let's not just celebrate Women's History Month; let's build on women's historical successes and make this an even more perfect Union.

MUELLER REPORT

Last Friday, Attorney General William Barr announced that Special Counsel Bob Mueller had submitted a lengthy report from his investigation to the Attorney General.

On Sunday, Attorney General Barr sent another letter to Congress summarizing Mr. Barr's view of the ''principal conclusions'' of the Mueller report.

This letter is very troubling, particularly because the Attorney General inserted his own judgment about potential obstruction of justice by the President rather than letting the Mueller report speak for itself.

I have said repeatedly that I trust Bob Mueller. I believed he could be trusted to do a thorough and fair investigation into what happened with Russian meddling in the 2016 election. I still feel that way.

We have now heard Attorney General Barr's description of what Special Counsel Mueller found, but, respectfully, that is not good enough.

The American people need to hear Special Counsel Mueller's description of what he found.

Attorney General Barr is a political appointee. The reason a special counsel was appointed in this case was to take politics out of the investigation.

The Mueller report needs to be made public without delay. That is what we need to have confidence in the outcome of this investigation. The House of Representatives voted 420 to 0 for making the report public. Even the President claims he wants the report to be public, but we are already seeing an effort by the White House and Republicans to walk back from transparency of the Mueller report.

On Monday, White House Press Secretary Sarah Sanders said the White House will ''want to make sure we're protecting the office of the presidency; have to look at things like protecting executive privilege and sources and methods.''

Let us be clear—We need to see the full Mueller report, not just summaries and not just page after page of redacted text. The sooner this happens, the sooner we can reassure the American people about the integrity of the process. The American people deserve no less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Montana.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, the decision earlier this week to undo the Affordable Care Act—the decision made by a bunch of unelected bureaucrats at the Department of Justice—is nothing short of a slap in the face to our democracy.

The Affordable Care Act was passed by majorities in the House and the Senate; it was upheld by the Supreme Court; and it continues to be supported by folks on both sides of the aisle.

Nonetheless, the Department of Justice, through the direction of the President of the United States, has decided to undo the ACA and all the things that are in the ACA.

This isn't the first time. For the last nearly decade, I have heard a seemingly endless number of speeches on the floor of this body, and we have seen vote after vote after vote after vote, under both Republican and Democratic leadership, to repeal the ACA. It hasn't succeeded.

So what the Department of Justice decided to do is take the law into their own hands and circumvent the legislative process. I guess they felt they had no other choice.

It didn't just happen this week. Last summer, they refused to defend a provision of the ACA that protects people with preexisting conditions. That is pretty interesting.

My best friend in life, other than my wife, has diabetes, and he is somebody who has fought diabetes since we were in junior high. His folks didn't have diabetes, but he did. He still does.

He was not able to have health insurance that was affordable until the ACA came along. He wasn't even allowed to change jobs for fear that when he did get health insurance when he changed jobs, he would lose it and then have to go uninsured until—until—the ACA came along.

So when the DOJ decided to not defend the provision for preexisting conditions, it left many of us scratching our heads.

Then, earlier this week, the administration took it even further by lending its full-throated support for overturning the ACA in its entirety, which would result in ripping healthcare away from tens of millions of Americans.

This administration's actions would put millions of Americans at risk by getting rid of every last protection that was enshrined in the law, including Medicaid expansion and coverage for preexisting conditions that are, without debate, providing lifesaving and affordable healthcare to folks across this country.

If they, the administration, succeed in dismantling our healthcare system, I guarantee you the cost of healthcare will rise through the roof.

Oh, yes—no, no—they will point to junk plans. There are junk plans out there. They are cheap, but they are called junk for a reason. Just hope, if you have a junk plan, you never get sick because they are junk.

Dismantling this healthcare system not only will cause healthcare to go through the roof—because we are going back to the old system—there is no replace here. They will replace it with the old system. It will imperil the sustainability of our hospitals across this country but particularly in rural and frontier communities.

Don't ask me about this; ask hospital administrators. They will tell you that if the healthcare bill is repealed, they will either have to change the entire way they provide healthcare or close entirely. Once again, it will mean American families are just one devastating diagnosis away from bankruptcy, particularly if you live in rural America.

This administration's heartless decision is going to have devastating consequences on Montana's families. Let me give some statistics from a Montana perspective:

Fifty thousand Montanans who buy their healthcare coverage on the ACA market would lose that. Now, 50,000 is not many people, right? In a State of just over 1 million, that is a lot of people.

Ninety thousand Montanans who receive coverage as a result of Medicaid expansion would lose their coverage. I have told the story many times about a gentleman in Butte, MT, who was fighting diabetes and, by his own admission, mental health problems. This guy was about 45 years old, by the way. When the legislature expanded Medicaid 2 years ago, he was able to get healthcare to finally get his diabetes under control, and he was able to see a psychologist to get the tools he needed to take care of his own mental health. It resulted in his ability—for the first time in his life, he said—to be able to get a full-time job and support his family. He was incredibly proud of that.

That is one story of many across Montana and across this country, where Medicaid expansion has done an incredible job getting people back into the economy and helping build our economy. Know, once the ACA is repealed, Medicaid expansion is gone.

In Montana, we have 152,000 Montanans with preexisting conditions that before the ACA would disqualify them from coverage for healthcare. If the ACA is repealed, they could once again face lifetime caps; so, when you get sick and need that health insurance the most, it will not be there because you would be up against a cap.

They already have Medicare, where more than 110,000 Montana seniors rely on Medicare prescription drug plans for coverage of prescription drugs. That is going to be gone. It would reopen the doughnut hole and make hundreds of thousands responsible for increased costs.

I can tell you, in Montana, where poverty is the highest is in Indian Country. They would lose their assistance to purchase coverage or cost-sharing reductions to eliminate out-of-pocket expenses—these are our Native Americans—or those who were able to get on expanded Medicaid would lose that.

These aren't nameless, faceless folks. These are folks like Donna from Big Timber, who, after battling cancer, wouldn't be able to access quality, affordable healthcare without the ACA. They are people like Jeffrey from Great Falls, who has a daughter with special needs and owns a business. He told me his family and business would both fall apart without the ACA. It means the many folks in Libby who rely on quality insurance to access their community health center to address the unique healthcare challenges their government promised to protect would be gone.

Look, I have sat in this body, and I have heard speech after speech after speech about the ACA, what it does good and what it does not so good, but I am telling you, if you want to cause a train wreck in healthcare, this is a great way to do it—repeal it and let everybody be on their own—and it is not going to be pretty.

If you start losing rural hospitals in rural America, they will not come back. You will see further depopulation in rural America—because, by the way, that golden hour is called golden for a reason when you get hurt. If that hospital isn't there, you are more likely to go live in a more urban population center where healthcare is more expensive.

Nobody in this body has ever said the ACA was perfect, but I firmly believe it was a lot better than what we had. We always have the opportunity to step forth and improve it. Repealing it is not improving it.

What repealing is, is a campaign promise. We have heard them before: We are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. We are going to build a wall on the southern border, no matter if it separates farmers from their land, no matter if it creates a different border on the southern border. It was a campaign promise, just like repealing the ACA was.

The reason we are in single-digit popularity in this body is that we don't listen to the people. We listen to a select few who have certain people's ears in this body, and we don't make decisions based on what is best for this country and the people who live here. This is just another example of that.

It is time the Members of the greatest deliberative body wake up, take the ACA and improve the things that are wrong with it, and do our level best to make sure people can afford to get sick. It is pretty basic.

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

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

NOMINATION OF NICOLE R. NASON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Nicole Nason to serve as Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration at the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The Federal Highway Administration plays a central role in America's mobility. The administration is the lead partner to State and local transportation programs that maintain and improve our Nation's roads, highways, and bridges. It has been without a Senate-confirmed leadership director for far too long.

America's transportation infrastructure faces a number of challenges. Authorization of the Federal highway programs are going to expire at the end of September of 2020. We need to work together in Congress to write and pass a bipartisan highway infrastructure bill that upgrades America's roads and bridges.

The Environment and Public Works Committee, which I chair, has already begun the bipartisan process of drafting this legislation. The Federal Highway Administration needs a strong Administrator in the office, one who can work with Congress on the development and implementation of highway infrastructure legislation.

Nicole Nason is the right person for the job. She is well qualified, and brings impressive experience in transportation policy to this critically important position.

Under President Bush, she served as Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. That is the Department of Transportation's top road safety official.

Before that, she served as the Department of Transportation's Assistant Secretary for Government Affairs. In that role, she played a key part in negotiating the bipartisan passage of a 5-year highway reauthorization bill.

Ms. Nason most recently served as the Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Administration, a position where she has managed nearly 2,000 employees and contractors.

Ms. Nason has won praise from a wide variety of groups. Helen Witty is the national president of Mothers Against Drunk Driving. This is what she stated:

> Nicole is a true champion of highway safety and will be an asset to the Department of Transportation as the Federal Highway Administration Administrator. On behalf of MADD, I wholeheartedly endorse her for this position.

The Associated General Contractors of America had this to say:

> Ms. Nason is a superb choice to fulfill the Federal Highway Administration's leadership role in improving mobility on our nation's highways.

The Governors Highway Safety Association has stated:

> Throughout her career, Ms. Nason has demonstrated a clear commitment to public service and, during her tenure as Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) a dedication to advancing highway safety.

Confirming Ms. Nason to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration will be an important step in supporting our Nation's highways, roads, and bridges.

The Environment and Public Works Committee recognized this when we reported her nomination by voice vote on February 5. That has been nearly 2 months ago. It shouldn't take this long to confirm such a highly qualified nominee to such an important position.

Nicole Nason will be an excellent Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. I encourage every Senator to vote to confirm her.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicole R. Nason, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 15 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend and colleague, Senator BARRASSO, to speak on behalf of the nomination of Nicole Nason to serve as Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

Ms. Nason is currently serving as the Assistant Secretary for Administration

at the State Department. Right now, though, there is no Administrator leading the Federal Highway Administration. In fact, it has been more than 2 years since we had an Administrator in charge at that important Agency. The last time our country went this long without top leadership at the Federal Highway Administration was more than 100 years ago, back when the Agency was known as the Bureau of Public Roads. Henry Ford had just introduced the Model T, and the idea of speedy and safe transcontinental travel was still outside of our imagination and even further from being realized.

Today the Federal Highway Administration oversees more than 220,000 miles of our National Highway System and some 145,000 bridges. The sad truth is, many of these roadways and many of these bridges are in poor, in some cases, even dangerous condition, having been in use far beyond the intended duration of their original design.

Moments from now, when Ms. Nason is confirmed—and I hope she will be confirmed—to be our Administrator, I think she is going to inherit responsibilities and political realities far more challenging and complex than perhaps all of her predecessors.

As our next Administrator, Ms. Nason will find herself at the center of a national crisis because our highway trust fund is going broke, and the system of paying for it is broken.

Last year, we spent about $11 billion more from the highway trust fund than we collected in revenues. When that happens, the highway trust fund turns to the general fund, Treasury, and says: How about $11 billion? The general fund doesn't have $11 billion, so what Treasury does is it issues debt in order to finance the hole in the trust fund, the general fund, so we can actually fund the hole in the highway trust fund. It is crazy. In fact, to pay for the FAST Act, we took $70 billion from the general fund and other programs.

For the next Transportation bill, we need to find an additional $68 billion—$68 billion—just to prevent the highway trust fund from going broke for 5 more years and to keep our programs at the current funding level.

We all know that the current funding isn't sufficient, either. Despite spending more than we collect, we still aren't spending enough. The backlog of money to rehabilitate and improve highways and bridges in this country has grown to $800 billion. The backlog for roads, highways, and bridges is $800 billion. The 800-pound gorilla in the room is really an $800 billion gorilla.

We have to figure out how we are going to pay to maintain or better yet rebuild and modernize our roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems. That should be near the top of our to-do list. It is not just the Senate, not just the House, not just the Congress, not just the administration, but all of us together.

Whether or not it is fair, Ms. Nason's job as Administrator will be made either easier or all the more difficult by Congress's ability or inability and the administration's ability or inability to responsibly address that 800-pound gorilla.

On the topic of paying for infrastructure, I was encouraged to hear from Ms. Nason at her confirmation hearing that she believes that ''all options are on the table.'' Those are her words: ''All options are on the table.'' I welcome those words.

We also discussed several other policy-related concerns Ms. Nason will need to begin addressing on day one at the Federal Highway Administration. Too many pedestrians, too many bicyclists, and too many drivers put their lives at risk when they use our roadways.

In 2017, 2 years ago, there were more than 37,000 fatalities on our Nation's roadways. In that same year, nearly 7,000 nonmotorized users were killed. That is unacceptable.

I was encouraged that during her confirmation hearing, Ms. Nason promised that she would have a focus on safety at the Agency and work closely with NHTSA and others to improve information-sharing with States, localities, and Tribal communities.

Too many Americans lack access to reliable transit or safe places to walk or to bike. In my State, we have done a lot in the last 20, 25 years. There is a lot more to do, and, frankly, we can learn from other States, and maybe one or two of them can learn from us.

Meanwhile, our country's public safety networks should connect people to commerce and opportunity in every ZIP Code—not just some of them, in every ZIP Code. In too many instances, disadvantaged communities are spatially disconnected from commerce and opportunity. Lower income neighborhoods are often far from good-paying job opportunities, or safe and dependable transit options don't exist for those working outside of an 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. schedule. Our country's public transportation networks should lift up disadvantaged communities—lift them up. The Federal Highway Administration must be a strong Federal partner in that effort.

Too many drivers lack access to charging stations for electric vehicles and hydrogen fueling stations for fuel cell vehicles. This is especially frustrating for those who have made investments in this technology but may not have feasible options to use those investments.

That brings us to the glaring reality of climate change and its worsening impact on our infrastructure. Our vehicles and travel patterns exacerbate the impacts of climate change, and mobile sources are our Nation's largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. I want to say that again. Our vehicles and travel patterns accelerate and exacerbate the effects of climate change, and mobile sources—our cars, trucks, and vans—are our Nation's largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in this country and on the planet.

Meanwhile, increasingly frequent and extreme weather events are continuing to erode our transportation networks. We see it in my State. My guess is that we see it in every other State that is represented here.

Sea level rise threatens the structural integrity and longevity of our roads and bridges. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America, and seas are rising. That is not a good combination.

The challenges are great, but here is the good news: so are the opportunities. The challenges are great, but so are the opportunities.

Today, I am supporting the nomination of Ms. Nason because I believe the key to success at any organization—any organization I have ever been a part of—is its leadership—the Navy, the State of Delaware's Governor, and here. Right now, the Federal Highway Administration needs a top leader, and I believe that in Ms. Nason, they will have one. I hope—more than just hope, I believe she is going to prove to be a partner with Congress and work with us to address some of the many challenges I have laid out and the many challenges before us in the months and years ahead. I call on all of our colleagues—Democratic, Republican, and a couple of Independents—to rise up later today when the vote is taken and vote in favor of her nomination.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for both sides to yield back all remaining time.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nason nomination?

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Ex.]

YEAS—95

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

NAYS—1

Sanders

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Stabenow
Moran	Sullivan

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

FREE TRADE RESOLUTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for the last 3 years, the world has watched with rapt attention as the United Kingdom has debated and negotiated that country's exit from the European Union after the historic Brexit vote in June of 2016.

There have been multiple deals proposed since then, and now the deadline for withdrawal fast approaches this Friday. As the special ally of Britain for a very long time—a very close ally for well over 100 years—this is and it ought properly be of great interest to us in the United States of America.

Throughout times of change and tumult, the UK has been one of our staunchest and most loyal allies. We stood beside each other through two world wars and throughout the Cold War. Now, in the 21st century, the United States and the United Kingdom have become even stronger friends and partners, both in the fight against global terrorism and for freedom, peace, and prosperity.

The United Kingdom, significantly, is the seventh largest trading partner the United States has. In 2017 alone, we are talking about $232 billion in goods that were traded between our two countries. Now, Britain's impending exit from the European Union presents an enormous opportunity to strengthen and to preserve our special relationship.

As the Brexit deadline approaches, the United States should stand ready and willing to negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom, which is the purpose of the resolution that I want to bring before this body today. Prior to this, we haven't been able to have true free trade with Britain, precisely because the UK was a member of the EU and, therefore, had to play by its rules.

Yet once the UK leaves, it will reclaim the authority to make its own trade agreements, opening up a window of opportunity for genuine, bilateral free trade with our own country. Such an agreement would advance prosperity on both sides of the Atlantic as an engine of economic liberty.

This resolution—the one I would like to bring up and plan to bring up either later today or Monday, based on the schedule I am trying to negotiate with Senator WYDEN—is a good deal. It is a good deal for the United States and for the United Kingdom. I think it is such a no-brainer, in fact, that most Americans would probably be surprised to find out that we don't already have a free trade agreement with our friends on the other side of the pond.

Yet there are some objections to this resolution. Some of my colleagues have argued that by encouraging a free trade agreement with Britain, we would somehow be meddling in this affair or picking sides, or that we would somehow be affirming Brexit. Yet this resolution that I want to offer and am suggesting that we call up and pass by unanimous consent, itself, says nothing about whether or not Brexit should or should not happen—not at all. That is not a decision that belongs to this body, and it is not a decision that I am even suggesting that this body make. It is not ours to make. It is a decision for the British people to make—the people of the United Kingdom—and they, of course, have made it. They have decided to stand on their own. We should stand with them just as they have stood beside us in conflict after conflict, in cause after cause, defending the dignity of the immortal human soul and the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Others have claimed that the point of this measure is somehow to lambaste the EU, but this, too, badly misses the point, which is simply to preserve a unique and important alliance and to promote America's interests in the world.

Finally, some have suggested that this resolution that I want to propose and call up and pass before this body did not go through the Finance Committee. First of all, this is not a complicated resolution. It is simple. It is a straightforward, 2-page resolution declaring the sense of the Senate that No. 1, the United States has and should have a close, mutually beneficial trading and economic partnership with the United Kingdom without interruption and, No. 2, that the President, with the support of Congress, should lay the groundwork for a future trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Also, the vast majority of resolutions that simply specify a general sense of the Senate do not normally go through the full-blown legislative committee process. A straightforward assertion of friendship, support, and economic partnership with one of our oldest and closest allies in the world should not be controversial—not in the least. America's special relationship with the United Kingdom is special because we make it so—our two peoples, our two governments.

It is not our job to decide whether or not the UK stays in the EU. It is up to the British people to decide whether to stick with the EU or not. It is up to us to decide whether we stick with the British, and we should. We should do that by supporting this resolution today.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to be able to talk about a couple of subjects today, but I want to be able to set the context on these with the recognition of Women's History Month. A lot of fairly remarkable ladies in Oklahoma have set American history and world history into a different pace based on what they have done in the past.

I can't help, when I am talking about Women's History Month, to be able to talk about my own mom, who is a pacesetter in her own leadership. She was a student, librarian, and mom. She went through elementary school librarian and high school librarian and then became the director of libraries for a very large school district.

She led the way for our family and community. She even led the American Association of School Librarians around the country. She was a pacesetter there.

There are other pacesetters that I would highlight who are Oklahoma pacesetters. The first is Claire Luper. Born in Okfuskee County, OK, in 1923, Claire Luper was the first African-American student to enroll in the History Department at the University of Oklahoma. She was a civil rights leader. She led Americans at lunch counters in 1958 as she was seated there and helped to train youth to be seated at lunch counters to break through the racism that was existing in Oklahoma City and in Oklahoma.

Claire Luper herself was arrested 26 times for just eating lunch—for just

leading for the rights of what every single human being should be allowed to do in our great country.

After 26 arrests and the breakthrough leadership that she experienced, she now has been recognized with over 500 different awards and honors in her lifetime. She taught in the Oklahoma City area for 41 years, was a senior adviser for the NAACP Youth Council in Oklahoma City, and is now a member of the Oklahoma Hall of Fame.

Another great leader from Oklahoma is Shannon Lucid. She was raised in Bethany, OK. In 1979 she became an astronaut in a time period when ladies did not become astronauts. She set the pace. She was the chief scientist at NASA from 2002 to 2003. She served as the capsule communicator for numerous space missions. She was the first woman to receive the Congressional Space Medal of Honor.

Jeane Kirkpatrick is another Oklahoman. Born in 1926, she was the first woman appointed to serve as a Permanent Representative to the United States for the United Nations. She served from 1981 to 1985. She served on President Ronald Reagan's Cabinet, was a political science professor at Georgetown University, and was a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. She made Oklahoma proud.

Let me tell you about a current one now. LaRita Aragon. LaRita Aragon was born in Shawnee, OK, but she was raised in the big town of Dale, just outside of Shawnee. She became the first woman to hold the rank of brigadier general in the Oklahoma Air National Guard and the first female commander of the Air National Guard.

Before her military career, she was an elementary school teacher and a principal. After retirement from the military, she returned to education. She served as the director of advanced programs in the University of Oklahoma College of Continuing Education. Then, in January 2011, she started serving as secretary of veterans affairs for the State of Oklahoma. She is a remarkable military leader from our State and a tremendous role model for people in our State—boys and girls.

Maria Tallchief was born in 1925 in Fairfax, OK. She was a member of the Osage Nation. At age 17, she did a crazy thing. She moved to New York City to pursue her dream of becoming a dancer. As her career began to take off, people tried to persuade Maria Tallchief to change her last name so that she wouldn't face the prejudice of being Native American. She refused to do that. She continued to work and to prove herself. In 1947 she became the first American to dance with the Paris Opera Ballet. She led the way, and she set the pace.

Oklahomans are proud of these ladies and many, many others who have done great work and made remarkable advances. We are proud of them.

LONG-TERM BUDGET PLANNING

Mr. President, from recognizing Women's History Month, let me make a comment on something currently happening in the Senate. Right now in the Senate, the Senate Budget Committee is continuing to work on a budget.

The President turns in a budget. As many people know, since 1974, the President's budget has been just a document of ideas. The Senate and the House agree together on a budget, set a number, and then do appropriations bills. That is how we actually do the spending for the Federal taxpayers' dollars. Since 1974, it has typically begun with a budget document from the Senate and from the House.

They are working on that budget document right now in the Budget Committee, but here is the difficult thing. In all likelihood, that budget document that will come out of committee will never come to this floor and will never be voted on because of the difficulty we face right now in our deficit and the challenges the budget will have in order for it to move through the process. In all likelihood, this body will deem a budget number, where there will be no real plan. It will just set a budget number and then move on and start heading toward appropriations.

Layer upon layer of debt and deficit will be added to where we are as a nation. Our simple challenge is, how do we get around this?

Last year, 16 Members met—eight Senators, eight House Members; eight Republicans, eight Democrats—to try to strategize how we could change the budget process. Though I commend Chairman ENZI of the Budget Committee and his remarkable work, thought, and incredible staff, once again that document will not make a difference on this floor, and once again it will not set us on a long-term path to getting back to solvency. We have to change the process of what we do.

These 16 Members met all last year to establish a set of ideas of how we could change the process, but it failed in December. I am challenging this body to step up to it again and to reengage on some simple sets of ideas of how we can get our budget back in balance and how we can do better planning. Though we do budgets and though we will do the deeming of a budget number, there is no real plan for how things can get better. We have to get better at planning, so let me give you some simple ideas that were birthed out of the conversation last year.

We hold debt ceiling votes, which are supposedly to limit our debt, but they never do. They did decades ago, but they have not for decades. We will have 12 appropriations bills in some form and in some way so as to actually do the spending in the next several months, but there will be no bill to deal with how we can reduce spending.

A simple idea that came out of that conversation last year was this: How do we add a 13th bill?

As simple as I can say it, we have 12 spending bills. In every single Congress, the 13th bill would be set aside for how we will reduce our deficit. We have a structure with which to do that. It is the reconciliation process. It will certainly take work to reform this. We have a process in place right now that we could use but that we don't. What if we mandate it each year? We would have our 12 spending bills in whatever form they would take, but in every single session of Congress, we would have to have some conversation about what we would do to reduce spending or to fix our deficit. It is not an unreasonable proposal. It is an opportunity for us to sit and plan, to actually think about things, and to work things out.

Senator MAGGIE HASSAN and I also have another idea for working through the process. How do we end government shutdowns? How do we stop the perpetual cliffs of budgeting issues? There is a simple way to do that.

The simple way to do that, as odd as it may sound, is for Members of Congress and our staffs, as well as for members of the staff within the Office of Management and Budget from the White House, to not travel if you get to the end of a budget year and the budget is not done. You can't leave until the work is done, is as simple as I can say it. That may sound overly simplistic, but I guarantee you, if this body has to work through 2 weeks, no one would have the opportunity to travel. Everyone would have to be here days and weekends. There would be no official travel. There would be no opportunity to head back and see your family. There would be no codels or staffdels or any kind of other opportunity to leave. Each day, we would also have to have a quorum call and be here until the work gets done. Then we would solve this.

Last December, we had this protracted shutdown that began when Members of Congress left for Christmas. They just left with there being an unresolved budget issue here. If Senator HASSAN's and my idea were to pass, we would have finished that work last December, and Americans would never have experienced that protracted government shutdown.

We have differences of opinion. It is who we are as Americans, and that is what we represent in the U.S. Senate, but we should not punish Federal workers and the American people because we have not worked out our differences here. We should stay until the work is done, and we should keep negotiating until we are finished. That is a simple, straightforward way to resolve this.

With our adding a 13th bill to enable our having to plan for how we will actually deal with debt and deficit, there will be some moment created every year to compel us to actually be here until our work is done as well as having a more systematic structure of how we are going to do budgeting. All of these are simple ideas, but they are ideas that will help us get on top of a $22 trillion debt and an approaching $1

trillion yearly deficit. It is as if we have lost the importance of this, and we cannot.

My challenge to this body is to make the budget mean something again. Let's actually do long-term planning, and let's figure out how to make a process work for the taxpayers. We can figure this out, and we can work together to do it.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 268, the supplemental appropriations bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for H.R. 268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Josh Hawley, John Thune, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Rob Portman, Steve Daines, John Kennedy.

S. RES. 50

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the unprecedented obstruction that has faced President Trump's nominees for the past 26 months—and counting—and to announce that the Senate is going to do something about it.

The systematic, across-the-board delay and obstruction that have crippled this administration's nominations are unique in American history.

Every Presidential election since Adams beat Jefferson in 1796 has left some Senators disappointed that their side lost. There is always a losing side, and they are never happy about it. But the past 2 years have been the first time—the first time ever—that the unhappy party has used Senate procedure to systematically blockade the new President's nominees and prevent him from even staffing up his administration. Let me say that again. Since January 2017, for the first time in the 230-year history of the U.S. Senate, a minority of Senators have used Senate procedure to systematically prevent the President of the United States from putting a full team in place.

During the first 2 years of the last six Presidential administrations before President Trump, 24 total cloture votes had to be held to advance a nomination, but in President Trump's first 2 years, there were 128 cloture votes on nominees.

For 42 different executive branch positions, cloture votes have been required for the first time in history—the first time ever. Uncontroversial Assistant Secretaries and Agencies' general counsels never required cloture votes before—ever—until this particular Democratic minority.

Just compare President Trump's first 2 years to President Obama's. Overall, we have confirmed 22 percent fewer nominations for President Trump and sent more than twice as many back to the White House.

Take just the Foreign Relations Committee as one example. The share of nominees sent to the Foreign Relations Committee who were still not confirmed after President Trump's first 2 years was more than three times—three times—what it was for President Obama.

To be clear, the lion's share of all of these are not controversial, high-profile figures. In most cases, they are unambiguously well-qualified nominees for critical but lower profile jobs.

For example, it took more than 6 months—6 months—and several tragic railroad accidents that made national news before a minority of Senators would allow us to confirm the President's nominee to head the Federal Railroad Administration. That is 6 months and several railroad accidents to get us to confirm the President's nominee to head the Federal Railroad Administration.

He had worked in railroads as an engineer, manager, and executive for 45 years. Our colleagues on the Commerce Committee voice-voted him out of committee. Actually, when Democrats finally allowed his nomination to come to the floor—when they finally allowed that—he was confirmed by voice vote. Despite the fact that nobody actually objected to this nominee, this important job was held empty for 6 long months. It is obstruction for obstruction's sake.

It is the same story with even the least controversial judicial nominees. Last January, it took more than a week of floor time to confirm four district judges, all of whom had been voice-voted out of the Judiciary Committee the previous autumn, but there were still months of delays. Then cloture votes were required for each, but once we finally plowed through to the confirmation votes, they were all confirmed unanimously.

There were months of delays and procedural roadblocks for four bipartisan nominees whom not a single Senator actually opposed.

This is not a principled maneuver, not thoughtful use of minority powers, but obstruction simply for the sake of obstruction.

This historic campaign isn't fair to our duly elected President, and, more importantly, it is not fair to the American people. The American people deserve the government they elected. They deserve important positions to be promptly filled with capable individuals, not held open indefinitely out of political spite.

As we all acknowledge, from an institutional perspective, this is completely unsustainable, but if we allow it to persist, it seems guaranteed to become standard operating procedure for every administration going forward.

Let's assume 2 years from now that my side is in the minority, and there is a Democratic President. If we allow this to persist, we will be doing the same thing to those guys that they have been doing to us. It will be the new norm.

Some of our colleagues who are leading the systematic obstruction are actually running for President themselves. Well, these tactics will virtually guarantee that any future Democratic administration is subjected to the same paralysis. Everybody will be doing it.

Is this how the American Government is supposed to work from here on out—whichever party loses the White House basically prohibits the new President from standing up an administration?

We can't accept this. This just can't be allowed to continue. We need to restore the Senate to the way it functioned for literally decades.

Remember, the idea that nominees would regularly require cloture votes was completely foreign to the Senate until this sad chapter began during the administration of President Bush 41, in the early 2000s.

As of 1968—1968—cloture had never been required for any nomination—any nomination. As of 1978, it had been required for two—two as of 1978.

Until 2003, in no conference—none—had more than 12 cloture motions ever been needed for nominations. But now, again, President Trump's chosen nominees faced 128 cloture votes in the Congress that just past. So this entire conversation is a modern aberration. This hasn't been going on forever. This is a fairly recent thing. This behavior is new. We need to restore the Senate's tradition in this area. Fortunately, we have a clear roadmap to do just that.

In 2013, immediately after President Obama's reelection, 78 Senators, including me, passed a bipartisan standing order to speed up the consideration of many Presidential nominees. Seventy-eight Members of this body passed a standing order to help President Obama speed up the Executive Calendar.

It reduced the postcloture time for most nominations without touching the Supreme Court, circuit courts, or the highest levels of the executive branch. Essentially everything else got

a more streamlined process so nominees could be confirmed more efficiently.

Again, President Obama had just been inaugurated for the second time days earlier. You better believe Republicans were disappointed we had lost, but we did not throw a systematic tantrum. Instead, a sizable number of us came over and joined the Democrats to help the Senate process noncontroversial nominations, as it had for the vast bulk of the history of the Senate. I was a Republican leader in the minority, and I still supported it. We judged if it was the right thing to do, and we did it. The standing order passed 78 to 16.

So, today, I am filing cloture on a resolution that takes that bipartisan effort as its blueprint. This resolution from Senator BLUNT and Senator LANKFORD would implement very similar steps and make them a permanent part of the Senate going forward.

The Supreme Court, circuit courts, Cabinet-level executive positions, and certain independent boards and commissions would not change, but for most other nominations—for literally the hundreds of lower level nominations that every new President makes—postcloture debate time would be reduced from 30 hours to 2 hours.

This would keep the floor moving. It would facilitate more efficient consent agreements, and, most importantly, it would allow the administration—finally, 2 years into its tenure—to staff numerous important positions that remain unfilled with nominees who have been languishing.

This resolution has come up through the regular order, through the Rules Committee, and next week we will vote on it. It deserves the same kind of bipartisan vote that Senator SCHUMER and Senator Reid's proposal received back during the Obama administration.

I understand that many of my Democratic colleagues have indicated they would be all for this reform as long as it doesn't go into effect until 2021, when they obviously hope someone else might be in the White House, but they are reluctant to support it now. Give me a break. That is unfair on its face.

My Democratic colleagues were more than happy to support a similar proposal back in 2013 under President Obama. They whisper in our ears privately that they would support it now if it took effect in 2021, oh, but they can't support it now, especially under these unprecedented circumstances, simply because we have a Republican President.

Fair is fair. Members of this body should only support reforms that they would be as ready to support in the minority as they are in the majority.

Put another way, if my side is in the minority 2 years from now, I don't think this will be unfair, and it will not disadvantage us in the wake of a new Democratic President. This is a change the institution needs—a change the institution made already, basically, with a 2-year experiment when President Obama was in office. This is reform that every Member should embrace when their party controls the White House and when it does not control the White House.

I urge every one of my colleagues: Let's get the Senate back to a normal historical pattern for handling Presidential nominations. Let's give President Trump, as well as all future Presidents, a functional process for building their administrations. Let's give the American people the government they actually elected, and let's seize this chance to do so through the bipartisan regular order that we are pursuing here, both in committee and now on the floor.

The status quo is unsustainable for the Senate and for the country. It is unfair to this President and to future Presidents of either party. It cannot stand, and it will not stand.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. MERKLEY. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

IMPROVING PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE SENATE—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 24, S. Res. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. Res. 50, a resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 24, S. Res. 50, a resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Shelley Moore Capito, Tom Cotton, David Perdue.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 130 through 156 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. The majority leader has said he is going to put a rule change on the floor, and we are going to return to historical norm. The historical norm has been that when such issues are on the floor, amendments will be allowed.

Does the majority leader intend to allow amendments?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Oregon is propounding a question. If he would repeat it, I would appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Referring to historical norms, it has been a historical norm to allow amendments on the floor of this Chamber so that they could be debated, and I recall very well listening to you complain a great deal about Harry Reid's blocking of amendments, blocking the tree, and he did, in fact, do that as the majority leader.

Then he would negotiate with that whole set of amendments on both sides. It took some time, but there were amendments.

We have had a historic lull in amendments, and now we are proposing a rule change on how this Chamber operates. So isn't it the right thing to do, before returning to historical norm or trying to restore that sense of making this a functioning Chamber—

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes.—to allow amendments when this comes to the floor? I am asking if he would allow such amendments.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say that we have had a number of bills that were brought to the floor open for amendment. One of the things we devolved into here, another unfortunate precedent, is Members objecting to time agreements on amendments from either side. So even if the majority leader calls up a bill and has it open for amendment, unless Members of the Senate in both parties will allow there to be time agreements so that we can actually have votes on amendments, it gets bogged down.

I think the complaint of my friend from Oregon is legitimate. I have been very frustrated by the fact that when I

call up a bill and open it up for amendments, I have Members on both sides preventing each other's amendments from getting a vote. I share the frustration of my colleague from Oregon, but I assure him that when I call up a bill and say that it is open for amendment, it is open for amendment. It is just that it requires Senatorial bipartisan cooperation to set time agreements to actually have such votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—I think I have a UC agreement, a UC pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request with respect to the—

Mr. MERKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I didn't actually get clarity on whether he will open the floor for amendments when he will bring this rule change to the floor—whether it will be open in the sense that when one amendment is completed, a Senator can ask for another to be considered or only the amendments he approves will be allowed to be considered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to guarantee a particular amendment would get a vote without consent, we would have to be able to get 60 votes and vote cloture to advance the amendment.

I will just reiterate to my friend from Oregon that his complaint is legitimate, but it does require, no matter what the majority leader says with regard to openness of the bill, some level of bipartisan cooperation in order to process amendments. We have tried that on numerous occasions, and Members on both sides have sort of hunkered down and objected to each other's amendments, thereby making the amendment process, in an open fashion, simply impossible.

I do have a consent agreement pending. I don't know whether the Senator from Oregon wants to continue to object to all of these—

Mr. MERKLEY. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. MCCONNELL.—nominations, which would include people from the Marine Corps, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army. I was seeking the military promotions of these people who are serving our country in the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I will, in fact, make this the last time I reserve the right to object, simply to make the point that there are many ideas for improving this Chamber that have not had due consideration.

My colleague has expressed a lot of frustration over executive nominations. I put forward an amendment in the minority establishing a 100-day clock for amendments to be voted before this floor once the paperwork is complete. Others have other ideas, including the ability to have a time at the start of every 2 years to be able to have an open debate on amendments—on how we work. Others have other ideas for improving this Chamber.

I think such a debate is way overdue, but if it is the majority leader's intent to allow just the one issue that he is bringing forward, then that is not turning the clock back to historical norm.

I was here in this Chamber in 1976 and during the eighties, seeing this body debate issues. I would ask, if my colleague brings this to the floor as he is planning to do, that he open it up for amendments. Get a time agreement. I will certainly encourage my side to agree to such a thing.

I take your point about it not just being a delay. I think there are serious possibilities for improving how we work that should be debated. I hope my colleague will open the floor for amendments.

I withdraw my objection.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Leonard F. Anderson, IV
Col. William E. Souza, III

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Peter G. Stamatopoulos

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Gayle D. Shaffer

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Kelly A. Aeschbach
Rear Adm. (lh) Frank D. Whitworth

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

Rear Adm. (lh) Blake L. Converse
Rear Adm. (lh) Charles B. Cooper, II
Rear Adm. (lh) Donald D. Gabrielson
Rear Adm. (lh) Gregory N. Harris
Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey T. Jablon
Rear Adm. (lh) Yancy B. Lindsey
Rear Adm. (lh) John F. Meier
Rear Adm. (lh) James E. Pitts
Rear Adm. (lh) John B. Skillman
Rear Adm. (lh) Karl O. Thomas
Rear Adm. (lh) John F. Wade
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael A. Wettlaufer

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Dean A. Vanderley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth W. Epps

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Timothy H. Weber

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. James L. Hancock

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Nicholas M. Homan
Capt. Michael J. Vernazza

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Charles W. Brown

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel and appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5141:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John B. Nowell, Jr.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven L. Basham

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Steven J. Butow

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Karen H. Gibson

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) James P. Downey
Rear Adm. (lh) Shane G. Gahagan
Rear Adm. (lh) Francis D. Morley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Ronald A. Boxall

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to that position under title 10, U.S.C., sections 7036 and 7073:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas L. Solhjem

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig: Gen. Telita Crosland

Brig. Gen. Dennis P. LeMaster

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment as the Director, Army National Guard, and for appointment to the grade indicated in the Reserve of the Army under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 10506:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Daniel R. Hokanson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Leon N. Thurgood

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Walter E. Piatt

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James C. Slife

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Paul E. Funk, II

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Dee L. Mewbourne

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Jon A. Hill

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Stuart B. Munsch

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN288 AIR FORCE nominations (55) beginning DANIEL M. ANDERSON, and ending DENISE M. ZONA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN425 AIR FORCE nomination of Thomas D. Crimmins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN427 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning SHAWN C. BISHOP, and ending CHRISTIAN L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN428 AIR FORCE nominations (14) beginning MICHELL A. ARCHEBELLE, and ending SHELLEY A. SHELTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN429 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning PETER N. FISCHER, and ending JONATHAN H. WADE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN430 AIR FORCE nominations (425) beginning BRIAN M. ALEXANDER, and ending JASON C. ZUMWALT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN472 AIR FORCE nomination of Latoya D. Smith, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN473 AIR FORCE nomination of Lisa Marie Ahaesy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN500 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JULIE HUYGEN, and ending TOM POSCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 6, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

PN305 ARMY nomination of Matthew D. Colsia, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN306 ARMY nomination of Deven R. Gaston, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN380 ARMY nominations (949) beginning ADRIAN ACEVEDO, and ending G010477, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN381 ARMY nominations (556) beginning BENJAMIN T. ABEL, and ending G010598, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN382 ARMY nominations (555) beginning KWANSAH E. ACKAH, and ending D014862, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN383 ARMY nominations (51) beginning ALAN ADAME, and ending D013619, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN384 ARMY nomination of Elizabeth A. Fields, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN433 ARMY nomination of P. J. Fox, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN434 ARMY nomination of Nathan M. Clayton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN435 ARMY nomination of Adam P. James, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN436 ARMY nominations (33) beginning JASON S. BAKER, and ending RICHARD J. ZEIGLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN437 ARMY nomination of Shelia R. Day, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN438 ARMY nomination of Robert D. Cope, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN439 ARMY nomination of William C. Mitchell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN474 ARMY nomination of Rubirosa B. Bago, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN475 ARMY nomination of Meghan C. Gerrity, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN476 ARMY nomination of Daniel M. Jansen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN477 ARMY nomination of Randolph Powell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN478 ARMY nomination of Michael J. Prokos, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN481 ARMY nomination of Anthony Bellofigueroa, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN482 ARMY nomination of Sean R. Richardson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN483 ARMY nomination of Kahtonna C. Allen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN484 ARMY nomination of Angelo N. Catalano, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN485 ARMY nomination of Charles J. Calais, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN486 ARMY nomination of Robert T. Evans, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN501 ARMY nominations (2) beginning PAULA I. SCHASBERGER, and ending JAN E. ALDYKIEWICZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 6, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN319 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning STEVEN M. ANGELINE, and ending Curtis E. Borjas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN326 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning DAVID F. HUNLEY, and ending JAMES P. STOCKWELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN328 MARINE CORPS nomination of John C. Jarvis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN337 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning NATHANEAL J. HART, JR., and ending DUSTIN R. HEFFEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN340 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning MATTHEW J. ANDERSON, and ending ISAAC K. TIBAYAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

IN THE NAVY

PN487 NAVY nomination of Edward M. Prendergast, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN489 NAVY nomination of Thomas L. Hinnant, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN490 NAVY nomination of Sanjay Sharma, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 2019.

PN502 NAVY nomination of Angela Tang, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 6, 2019.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

REMEMBERING ANDREW MARSHALL

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to recognize a titan of defense thinking, Andrew Marshall, who passed away at the age of 97 on March 26, 2019.

Mr. Marshall was the founding father of the Department of Defense's Office of Net Assessment. From its creation, he served as its director for over four decades, leaving an indelible mark on our defense institutions. He finally retired in 2015, at the age of 93.

In his role, he piloted rigorous analysis of critical national security issues, rooted in his unparalleled institutional knowledge. This is why he was often called the 'Yoda' of the Pentagon.

His groundbreaking work shaped how the Department of Defense responds to long-term challenges and paved the way for a nimbler, more modern force.

Despite its relatively small budget, the Office of Net Assessment has had an outsized impact on military thinking. In particular, he foresaw the threats posed by the then-Soviet Union and, more recently, China.

Mr. Marshall's legacy goes beyond strategic thinking. He also trained the next generation of defense analysts, including the current Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Air Force Gen. Paul Selva, ensuring his knowledge lasts into the future.

Our Nation is more secure because of Mr. Marshall's important work. We owe a great deal of debt to him, and I am thankful for the opportunity to commemorate him today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. JONATHAN L. BINGHAM

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Dr. Jonathan L. Bingham for his service in providing quality dermatologic surgery care to the folks in Great Falls and his military service in the Montana Air National Guard.

Dr. Bingham graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy. Following the Naval Academy, he went on to medical school at Pennsylvania State University and the Air War College. Dr. Bingham then served with distinction as a flight surgeon and Mohs Surgeon-Dermatologist in the U.S. Navy.

Throughout the course of his career, he has served his country and his fellow citizens with great honor. During his time in the Navy, he deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom as a flight surgeon, and he also served as faculty dermatologist and Mohs Surgeon at the National Naval Medical Center and the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center to support the White House Medical Unit and the Office of the Attending Physician.

In Great Falls, Dr. Bingham is one of the leading experts on dermatologic care. Despite his successful career as a civilian and servicemember, Dr. Bingham continues his service to our country in the Air National Guard.

Dr. Bingham is an inspiration to any young Montanans seeking to live out a life in service to his or her country. I congratulate Dr. Bingham for his exemplary record of excellence, and I thank him for his continued service to the people of Montana and our country.●

TRIBUTE TO CLARE HARMON

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and congratulate Clara Harmon from Helena for winning the 2019 Treasure State Spelling Bee. Clara is an exceptional young woman who attends school through the Helena Area Christian Home Educators.

Clara endured 19 rounds of tough competition which amounted to 3 1/2 hours before she was crowned the victor. Clara is a shining example of the best and the brightest Montana has to offer. This May, Clara will be travelling to National Harbor, MD, to represent Montana at the Scripps National Spelling Bee. I also want to thank Clara's parents, Charles and Dianna Harmon for raising such a talented and passionate daughter.

All of Montana will be rooting for Clara as she represents us on the national stage in May.●

TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP SOUTH

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Phillip South of Sheridan, MT, for his 100 years of determination, bravery, and service.

At 100, Philip South has lived through 18 presidents, two World Wars, the Great Depression, and was born when there were only 48 States in the United States. Mr. South served his country heroically in World War II as a rifleman and scout in the U.S. Marine Corps with the renowned First Marine Division.

In the Guadalcanal, Phillips survived sniper fire and his small regiment of rifleman and scouts found themselves in the heart of the battle for Henderson Field. He held a position not too far from Medal of Honor recipient John Basilone, to hold the line against an onslaught of Japanese troops. Despite being outnumbered, his small group prevailed.

I would like to thank Mr. South for his service to our Nation. He is an inspiration to all young Montanans wishing to serve their country.●

TRIBUTE TO DELORES PIGSLEY

● Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this month, Women's History Month, we recognize and celebrate the contributions that women have made to the betterment of our Nation. Today, I want to talk about one such remarkable woman from my home State of Oregon: Delores Pigsley.

In 1991, Delores Pigsley said, ''You never quit being an Indian just because your tribe has been terminated.'' Delores—Dee to her friends—ought to know. As a young child, Delores witnessed the termination of her Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, in 1954, and just over two decades later, in 1977, she was the driving force behind the Siletz becoming the first Tribe in Oregon, and just the second tribe in the entire United States to have its Federal status as a sovereign government restored.

For over four decades now, Delores has never slowed down or wavered in her commitment to serving the members of the Siletz Tribe, 32 of those years as Tribal chairman.

As chief negotiator for the Siletz Tribe, Delores passed agreements with Congress, negotiated compacts, and testified here on Capitol Hill before Congress. She has worked with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Services on behalf of her Tribal members, and thanks in no small measure to her leadership, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, which was once on the verge of ceasing to exist, now owns and manages a reservation of over 3,500 acres, with a casino, resorts, hotels, a school, and health clinics.

Delores is many things to many people: a chairman, a leader, a role model, a wife, a mother, and a grandmother. In spite of all her accomplishments, she remains humble, attributing much of her success to other Tribal council leaders and to many national Tribal leaders who have served as mentors to her.

So this Women's History Month, let's take a moment to recognize and to thank Delores Pigsley for all that she has done for the members of the Siletz Tribe, for Tribes across the country, and for the people of Oregon.

Thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO GARY YOHE

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to Gary Yohe, a Connecticut resident

and preeminent national expert on climate change, who is retiring from Wesleyan University.

Professor Yohe has had an impressive and distinguished career. After receiving his PhD in economics from Yale University, he devoted his career to climate impact and mitigation research. He worked as a senior member of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, receiving a share of the 2007 Nobel Prize, served as vice chair of the National Climate Assessment Development and Advisory Committee under President Obama, and has testified before the Senate on multiple occasions to explain the risks and impacts of climate change. Professor Yohe continues to serve as a member of the New York City Panel on Climate Change and has been a member of the faculty at Wesleyan University for more than 40 years. On a more personal note, he has been a great resource to my office, and I hope he will continue to contribute to public policy after his official retirement.

I would like to congratulate Professor Yohe on his retirement from Wesleyan University and take this moment to thank him for his contributions to the scientific community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

At 1:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 863. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The message also announced that pursuant to Section 1652(b) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the Minority Leader appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Cyberspace Solarium Commission: Mr. GALLAGHER of Wisconsin.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–793. A communication from the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's development of a plan for integrated overhead persistent infrared capabilities (OSS–2019–0294); to the Committees on Appropriations; Armed Services; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–794. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Research and Engineering), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the funding of Department of Defense programs under the Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program; to the Committees on Armed Services; and Appropriations.

EC–795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–796. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–797. A communication from the Deputy Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Bureau's efforts to better align state and federal plans for managing Greater Sage-Grouse habitat on federal lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–798. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2018 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–799. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Budget Request for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–800. A communication from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Arms Export Control Act (OSS–2019–0255); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–801. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS–2019–0272); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–802. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, sixteen (16) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–803. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation for 2018''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–804. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–805. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–806. A communication from the Congressional Relations Officer of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2018 and Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2019–2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–807. 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 ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to National Park Service's Research and Monitoring Activities in Southern Alaska National Parks'' (RIN0648–BH90) 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–808. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Mississippi Canyon Block 20, South of New Orleans, LA, Gulf of Mexico'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–1062)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–22. 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Special Report entitled ''Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence United States Senate Covering the Period January 3, 2017 to January 3, 2019'' (Rept. No. 116–20). Additional views filed.

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 257. A bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–21).

By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Special Report entitled ''Report on the Activities of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary During the 115th Congress'' (Rept. No. 116–22).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Special Report entitled ''Legislative Activities Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Fifteenth Congress'' (Rept. No. 116–23).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled ''Legislative Activities Report of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the United States Senate During the 115th Congress'' (Rept. No. 116–24).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Wing Chau, of Rhode Island, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island for the term of four years.

Ramona L. Dohman, of Minnesota, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 921. A bill to prohibit the use of chlorpyrifos on food, to prohibit the registration of pesticides containing chlorpyrifos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 922. A bill to limit the transfer of F–35 aircraft to Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 923. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individuals and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 924. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require training and education to teachers and other school employees, students, and the community about how to prevent, recognize, respond to, and report child sexual abuse in primary and secondary education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 925. A bill to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that kombucha is exempt from any excise taxes and regulations imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 927. A bill to amend the National Aviation Heritage Act to reauthorize the National Aviation Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 929. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 930. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 933. A bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 934. A bill to prohibit mandatory or compulsory checkoff programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 935. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

S. 936. A bill to repeal the authority to access on an ongoing basis business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 937. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to require institutions of higher education and other research facilities to obtain deemed export licenses for foreign nationals conducting scientific research at such institutions and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 938. A bill to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 939. A bill to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 940. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 941. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the obligations of licensees under section 331 of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 942. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require all political committees to notify the Federal Election Commission within 48 hours of receiving cumulative contributions of $1,000 or more from any contributor during a calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 943. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide capacity-building assistance to institutions of higher education to examine and address inequities in college student access and success, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 944. A bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 945. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to require certain issuers to disclose to the Securities and Exchange Commission information regarding foreign jurisdictions that prevent the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from performing inspections under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 946. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to complete a study on barriers to participation in federally funded cancer clinical trials by populations that have been traditionally underrepresented in such trials; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 947. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 948. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 949. A bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 950. A bill to require the Director of the United States Geological Survey to perform a nationwide survey of perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 951. A bill to promote registered apprenticeships, including registered apprenticeships within in-demand industry sectors, through the support of workforce intermediaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 952. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 953. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the ''Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 954. A bill to provide grants to State, local, territorial, and Tribal law enforcement agencies to purchase chemical screening devices and train personnel to use chemical screening devices in order to enhance law enforcement efficiency and protect law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 955. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to reduce waiting times for voters in Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 956. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of all donations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 957. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to establish minimum requirements for early voting; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 958. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to save eligible voters from voter purging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 959. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 960. A bill to establish a commission to develop proposals regarding voting representation for citizens of the United States who reside in a territory, commonwealth, or Federal District of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; 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 Mrs. MURRAY:

S. Res. 128. A resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the National Parks Conservation Association; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. Res. 129. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 130. A resolution recognizing the significance of endometriosis as an unmet chronic disease for women and designating March 2019 as ''Endometriosis Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 131. A resolution designating April 2019 as ''National 9–1-1 Education Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 132. A resolution honoring the life of Ted Lindsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Con. Res. 10. A concurrent resolution recognizing that Chinese telecommunications companies such as Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 64

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 64, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor 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. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 386, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases.

S. 475

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 475, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent catastrophic out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

S. 476

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide greater transparency of discounts provided by drug manufacturers.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) 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. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 506

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) 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. 530

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 530, a bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 630

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 630, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 with respect to arbitration.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 703

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 703, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 703, supra.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 716, a bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, and for other purposes.

S. 778

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 834, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the national strategy for combating and eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

S. 867

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 867, a bill to protect students of institutions of higher education and the taxpayer investment in institutions of higher education by improving oversight and accountability of institutions of higher education, particularly for-profit colleges, improving protections for students and borrowers, and ensuring the integrity of postsecondary education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) 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. 894

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 919

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 919, a bill to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commercial space activities, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 30

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 30, a resolution condemning efforts to undermine democracy in Hungary and urging President Trump to defend the universal human rights and democratic norms under attack by the Orban government.

S. RES. 119

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 119, a resolution supporting the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 123

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 123, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 204 intended to be proposed to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 212

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 212 intended to be proposed to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that my colleague, Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN, will be joining me in introducing the Taxpayer First Act of 2019 later today. This legislation seeks to modernize the Internal Revenue Service, improve taxpayers' services, and strengthen taxpayer protections.

The package of IRS reforms we will introduce today is the culmination of years of work by both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. It is truly a bipartisan package that adopts provisions authored by committee members on both sides of the aisle of the House and the Senate.

Former Chairman Hatch of Utah deserves a lot of credit for working to reach a bipartisan, bicameral agreement at the end of the last Congress, which is reflected in the legislation we will be introducing this afternoon.

I know Senator Hatch put a lot of work into trying to get this legislation across the finish line last year. Unfortunately, it wasn't meant to be, due to both political realities and, maybe, time constraints—even more so.

However, his work helped us get to where we are today. In other words, we are advancing a great deal of what Senator Hatch worked on, and our hope is that it will allow us to move quickly this year and finally get these commonsense reforms of the Internal Revenue Service enacted into law.

Some of the IRS reforms in this legislation include establishing a truly independent Office of Appeals within the Internal Revenue Service. This will help ensure the playing field is not tilted against taxpayers when those taxpayers are in dispute with the Internal Revenue Service.

To help bring the Internal Revenue Service into the 21st century, the legislation also would require the IRS to submit to Congress a plan to redesign the structure of the Agency to improve efficiency, enhance cyber security, and better meet taxpayer needs.

It also includes a number of provisions to protect the taxpayers better from tax ID theft and improve taxpayer interaction with the IRS, should they become a victim of that crime. This includes creating a single point of contact in the IRS to help the taxpayers navigate the bureaucracy and resolve their issues as quickly as possible.

To provide taxpayers with better protection against becoming such a victim in the first place, the legislation will expand to all taxpayers an IRS program that currently allows victims—and only victims—of tax ID theft to obtain a personalized PIN that better secures the identity of any taxpayer who asks for it.

The legislation also puts in place new safeguards to protect taxpayers against recent IRS enforcement abuses of so-called structuring laws. On several occasions, the IRS used these laws to seize bank accounts of small business owners when no underlying criminal activity was present. This includes seizing $33,000 from a small business owner who operated a small restaurant in Arnolds Park, IA, for nearly 40 years. The IRS—on a whim, taking $33,000 from that small business—caused the business to close, and the owner did nothing wrong in the end. Provisions in our bill will help ensure these types of abuses never occur again.

I would also like to note the improvements to the IRS whistleblower program that are contained in the bill.

In 2006, I authored legislation establishing a mandatory Internal Revenue Service whistleblower program. Since it was established, the IRS whistleblower program has turned into one of the most effective programs addressing tax evasion, leading to the recovery of more than $5 billion in taxes that otherwise would have been lost to fraud.

Unfortunately, too many IRS whistleblowers continue to be treated like a skunk at a picnic. They often wait for years, and while they are waiting for years, it is in the dark, with no indication of whether the information they provided to the IRS would ever lead to a successful recovery or whether their reward is even being processed.

Moreover, they are often putting their careers on the line, exposing corporate tax shelters with no protection should their employer decide to retaliate.

Provisions in our bill will help to address these issues by authorizing the IRS to communicate with whistleblowers, in certain instances, while protecting taxpayer privacy.

What we are really saying is this: You ought to let these whistleblowers, who are patriotic people, trying to help the Federal Government collect money that wouldn't otherwise be collected—treat them like the patriotic citizens they are.

The bill would also extend anti-retaliation provisions to IRS whistleblowers that are presently afforded to whistleblowers under other whistleblower laws—the False Claims Act, which I authored in 1986, as well as the more recent Sarbanes-Oxley Act, which came out of another committee that I didn't serve on.

Finally, the bill includes modifications to the private debt collection program. I have long been a proponent of this program as a way to tackle the tax gap and to promote tax fairness. It works by assigning certain tax debts, which the IRS otherwise would not attempt to collect, to an outside contractor to pursue.

In other words, if the IRS isn't going to go after all the money that is owed to the taxpayers—and we don't want $1 more than what people owe, but we want every dollar that people do owe—if they aren't going to go after it, we ought to find some way to go after it. That is why we have outside contractors pursuing some of these issues that the IRS isn't going to pursue.

Recent quarterly revenue reports demonstrate the program has the potential to bring in hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue on an annual basis.

I understand some of my colleagues, particularly on the House Ways and Means Committee, have been concerned that the program has been too heavily focused on lower income taxpayers. We listened to these concerns, and we worked to develop a sensible compromise while yet strengthening the long-term viability of this program.

These are just a few of the provisions in this bill. There are many others that will go a long way toward making the IRS work better for taxpayers.

I also know that some of my colleagues have additional ideas that we were unable to include in this package. I want them to know that I see this legislation as a first step toward reforming the IRS and strengthening taxpayers' protections.

I agree there is more that we can do. I am committed to evaluating additional proposals with input from all of our colleagues on reforms that could be included in a package of additional IRS reforms later this Congress.

But first things first. Companion legislation is being introduced in the House, which I hope the Senate will receive in the near future.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me and Ranking Member WYDEN in supporting this bipartisan bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 923. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individuals and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the ''Fighting Homelessness with Services and Housing Act.'' This bill would help address our Nation's current homelessness crisis by establishing a new Federal grant program to increase support for comprehensive services paired with housing.

As we have seen with the growing diversity of our homeless populations—families with children, veterans, individuals with mental health conditions, people who simply could not keep up with increases in rent—our Nation's homelessness crisis is not going to resolve itself on its own.

According to the most recent data available from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, there are more than 552,000 homeless individuals and families in the United States. Nearly 25 percent of this population is in California, with approximately 129,972 homeless people sleeping on the streets on any given night.

In a Nation as prosperous as ours, we can and we must do better. Our city, county, state, and Federal governments must work hand-in-hand with the non-profit and private sectors to establish collaborative efforts to significantly address the issue of homelessness.

The good news is that we have seen a model that works: supportive housing can truly stabilize an individual or family and change their life. Supportive services such as mental and physical health care, substance abuse treatment, education and job training, and life skills such as financial literacy are critical components. Paired with intensive case management, supportive housing models make a difference.

One success story is the Downtown Women's Center in Los Angeles. This shelter allows homeless and formerly homeless women to transform their lives through a combination of permanent, supportive housing and workforce development. This would not be possible without the Center's partnerships with the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Department of Health, and other critical stakeholders. I've visited the Center, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same to see why this model works.

It will take a significant investment to solve the current homelessness crisis. The ''Fighting Homelessness with Services and Housing Act'' authorizes a new Federal funding grant program of $750 million per year, subject to annual appropriations. Grantees must serve individuals or families who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless by providing housing paired with a comprehensive set of services, and they must provide a 25 percent match for any Federal funds received.

Because each individual and every community is unique, the grant program created by this bill would be flexible in order to work in any region or for any homeless population. This bill supports the great work already being done across the country, allowing local governmental entities and non-profit organizations to expand their capacity and ensure a greater reach by putting Federal dollars where they will make the most effective impact.

This bipartisan legislation is supported by a wide coalition of local government, housing, health, and child welfare organizations, including the Child Welfare League of America, Children's Defense Fund, Corporation for Supportive Housing, Mayors and CEOS for U.S. Housing Investment, National Alliance to End Homelessness, National Association of Counties, National Education Association, National League of Cities, National Low Income Housing Coalition, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, and Treatment Communities of America.

I particularly want to thank Senator MURKOWSKI for working with me on this important issue. I hope our colleagues will join us in cosponsoring the bill and moving it through the Senate. Thank you Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 959. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act. This bill would establish an American women's history museum in our Nation's Capital.

American women have made invaluable contributions to our country in every field, such as government, business, medicine, law, literature, sports, entertainment, the arts, and the military. Telling the history of American women matters, and a museum recognizing these achievements and experiences is long overdue.

In 1999, a Presidential commission on commemorating women in American history concluded that an ''appropriate celebration of women's history in the next millennium should include the designation of a focal point for women's history in our Nation's capital.'' In 2014, Congress took an important step toward realizing this goal when it passed legislation creating an independent, bipartisan commission to study the potential for establishing such a museum in Washington, DC. Following 18 months of study, the bipartisan commission unanimously concluded, ''America needs and deserves a physical national museum dedicated to showcasing the historical experiences and impact of women in the country.'' I could not agree more.

The bill we are introducing takes the next step toward creating this national museum. Incorporating the recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, the bill would establish a national museum to collect, study, and create programs incorporating and exhibiting a wide spectrum of American women's experiences, contributions, and history. The Smithsonian Institution would be the governing body, ensuring that this museum is free and open to all who visit Washington, DC. Following the Commission's recommendation, the Smithsonian has begun an American Women's History Initiative to increase its research and programming related to American women, past and present.

Mr. President, this year we commemorate the 100th anniversary of American women's suffrage and the decades-long fight for women's equality at the ballot box. The story, leaders, and lessons of women's suffrage are among the most powerful in our nation's history. Amid celebrations of that historic moment, I can think of few better ways to honor those women and that momentous achievement than by passing this legislation. A museum dedicated to women's history would help ensure that future generations understand what we owe to those American women who have helped build, sustain, and advance our society.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 128—COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mrs. MURRAY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 128

Whereas on May 19, 1919, a group of scientists, artists, and civic leaders met in Washington, District of Columbia, and founded the National Parks Association, now known as the National Parks Conservation Association;

Whereas Robert Sterling Yard, founder of the National Parks Conservation Association and first Chief of Education of the National Park Service, led a 6-member committee to develop the articles of incorporation for the National Parks Conservation Association ''to further the view of national parks as classrooms and museums of nature'';

Whereas the National Parks Conservation Association has grown from 1 staff member to a community of organizers, policy experts, attorneys, communications professionals, and more than 1,300,000 members and supporters, all dedicated—

(1) to advocating for parks in the United States; and

(2) to inspiring future generations to be good stewards of public spaces;

Whereas the mission of the National Parks Conservation Association, ''protecting and enhancing America's National Park System for present and future generations'', is as relevant in 2019 as the mission was in 1919;

Whereas, a century after being established, the National Parks Conservation Association—

(1) continues to act as a passionate and outspoken defender of the national parks of the United States; and

(2) represents people from different backgrounds coming together to fulfill a unique mandate to steward publicly shared land, independent of government and private business;

Whereas the founders of the National Parks Conservation Association envisioned national parks as incredible places deserving of protection and preservation for all people;

Whereas the National Parks Conservation Association is dedicated to ensuring that all people can share in that vision, regardless of gender, race, or religious belief; and

Whereas the National Parks Conservation Association plays a vital role in protecting places of unparalleled natural wonder, historical significance, and cultural value within the National Park System: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Parks Conservation Association;

(2) recognizes the National Parks Conservation Association for 100 years of protecting and enhancing the National Park System for present and future generations;

(3) applauds the past, present, and future efforts of the National Parks Conservation Association to advocate for the National Park System; and

(4) wishes the National Parks Conservation Association continued success during the next 100 years as the National Parks Conservation Association strives to engage and inspire the public to advance the mission of the National Park System.

SENATE RESOLUTION 129—HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGACY OF CÉSAR ESTRADA CHÁVEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 129

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez spent his early years on a family farm;

Whereas, at the age of 10, César Estrada Chávez joined the thousands of migrant farm workers laboring in fields and vineyards throughout the Southwest after a bank foreclosure resulted in the loss of the family farm;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez, after attending more than 30 elementary and middle schools and achieving an eighth grade education, left school to work full-time as a farm worker to help support his family;

Whereas, at the age of 17, César Estrada Chávez entered the United States Navy and served the United States with distinction for 2 years;

Whereas, in 1948, César Estrada Chávez returned from military service to marry Helen Fabela, whom he had met while working in the vineyards of central California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez and Helen Fabela had 8 children;

Whereas, as early as 1949, César Estrada Chávez was committed to organizing farm workers to campaign for safe and fair working conditions, reasonable wages, livable housing, and the outlawing of child labor;

Whereas, in 1952, César Estrada Chávez joined the Community Service Organization, a prominent Latino civil rights group, and worked with the organization to coordinate voter registration drives and conduct campaigns against discrimination in East Los Angeles;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez served as the national director of the Community Service Organization;

Whereas, in 1962, César Estrada Chávez left the Community Service Organization to establish the National Farm Workers Association, which eventually became the United Farm Workers of America;

Whereas, under the leadership of César Estrada Chávez, the United Farm Workers of America organized thousands of migrant farm workers to fight for fair wages, health care coverage, pension benefits, livable housing, and respect;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was a strong believer in the principles of nonviolence practiced by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez effectively used peaceful tactics that included fasting for 25 days in 1968, 25 days in 1972, and 38 days in 1988 to call attention to the terrible working and living conditions of farm workers in the United States;

Whereas, through his commitment to nonviolence, César Estrada Chávez brought dignity and respect to the organized farm workers and became an inspiration to and a resource for individuals engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world;

Whereas the influence of César Estrada Chávez extends far beyond agriculture and

provides inspiration for individuals working to better human rights, empower workers, and advance the American Dream, which includes all individuals of the United States;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez died on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66 in San Luis, Arizona, only miles from his birthplace;

Whereas more than 50,000 people attended the funeral services of César Estrada Chávez in Delano, California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was laid to rest at the headquarters of the United Farm Workers of America, known as ''Nuestra Señora de La Paz'', located in the Tehachapi Mountains in Keene, California;

Whereas, since the death of César Estrada Chávez, schools, parks, streets, libraries, and other public facilities, as well as awards and scholarships, have been named in his honor;

Whereas more than 10 States and dozens of communities across the United States honor the life and legacy of César Estrada Chávez each year on March 31;

Whereas March 31 is recognized as an official State holiday in California, Colorado, and Texas, and there is growing support to designate the birthday of César Estrada Chávez as a national day of service to memorialize his heroism;

Whereas, during his lifetime, César Estrada Chávez was a recipient of the Martin Luther King Jr. Peace Prize;

Whereas, on August 8, 1994, César Estrada Chávez was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas, on October 8, 2012, President Barack Obama authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a César Estrada Chávez National Monument in Keene, California;

Whereas President Barack Obama was the last President to honor the life and service of César Estrada Chávez by proclaiming March 31, 2016, to be ''César Chávez Day'' and by asking all people of the United States to observe March 31 with service, community, and education programs to honor the enduring legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

Whereas the United States should continue the efforts of César Estrada Chávez to ensure equality, justice, and dignity for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments and example of César Estrada Chávez, a great hero of the United States;

(2) pledges to promote the legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of César Estrada Chávez and to always remember his great rallying cry, ''¡Sí, se puede!'', which is Spanish for ''Yes, we can!''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 130—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ENDOMETRIOSIS AS AN UNMET CHRONIC DISEASE FOR WOMEN AND DESIGNATING MARCH 2019 AS ''ENDOMETRIOSIS AWARENESS MONTH''

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 130

Whereas 6,500,000 women in the United States are living with endometriosis;

Whereas endometriosis is a chronic disease affecting—

(1) 176,000,000 women throughout the world; and

(2) an estimated 1 in 10 women in the United States between the ages of 18 and 49;

Whereas medical societies and patient groups have expressed the need for greater public attention and updated resources targeted to public education about this unmet health need for women;

Whereas endometriosis occurs when tissue similar to that normally found in the uterus begins to grow outside the uterus;

Whereas, although endometriosis is one of the most common gynecological disorders in the United States, there is a lack of awareness and prioritization of endometriosis as an important health issue for women;

Whereas women can suffer for up to 10 years before being properly diagnosed;

Whereas approximately ⅓ to ½ of all women with endometriosis will have difficulty getting pregnant;

Whereas endometriosis is a painful and debilitating disorder;

Whereas endometriosis is associated with increased health care costs and poses a substantial burden to patients in the health care system;

Whereas the total annual direct health care cost of symptoms associated with endometriosis is $56,000,000,000, or nearly $11,000 per patient;

Whereas 51 percent of endometriosis patients report that the disease detrimentally affects their performance of their job;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that the average number of ''bed days'' for patients with endometriosis was 18 days per year;

Whereas women with endometriosis can lose 11 hours per work week through lost productivity;

Whereas, in 2010, endometriosis patients were hospitalized over 100,000 days because of the disease;

Whereas there is a need for more research and updated guidelines to treat endometriosis;

Whereas the research dollars from the National Institutes of Health dedicated to endometriosis has dropped from $16,000,000 in 2010 to $6,000,000 in 2019;

Whereas there is an ongoing need for additional clinical research and treatment options to manage this debilitating disease; and

Whereas there is no known cure for endometriosis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2019 as ''Endometriosis Awareness Month'';

(2) recognizes the importance of endometriosis as a health issue for women that requires far greater attention, public awareness, and education about the disease;

(3) encourages the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(A) to provide information to women, patients, and health care providers with respect to endometriosis, including available screening tools and treatment options, with a goal of improving the quality of life and health outcomes of women affected by endometriosis;

(B) to conduct additional research on endometriosis and possible clinical options; and

(C) to update information, tools, and studies currently available with respect to helping women live with endometriosis; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION 131—DESIGNATING APRIL 2019 AS ''NATIONAL 9–1–1 EDUCATION MONTH''

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 131

Whereas 9–1–1 is recognized throughout the United States as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from law enforcement agencies, fire services, emergency medical services, and other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a ''single number should be established'' nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and various Federal Government agencies and governmental officials supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas, in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (commonly known as ''AT&T'') announced that it would establish the digits 9–1–1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas Congress designated 9–1–1 as the national emergency call number in the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (47 U.S.C. 615 et seq.);

Whereas section 102 of the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (47 U.S.C. 942 note) declared an enhanced 9–1–1 system to be ''a high national priority'' and part of ''our Nation's homeland security and public safety'';

Whereas it is important that policymakers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9–1–1, how the 9–1–1 system works, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9–1–1 system;

Whereas the 9–1–1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the United States and is often the first place emergencies of all magnitudes are reported, making 9–1–1 a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas nearly 6,000 9–1–1 public safety answering points serve more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas telecommunicators at public safety answering points answer more than 200,000,000 9–1–1 calls each year in the United States;

Whereas a growing number of 9–1–1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population of the United States, including individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing or who suffer from speech or language disorders, autism spectrum disorder, cerebral palsy, or anxiety, is increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services and expects those services to be able to connect directly to 9–1–1;

Whereas Next Generation 9–1–1 promises enhanced accessibility, interoperability, flexibility, and features, as well as network resiliency and reliability;

Whereas the growth in usage and diversification of means of communication to 9–1–1 services, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose unique challenges for accessing 9–1–1 and, thus, require increased education and awareness about the emergency communications capabilities of these different methods of communication;

Whereas numerous other ''N–1–1'' and 800 number services exist for nonemergency situations, including 2–1–1, 3–1–1, 5–1–1, 7–1–1, 8–1–1, poison control centers, and mental

health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use those services in addition to or instead of 9–1–1;

Whereas international visitors and immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the population of the United States each year, and visitors and immigrants may have limited knowledge of the emergency calling system in the United States;

Whereas people of all ages use 9–1–1, and it is critical to educate people on the proper use of 9–1–1;

Whereas senior citizens are highly likely to need to access 9–1–1, and many senior citizens are learning to use new technology;

Whereas thousands of 9–1–1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9–1–1, which saves lives and underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9–1–1;

Whereas the 9–1–1 system is often misused, including by the placement of prank and nonemergency calls;

Whereas misuse of the 9–1–1 system results in costly and inefficient use of 9–1–1 and emergency response resources and needs to be reduced;

Whereas parents, teachers, and all other caregivers need to play an active role in 9–1–1 education for children, but can do so only after first being educated themselves;

Whereas there are many avenues for 9–1–1 public education, including safety fairs, school presentations, libraries, churches, businesses, public safety answering point tours or open houses, civic organizations, and senior citizen centers;

Whereas children, parents, teachers, and the National Parent Teacher Association make vital contributions to the education of children about the importance of 9–1–1 through targeted outreach efforts to public and private school systems;

Whereas the United States Government should strive to host at least 1 educational event regarding the proper use of 9–1–1 in every school in the country each year;

Whereas programs to promote proper use of 9–1–1 during National 9–1–1 Education Month could include—

(1) public awareness events, including conferences, media outreach, and training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, other caregivers, and businesses;

(2) educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and

(3) production and distribution of information about the 9–1–1 system designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9–1–1; and

Whereas the people of the United States deserve the best education regarding the use of 9–1–1: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2019 as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''; and

(2) urges governmental officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, caregivers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 132—HONORING THE LIFE OF TED LINDSAY

Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 132

Whereas Robert Blake Theodore Lindsay (referred to in this preamble as ''Ted Lindsay'') was born in Renfrew, Ontario, Canada, on July 29, 1925, and was a professional hockey player known for his love of the sport and defense of players' rights;

Whereas, in 1917, the father of Ted Lindsay, Leslie ''Bert'' Lindsay, was one of the first players in the National Hockey League (in this preamble referred to as the ''NHL'') and was the first NHL goalie in the history of the league to record a win;

Whereas Ted Lindsay entered the NHL in 1944 at 19 years of age when he joined the Detroit Red Wings;

Whereas Ted Lindsay was known as a fierce competitor who earned the nicknames ''Terrible Ted'' and ''Old Scarface'' for his toughness;

Whereas the NHL developed 2 penalties, elbowing and kneeing, because of his physical play;

Whereas Ted Lindsay played left wing on the ''Production Line'' alongside Gordie Howe and Sid Abel, the most productive offensive scoring unit in the NHL from the late 1940s through the mid-1950s;

Whereas Ted Lindsay played 14 seasons with the Detroit Red Wings and led the team to 4 Stanley Cup championships;

Whereas, in 1950, Ted Lindsay started one of the most beloved traditions in the NHL by lifting the Stanley Cup over his head and skating around the rink after winning the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas Ted Lindsay led an effort to organize the first National Hockey League Players' Association;

Whereas the Detroit Red Wings stripped Ted Lindsay of his captaincy and traded Ted Lindsay to the struggling Chicago Black Hawks in retribution for his actions to unionize NHL players;

Whereas Ted Lindsay played 3 seasons with the Chicago Blackhawks and helped the team to the playoffs;

Whereas, in 1964, at 39 years of age, Ted Lindsay rejoined the Detroit Red Wings at the behest of his former teammate, Detroit Red Wings Coach Sid Abel;

Whereas, in 1966, Ted Lindsay was inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame, but refused to attend the men-only ceremony without his wife and children, leading to a rules change the following year;

Whereas, in 1977, the Detroit Red Wings named Ted Lindsay as general manager, and Ted Lindsay led the team to the playoffs for the first time in 9 years and to a playoff series win for the first time in 12 years;

Whereas Ted Lindsay appeared in 11 NHL All-Star games during 17 seasons in the NHL and recorded 379 goals and 472 assists for 851 points, making him the highest-scoring left wing at the time.

Whereas Ted Lindsay generously devoted his time to charity, driving across Michigan and Ontario to offer advice and encouragement to young hockey players;

Whereas Ted Lindsay started the Ted Lindsay Foundation, which has raised millions of dollars toward finding a cure for autism;

Whereas, in December 2018, the Ted Lindsay Foundation pledged $1,000,000 to support the autism outreach efforts of Oakland University;

Whereas Ted Lindsay was preceded in death by his wife of 27 years, Joanne Lindsay, who died in 2017;

Whereas, on March 4, 2019, Ted Lindsay died at 93 years of age, after a long career in professional hockey that inspired millions of people; and

Whereas Ted Lindsay is survived by his 3 children, 1 stepdaughter, and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and by hockey fans across the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and legacy of Ted Lindsay for his significant contributions to the sport of hockey, the city of Detroit, and the State of Michigan;

(2) expresses its deepest sympathies and condolences to the family of Ted Lindsay upon his passing; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Ted Lindsay.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10—RECOGNIZING THAT CHINESE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES SUCH AS HUAWEI AND ZTE POSE SERIOUS THREATS TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES

Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas fifth generation (5G) wireless technology promises greater speed and capacity and will provide the backbone for the next generation of digital technologies;

Whereas fifth generation wireless technology will be a revolutionary advancement in telecommunications with the potential to create millions of jobs and billions of dollars in economic opportunity;

Whereas Chinese companies, including Huawei, have invested substantial resources in advancing fifth generation wireless technology and other telecommunications services around the globe, including subsidies provided directly by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas Chinese officials have increased leadership roles at the International Telecommunications Union, where international telecommunications standards are set, and companies such as Huawei have increased their influence at the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), whose work informs global technology standards;

Whereas Huawei and ZTE have aggressively sought to enter into contracts throughout the developing world, including throughout Latin America and Africa in countries such as Venezuela and Kenya;

Whereas, in 2012, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives released a bipartisan report naming Huawei and ZTE as national security threats;

Whereas, in 2013, the United States restricted Federal procurement of certain products produced by Huawei and ZTE and has since expanded restrictions on Federal procurement of those products;

Whereas, in 2016, the national legislature of the People's Republic of China passed the Cyber Security Law of the People's Republic of China, article 28 of which requires ''network operators,'' including companies like Huawei, to ''provide technical support and assistance'' to Chinese authorities involved in national security efforts;

Whereas, in 2017, the national legislature of the People's Republic of China passed the National Intelligence Law of the People's Republic of China, article 7 of which requires ''all organizations and citizens''—including companies like Huawei and ZTE—to ''support, assist, and cooperate with national intelligence efforts'' undertaken by the People's Republic of China;

Whereas, in August 2018, the Government of Australia banned Huawei and ZTE from building the fifth generation wireless networks of Australia;

Whereas, in August 2018, Congress restricted the heads of Federal agencies from

procuring certain covered telecommunications equipment and services, which included Huawei and ZTE equipment;

Whereas, in December 2018, the Government of Japan issued instructions effectively banning Huawei and ZTE from official contracts in the country;

Whereas, on December 7, 2018, a Vice-President of the European Commission expressed concern that Huawei and other Chinese companies may be forced to cooperate with China's intelligence services to install ''mandatory backdoors'' to allow access to encrypted data;

Whereas, in January 2019, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence issued a Worldwide Threat Assessment that describes concerns ''about the potential for Chinese intelligence and security services to use Chinese information technology firms as routine and systemic espionage platforms against the United States and allies'';

Whereas, in February 2019, the Government of New Zealand expressed serious concern about Huawei building the fifth generation wireless networks of New Zealand;

Whereas the Department of Justice has charged Huawei with the theft of trade secrets, obstruction of justice, and other serious crimes;

Whereas, against the strong advice of the United States and a number of the security partners of the United States, the governments of countries such as Germany have indicated that they may permit Huawei to build out the fifth generation wireless networks of those countries;

Whereas installation of Huawei equipment in the communications infrastructure of countries that are allies of the United States would jeopardize the security of communication lines between the United States and those allies;

Whereas secure communications systems are critical to ensure the safety and defense of the United States and allies of the United States;

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other vital international security arrangements depend on strong and secure communications, which could be put at risk through the use of Huawei and ZTE equipment; and

Whereas there has been broad bipartisan consensus in Congress for years that Chinese companies like Huawei and ZTE present serious threats to national and global security: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Chinese telecommunications companies such as Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and allies of the United States;

(2) the United States should reiterate to countries that are choosing to incorporate Huawei or ZTE products in their new telecommunications infrastructure that the United States will consider all necessary measures to limit the risks incurred by entities of the United States Government or Armed Forces from use of such compromised networks;

(3) the United States should continue to make allies of the United States aware of the ongoing and future risks to telecommunications networks shared between the United States and such allies; and

(4) the United States should work with the private sector and allies and partners of the United States, including the European Union, in a regularized bilateral or multilateral format, to identify secure, cost-effective, and reliable alternatives to Huawei or ZTE products.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 213. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

SA 214. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 213 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra.

SA 215. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 268, supra.

SA 216. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 215 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 268, supra.

SA 217. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 218. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 219. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 220. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 221. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 222. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 223. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 224. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 225. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 69, designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day''.

SA 226. Mr. SCOTT, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 227. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 228. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 213. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

''This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.''

SA 214. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 213 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

SA 215. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

SA 216. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 215 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

SA 217. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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. ____. BUDGETING FOR DISASTERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Budgeting for Disasters Act''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply with respect to fiscal year 2021, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FOR DISASTER SPENDING FROM THE ANNUAL BUDGET CAPS.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (f)(2)(A), by striking '', including a final estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding''.

(2) The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992 (Public Law 102–154; 105 Stat. 990) is amended—

(A) in title I in the matter under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'' under the heading ''EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FIREFIGHTING FUND'' (43 U.S.C. 1474a), by striking '': *Provided further*'' and all that follows and inserting a period; and

(B) in title II in the matter under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'' under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' under the heading ''EMERGENCY FOREST SERVICE FIREFIGHTING FUND'' (16 U.S.C. 556e) by striking '': *Provided further*'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(3) Section 430(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189h(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (H).

(4) The matter under the heading ''DISASTER RELIEF'' under the heading ''FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY'' under chapter II of title I of the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Transfers for Relief From the Effects of Natural Disasters, for Other Urgent Needs, and for Incremental Cost of ''Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm'' Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 5302) is amended by striking '': *Provided further*,'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(5) Section 2602(e) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621(e)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(6) Section 104(a) of the Wildfire Suppression Funding and Forest Management Activities Act (43 U.S.C. 17648a–2(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''section 251(b)(2)(F)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(F)(i)), as added by section 102 of this division'' and inserting ''section 251(b)(2)(E)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(E)(i))''.

SA 218. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 title III and insert the following:

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $59,629,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $7,323,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $200,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $400,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $342,012,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $738,290,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, for necessary expenses for Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (FSRM) related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $3,505,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $46,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $84,587,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $66,656,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $1,072,000, for necessary expenses for Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (FSRM) related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SA 219. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 8, beginning on line 12, strike ''Cindy'' and all that follows through ''cold'' on line 14 and insert ''Cindy, losses of peach and blueberry crops in calendar year 2017 due to extreme cold, blueberry productivity losses in calendar year 2018 as a result of extreme cold and hurricane damage in calendar year 2017, and losses of milk and aquacultured plants and animals''.

SA 220. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 3, line 20, strike ''occurring in calendar years 2018 and 2019'' and insert ''occurring during the period beginning on January 1, 2018, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act''.

SA 221. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 3, line 16, strike ''milk'' and insert ''aquacultured plants and animals, milk,''.

SA 222. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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:

In title III, under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'' strike ''$200,000,000'' and insert ''$381,000,000''.

In title III, under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' strike ''$400,000,000'' and insert ''$550,000,000''.

SA 223. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 in title XI of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 11____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division for the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Homeland Security, or the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to plan, develop, or construct a new physical barrier along the Southwestern border of the United States.

SA 224. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 in title XI of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 11____. Notwithstanding section 201 of the National Emergencies Act of 1976 (50 U.S.C. 1621), section 284 or 2808 of title 10, United States Code, section 923 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2293), or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division or prior to the date of the enactment of this Act may be used for the construction of barriers, land acquisition, or any other associated activities on the Southern border of the United States without specific statutory authorization from Congress.

SA 225. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 69, designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day''; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of Vietnam from 1955 to 1975 and involved regular forces from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Viet Cong guerrilla forces in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, the armed forces of allies of the United States, and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct support by the Armed Forces to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to defend against the growing threat of Communism from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces of the United States began serving in an advisory role to the Government of South Vietnam in 1955;

Whereas, as a result of the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88–408) by an overwhelming majority on August 7, 1964, which provided to the President of the United States the authority to use armed force to assist the Republic of Vietnam in the defense of its freedom against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, ground combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join approximately 23,000 personnel of the Armed Forces who were already present there;

Whereas, by December 1965, approximately 184,000 troops of the Armed Forces of the United States were in Vietnam, and by 1969, the number of such troops reached a peak of approximately 549,500, including members of the Armed Forces who were supporting the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Japan, the Philippines, and aboard Navy vessels;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet-Nam (commonly known as the ''Paris Peace Accords'') was signed, which required the release of all prisoners-of-war of the United States held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all Armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 29, 1973, the Armed Forces of the United States completed the withdrawal of combat units and combat support units from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas more than 58,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States lost their lives in the Vietnam War, and more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States were wounded in Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall was dedicated in the District of Columbia to commemorate the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died or were declared missing-in-action in Vietnam;

Whereas the Vietnam War was an extremely divisive issue among the people of the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the public of the United States to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of those veterans;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were often wrongly criticized for the decisions of policymakers that were beyond the control of those members; and

Whereas designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day'' would be an appropriate way to honor the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in South Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War: Now, therefore, be it

---

SA 226. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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 3, line 16, strike ''milk'' and insert ''milk, timber,''.

SA 227. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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. ____. DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Trafalgar Road Fire in Bella Vista, Arkansas shall be deemed to be an emergency under section title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5191 et seq.).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on August 1, 2018.

SA 228. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY 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:

NO USE OF FUNDS FOR LITIGATION IN TEXAS V. UNITED STATES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act, or any other Act, may be used by the Department of Justice for the cost of litigation in opposition to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) in Texas v. United States, No. 4:18–cv–00167–O (N.D. Tex.).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Department of Energy's Atomic energy defense program.''

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to

conduct a hearing on the nomination of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining the Federal response to the risks associated with per and ployfluoralkyl substances.''

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, James Wesley Hendrix, and Mark T. Pittman, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Sean D. Jordan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Wing Chau, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island, and Ramona L. Dohman, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Owen Gomory from my office be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois (At Large) and the Honorable JOE MANCHIN III of West Virginia (Committee on Appropriations).

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 276 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 276) to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H. R. 276) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 69.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 69) designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day.''

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Burr amendment to the preamble at the desk be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 225) was agreed to as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of Vietnam from 1955 to 1975 and involved regular forces from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Viet Cong guerrilla forces in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, the armed forces of allies of the United States, and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct support by the Armed Forces to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to defend against the growing threat of Communism from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces of the United States began serving in an advisory role to the Government of South Vietnam in 1955;

Whereas, as a result of the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88–408) by an overwhelming majority on August 7, 1964, which provided to the President of the United States the authority to use armed force to assist the Republic of Vietnam in the defense of its freedom against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, ground combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join approximately 23,000 personnel of the Armed Forces who were already present there;

Whereas, by December 1965, approximately 184,000 troops of the Armed Forces of the United States were in Vietnam, and by 1969, the number of such troops reached a peak of approximately 549,500, including members of the Armed Forces who were supporting the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Japan, the Philippines, and aboard Navy vessels;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet-Nam (commonly known as the ''Paris Peace Accords'') was signed, which required the release of all prisoners-of-war of the United States held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all Armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 29, 1973, the Armed Forces of the United States completed the withdrawal of combat units and combat support units from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas more than 58,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States lost their lives in the Vietnam War, and more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States were wounded in Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall was dedicated in the District of Columbia to commemorate the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died or were declared missing-in-action in Vietnam;

Whereas the Vietnam War was an extremely divisive issue among the people of the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the public of the United States to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of those veterans;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were often wrongly criticized for the decisions of policymakers that were beyond the control of those members; and

Whereas designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day'' would be an appropriate way to honor the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in South Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

S. RES. 69

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of Vietnam from 1955 to 1975 and involved regular forces from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Viet Cong guerrilla forces in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, the armed forces of allies of the United States, and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct support by the Armed Forces to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to defend against the growing threat of Communism from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces of the United States began serving in an advisory role to the Government of South Vietnam in 1955;

Whereas, as a result of the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88–408) by an overwhelming majority on August 7, 1964, which provided to

the President of the United States the authority to use armed force to assist the Republic of Vietnam in the defense of its freedom against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, ground combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join approximately 23,000 personnel of the Armed Forces who were already present there;

Whereas, by December 1965, approximately 184,000 troops of the Armed Forces of the United States were in Vietnam, and by 1969, the number of such troops reached a peak of approximately 549,500, including members of the Armed Forces who were supporting the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Japan, the Philippines, and aboard Navy vessels;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet-Nam (commonly known as the ''Paris Peace Accords'') was signed, which required the release of all prisoners-of-war of the United States held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all Armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 29, 1973, the Armed Forces of the United States completed the withdrawal of combat units and combat support units from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas more than 58,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States lost their lives in the Vietnam War, and more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States were wounded in Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall was dedicated in the District of Columbia to commemorate the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died or were declared missing-in-action in Vietnam;

Whereas the Vietnam War was an extremely divisive issue among the people of the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the public of the United States to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of those veterans;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were often wrongly criticized for the decisions of policymakers that were beyond the control of those members; and

Whereas designating March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day'' would be an appropriate way to honor the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in South Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day'';

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of the veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in Vietnam during war and during peace;

(3) encourages States and local governments to designate March 29, 2019, as ''Vietnam Veterans Day''; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe Vietnam Veterans Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that—

(A) provide the appreciation that veterans of the Vietnam War deserve;

(B) demonstrate the resolve that the people of the United States shall never forget the sacrifices and service of a generation of veterans who served in the Vietnam War;

(C) promote awareness of the faithful service and contributions of the veterans of the Vietnam War—

(i) during service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(ii) to the communities of the veterans since returning home;

(D) promote awareness of the importance of entire communities empowering veterans and the families of veterans in helping the veterans readjust to civilian life after service in the Armed Forces; and

(E) promote opportunities for veterans of the Vietnam War—

(i) to assist younger veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in rehabilitation from wounds, both seen and unseen; and

(ii) to support the reintegration of younger veterans into civilian life.

RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 100) recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize two remarkable female leaders of the Mohegan and Mashantucket Pequot Tribes in honor of National Women's History Month. Both Tribes have reservations in the State of Connecticut and are an integral part of our community. The women I recognize today represent so many other Native American women who were strong in conviction, fearless in leadership, and dedicated to preserving their Tribal identity.

Dr. Gladys Iola Tantaquidgeon was a Mohegan Medicine Woman born in 1899. After learning tribal spirituality and herbalism from her ''grandmothers,'' Dr. Tantaquidgeon studied at the University of Pennsylvania, writing in the field of anthropology and working with noted anthropologist Frank Speck. She researched herbal medicine among related east coast Tribes in order to broaden her Mohegan pharmacopeia. For her impressive academic achievements, Dr. Tantaquidgeon received honorary doctorates from the University of Connecticut and Yale University. She was also inducted into the Connecticut Women's Hall of Fame and received the National Organization for Women's Harriet Tubman Award, the Connecticut Education Association's Friend of Education Award, and numerous Native American honors.

Her contributions extended beyond academia. In 1931, she, her brother Harold and their father, John, founded the Tantaquidgeon Indian Museum in Uncasville, CT, using education to help remedy prejudice. Then in 1934, John Collier, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, recruited Dr. Tantaquidgeon to serve as a community worker on the Yankton Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. For 9 years, she served as a specialist for the newly formed Federal Indian Arts and Crafts Board to promote Indian art, encouraging the restoration of critically important ancient practices the Federal Government had prohibited at that time.

Dr. Tantaquidgeon used her strong sense of social justice to support women in difficult situations by working as the Niantic Women's Prison librarian in the 1940s. She continued her life of service to others when her personal records of correspondence about Mohegan births, graduations, marriages, and deaths played a pivotal role in gaining Federal Recognition for the Mohegans in 1994.

Throughout her amazing 106 years of life, she led the way for women, especially women of color, to seize new opportunities and for everyone to engage in a greater level of discussion and education about Native American history and culture. Her legacy will leave a positive academic and social impact for years to come.

The other exceptional woman I wish to remember today is Martha Ann ''Matt'' Langevin, a Mashantucket Pequot Indian. Born in 1901, she spent her entire life in Mashantucket and dedicated her years to researching traditional medicinal uses for indigenous plants and herbs.

Ms. Langevin strongly advocated for the preservation of the Mashantucket Pequot land, culture, and way of life. She stood at the forefront of efforts to defend the Tribe's lands whenever State or local government officials tried to take them away. Her readiness to protect her community demonstrates Ms. Langevin's indomitable determination.

She was also an incredibly thoughtful, loving friend to many. With three siblings and seven half-siblings, Ms. Langevin was considered a beloved aunt by her nieces and nephews, as well as by other Pequot children who stayed with her when their parents left to find work. She took excellent care of the children.

Much of Ms. Langevin's life focused on gardening, preserving food, and watching over her ancestral lands. One of her most important undertakings was her constant work to preserve Pequot traditions and land, a task she took up with great passion and conviction. An inductee into the Connecticut Women's Hall of Fame, Ms. Langevin will be remembered for her compassion and zeal for continuing traditions and looking after the people and the lands she loved.

I applaud both of these women's immense accomplishments, and I hope my

colleagues will join me in recognizing Dr. Tantaquidgeon and Ms. Langevin as we celebrate National Women's History Month.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 7, 2019, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MILITARY RETIREE APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 118 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 118) recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as ''Military Retiree Appreciation Day'', and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 118) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 14, 2019, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONDEMNING THE MARCH 15, 2019, TERRORIST ATTACKS IN CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res 124 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 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.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 27, 2019, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments with respect to the cloture motions filed during today's session relating to H.R. 268 be at 4 p.m., Monday, April 1, 2019.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

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

VOTER SUPPRESSION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three. We all know them: ''We the people,'' written in supersize font so we don't forget what our Constitution is all about—government, as Lincoln put it, of, by, and for the people, or, as Jefferson put it, government designed to produce laws that reflect the will of the people.

We don't see that now. We don't have a government of, by, and for the people. Instead, we have a system that has been profoundly corrupted. It has been corrupted by gerrymandering. It has been corrupted by voter suppression and intimidation. It has been corrupted by dark and dirty money that has flooded our campaigns and wiped out the voice of millions of Americans. That is where we are now in this corrupted state.

We have debates on the floor that are all about helping a small group of people within a circle of power and privilege rather than having bills that help the citizens of the United States of America. In fact, we have a President who just this week said his goal was to tear down healthcare for 30 million Americans, to wipe out the expansion of Medicaid, to wipe out the tax credits that assist so many Americans with being able to afford insurance, to wipe out the protection to be able to get healthcare if you have a preexisting condition, and to wipe out the ability of your children to be on your policy until the age of 26. That is government by and for this very little circle of privilege and power instead of the people of the United States of America. We saw it in other ways too.

In 2017, we saw a bill that reached into the Federal Treasury, took $1.5 trillion, and gave almost all of it to that small group of people inside that circle of privilege and power while it ignored the rest of the country. That is what happens in corrupt countries. The power elite reach in, take the Treasury for themselves, and ignore the will of the people.

Every Member of this body took a pledge to the Constitution of the United States—a Constitution not founded on we the powerful but on we the people. So I ask: Are we going to honor that oath? If we are going to honor it, it means we have to stand up and end this deep and vast corruption.

Yesterday, Senator UDALL and I and all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle introduced a bill that is designed to take on gerrymandering, to take on voter suppression, and to take on dark money. Let's talk about gerrymandering.

The Supreme Court has never done a thing about it even though it is clearly all about having the powerful choose its voters rather than having the voters choose their Representatives. It is a complete shredding of the vision of the Constitution. The Supreme Court utterly failed to act. It has a case before it now, and it will have another opportunity, but don't hold your breath.

The time to address gerrymandering is before it is done. How do you do that? You do that with independent commissions. Independent commissions have been adopted in States like Iowa, and they have been widely received by the citizens as an issue of fairness. Yet, across so many States, we have congressional districts that are deliberately gerrymandered to favor the parties in power. It has happened in Democratic States, and it has happened in Republican States. You see it sometimes by the crazy configurations of the map. Sometimes you see it when a State that is essentially equally divided between the parties produces congressional Representatives heavily leaning to one side.

It is hard to remedy after the fact, but you can remedy before the fact by having independent commissions across this country. The way you take that on is you have a group of six individuals. They take two from the Democrats and two from the Republicans and two of whom are Independents, and they may select a broader set of participants—maybe an additional three

for the Ds and three from the Rs and three from the Independents. Then, when they take votes, there has to be a vote from each of those three sectors. That is sort of the design that forces cooperation and sets up a condition of fairness, and that is what the For the People Act does that we introduced yesterday.

Now, I will tell you that State by State, and in my State, people ask: Why should I fix gerrymandering when that State over there still favors the other party? It is like waving the white flag on my turf while they are ripping us off over there. That is why it should be done at the Federal level. That is why we should pass the For the People Act.

This act takes on the issue of voting fairness. If you really believe in the vision of a democratic republic, you believe in voter empowerment, not voter suppression. Yet what have we seen this last November 6? We have seen strategies to keep college students from voting, strategies to keep communities of color from voting, strategies to keep the poor from voting, strategies to prevent Native Americans from voting. Those strategies are born from people who don't believe in the vision of our Constitution. They don't believe it is the foundation for what we have. They see this as just a game to produce a result, which is a government for that small group of people inside that circle of power and privilege. I am a little more patriotic than that. I believe in the vision of our Constitution, so let's take on these efforts to obstruct voting.

We did have a bill that had vast bipartisan support. It was called the Voting Rights Act, and we reauthorized it with vast bipartisan support because not so long ago, both sides of the aisle believed in the vision of our Constitution but not now. Unfortunately, now we are hearing that our colleagues across the aisle like voter intimidation. We see the Republican States engaging in it on a massive scale. It is increasing their power. They want to hold onto it—to clutch it to their chests and not let go. Yet, if you believe in the Constitution, if you believe in our country, you would let go. You would say: Let's appeal to all of the voters with our vision and not try to stop them from voting.

That is why we need to take down the barriers for voting. That is why we need automatic voter registration and internet registration and same-day registration—so people can sign up to vote. It means we need better access to voting so there isn't manipulation at the precinct places and so there is early voting nationwide and the right to choose to vote by mail.

Now, of course, I am a little biased on this because my home State of Oregon led the Nation in automatic voter registration, and we led the Nation in voting by mail. For those who are worrying about people voting who shouldn't be voting, nothing is more secure than to vote by mail, and those who are worried about electronic machines being hacked and not having a paper ballot, there is nothing more secure than voting by mail.

When polls do occur and people go to those polls, shouldn't we make sure they are adequately staffed? The whole strategy of moving polling places at the last minute in order to confuse people and the whole strategy of understaffing polling places in the neighborhoods that you don't want to have vote is really evil—evil in that it takes away the vision of our Constitution. Voter empowerment is the vision; voter suppression is not. So that takes us to those polls and to our making sure we have a polling protection act. That is why we need the For the People Act—to take that on.

Then we come to dark and dirty money—money flowing in from corporations and all kinds of overseas, foreign participants. Nothing is being done here about that. Of course, the vision laid out by Thomas Jefferson called it equal voice. It meant distributed power among the electorate, not concentrated power, only with equal voice. He said it was the mother principle. Only with that do you get bills that reflect the will of the people. We are getting bills that reflect a small circle of power and privilege, not the people, because of this dark money concentrating power.

When the Koch brothers' cartel puts hundreds of millions of dollars into our campaign, the ordinary voter asks: Where is my equal voice? I don't have hundreds of millions of dollars. I will be lucky if I can give $10 to this candidate and $15 to that candidate. So the American people know the system is rigged—rigged in a profound way by this dark money.

Where does this come from?

It comes from that same Supreme Court that gutted the Voting Rights Act, from that same Supreme Court that failed to take on gerrymandering. It is the Court that has flipped our Constitution on its head and has replaced we the people with the vision of government by and for that small group of people in a circle of power—people like the Koch brothers, who, in 2014, spent hundreds of millions of dollars to change the makeup of this Chamber. Nobody in my blue-collar neighborhood has hundreds of millions of dollars. They know the system has been rigged. That is why we need the For the People Act—to restore the vision of our Constitution.

I encourage all red-blooded, patriotic Americans to stand up for their Constitution, to fight for the vision embodied in Jefferson's mother principle of equal voice, distributed power, and to remedy the dark money flowing through our campaigns. Not only is it vastly corrupting, but it drives vast cynicism because the people see what is going on.

Let's fix the gerrymandering on the front end. It is hard for the courts to do it on the back end even if they had the will to do so. Let's fix fair voting on the front end and not argue about it afterward when we can't even count the ballots because there are electronic machines and people didn't have a fair chance to get to the polls. Let's fix the dark money and embrace equal voice.

I am concerned that time is short to save our Republic because the money has so piled up under this strategy of government by and for the powerful that over the last decades, while the wages and benefits of ordinary people have been flat or declining, the wealth of that small circle of power has gone through the roof.

In the first three decades after World War II, everyone participated. It was the spirit of the war. We were all in it together. Let's make our government work for all. In the midseventies, it ended—vast wealth for the wealthy and only struggling opportunities or struggling conditions for those ordinary Americans.

We have to save our Constitution. Let's do it. Let's pass the For the People Act. Let's have a full and robust debate on this floor so we will all be accountable to our citizens and to our pledge and our oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO LEIF FONNESBECK

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to recognize a truly exceptional member of the U.S. Senate—not one who has a vote on this floor but certainly one who has wielded great influence and who has generated great appreciation from many of us who have had the privilege and the honor to serve on the Appropriations Committee, as you have.

Today I am here to speak about an individual who has been serving the U.S. Senate on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee now for two decades, and this gentleman is a friend by the name of Leif Fonnesbeck.

Leif started with the Interior Appropriations Committee under the helm of Chairman Slade Gorton from the State of Washington and then also, of course, the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee at that time, my friend and mentor Ted Stevens.

So it is actually a little bit bittersweet for me to be speaking about Leif and recognizing his contributions because after two decades—21 years—Leif is retiring from public service, and I understand, certainly, his desire. Twenty years is a good run. It is a significant amount of effort and truly an admirable career.

Both Leif and I are born and raised Alaskans, and you can never take the home out of your heart. It is something that is a continual tug, and so I can certainly understand his desire to spend more time at home with the incredible Alaskans whom we call friends

and family and to be in our amazing and extraordinary spaces.

As I mentioned, Leif is an Alaskan. He grew up there in Anchorage. Leif's mom was a librarian, and his father was a principal. He and his sisters grew up exploring and experiencing everything that is Alaska—all things great.

He attended East High School. He left to get his undergraduate degree in finance from here in Washington, DC, at Georgetown University, my alma mater. He then went on to law school and went out to the University of Arizona. Then, shortly after he got his law degree, he returned home to Anchorage, thinking that he was going to practice law there.

So he wasn't there for too very long when then-Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stevens tapped Leif and said: Look, I would like to have you come back to Washington, DC, and work for me on the Senate Appropriations Interior Subcommittee. So it was at that time that Leif made the big move, leaving from Anchorage and coming back here to Washington, DC, to work with his mentor and my mentor, Ted Stevens.

There are a lot of stories that go on around here. I have enjoyed getting to know the great Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, who had a great tenure working with Chairman Stevens on the Appropriations Committee, but you learn a lot from leaders like that, and I know that Leif certainly learned a great deal from the leadership of Senator Stevens.

He learned the art of the appropriations process, the art of trying to work with people on oftentimes contentious issues and places, but he really, truly learned the art of looking out for the needs of Alaska and Alaskans while meeting the needs of the Interior bill. He truly, truly served with distinction throughout his tenure on the subcommittee.

In addition to being an expert—and he really was an expert at his job—he is just a rock-solid guy. He gave solid advice, was willing to be helpful, and had a nature and a generosity that were really key to all those who knew him and who really had the pleasure to work with him.

Oftentimes, you can't say that it is really a pleasure to work with you. Well, it was a pleasure—it is a pleasure—to work with Leif Fonnesbeck.

Since becoming chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I have had the benefit of Leif's experience and knowledge of Alaska and of the appropriations process. I will tell you, when I moved over to Interior to take that on as chair of that subcommittee, it was a little bit daunting at first. It is an expansive portfolio—everything from the EPA to management of our public lands, to the Indian Health Service, to the BIA. It is all over the board, and it is a challenging one, including how we are dealing with wildfires and fire borrowing. We have some significant, significant challenges, but Leif was just that font of knowledge, not only from his experience on the committee but just from his experience in working with so many of these issues and working with so many of the people over the years.

He has been an absolutely excellent partner in navigating the really very difficult, complicated, and complex process that is required to produce funding bills in a manner that is viewed as fair and open and just true to the process. I am just so very, very grateful to his service to me, to the State of Alaska, and, truly, to the U.S. Senate.

For 21 years now, Leif's work on the Interior Subcommittee has impacted the lives of more Alaskans than he will possibly ever realize. His efforts, particularly on behalf of Alaska's Native communities, as well as our vast natural resources, have had and will continue to have a tremendous impact on our State and our people. Because of his work, more communities have access to clean water through new drinking systems. This was something that Leif really concentrated on. He would go out to the villages. He would see firsthand what it meant to the health conditions of families when they don't have access to clean and safe drinking water and when they don't have sanitation facilities, and he worked to address that.

More Alaskans are empowered to build their economy and create healthy communities through investments for new infrastructure and support for programs to address domestic violence, substance abuse, and suicide.

Every year we have been able to help those accounts move forward because the needs were so desperate and the needs were so urgent, and Leif helped to advance those priorities.

Support for rural healthcare clinics enabled more Alaskans to have access to care. There were the efforts that he went through to help facilitate Native hospitals, whether in Barrow or in Nome, and now down in the Bethel region with the joint venture projects, making sure that we have adequate, strong staffing packages. Investments in our public lands have helped to protect Alaska's tourism industry and our outdoor recreation opportunities.

He and I would go back and forth and forth and back as to whether or not the pedestrian walkway to allow visitors in Brooks Camp to view the bears was too Taj Mahal of a bridge or whether it was a bridge that was going to be necessary to protect the tourists from the bears when the bears got disinterested in the salmon that they were munching on.

Leif got down in the weeds. He got into the issues. He knew what was going on.

His efforts for local governments to construct roads and public schools are investments that will make a lasting impact on the State of Alaska and the people who live there. Knowing that this is a lasting impact that this individual, Leif, has made, is just so huge.

So as Leif is preparing to leave this place where he has been for two decades to go back home to spend more time there—whether it is fishing or just enjoying or going back to work—I know that he leaves many, many friends here. He leaves many that have such appreciation for his work, his character, his honesty, and just his professionalism.

I want to thank him for all of his years of dedication, his commitment, his service. I wish him and his dog Leo the best as they go back to Alaska. They will be hiking around, wandering around the shadow of the Chugach Mountains. I know, wherever it is that he goes, though, he will be involved in helping the people of Alaska.

I look forward to continuing to work with Lee in the next chapter of his life. It is indeed an honor to be able to speak about him and his good work today.

I know we are set to wrap up here. It is my colleague from Alaska who usually has the last word on a Thursday evening, and he speaks about the Alaskan of the Week. Senator SULLIVAN is not here today and will not be giving those comments, but I feel I have kind of filled in with giving him an Alaska of the Week with Leif Fonnesbeck, a gentleman who has served our State honorably over such period of time.

With that, I yield the floor.

(Ms. MURKOWSKI assumed the chair.)

(Mr. WICKER assumed the chair.)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2019

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, April 1; 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 H.R. 268; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions with respect to H.R. 268 filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, April 1; finally, that if cloture is not invoked with respect to the motions filed on H.R. 268, the cloture motion with respect to S. Res. 50 ripen at 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, April 2.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:33 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 1, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 28, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NICOLE R. NASON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEONARD F. ANDERSON IV
COL. WILLIAM E. SOUZA III

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PETER G. STAMATOPOULOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GAYLE D. SHAFFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KELLY A. AESCHBACH
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK D. WHITWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BLAKE L. CONVERSE
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES B. COOPER II
REAR ADM. (LH) DONALD D. GABRIELSON
REAR ADM. (LH) GREGORY N. HARRIS
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY T. JABLON
REAR ADM. (LH) YANCY B. LINDSEY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. MEIER
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES E. PITTS
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. SKILLMAN
REAR ADM. (LH) KARL O. THOMAS
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. WADE
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL A. WETTLAUFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEAN A. VANDERLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH W. EPPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TIMOTHY H. WEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES L. HANCOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. NICHOLAS M. HOMAN
CAPT. MICHAEL J. VERNAZZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHARLES W. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN B. NOWELL, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN L. BASHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEVEN J. BUTOW

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KAREN H. GIBSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES P. DOWNEY
REAR ADM. (LH) SHANE G. GAHAGAN
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANCIS D. MORLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RONALD A. BOXALL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO THAT POSITION UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 7036 AND 7073:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS L. SOLHJEM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TELITA CROSLAND
BRIG. GEN. DENNIS P. LEMASTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 10506:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DANIEL R. HOKANSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LEON N. THURGOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WALTER E. PIATT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES C. SLIFE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. PAUL E. FUNK II

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DEE L. MEWBOURNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JON A. HILL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. STUART B. MUNSCH

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH DENISE M. ZONA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. CRIMMINS, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHAWN C. BISHOP AND ENDING WITH CHRISTIAN L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHELL A. ARCHEBELLE AND ENDING WITH SHELLEY A. SHELTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER N. FISCHER AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN H. WADE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN M. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH JASON C. ZUMWALT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LATOYA D. SMITH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LISA MARIE AHAESY, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE HUYGEN AND ENDING WITH TOM POSCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF MATTHEW D. COLSIA, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DEVEN R. GASTON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADRIAN ACEVEDO AND ENDING WITH G010477, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENJAMIN T. ABEL AND ENDING WITH G010598, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KWANSAH E. ACKAH AND ENDING WITH D014862, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALAN ADAME AND ENDING WITH D013619, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH A. FIELDS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF P. J. FOX, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NATHAN M. CLAYTON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ADAM P. JAMES, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON S. BAKER AND ENDING WITH RICHARD J. ZEIGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHELIA R. DAY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT D. COPE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM C. MITCHELL, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RUBIROSA B. BAGO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MEGHAN C. GERRITY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL M. JANSEN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RANDOLPH POWELL, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. PROKOS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANTHONY BELLOFIGUEROA, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SEAN R. RICHARDSON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KAHTONNA C. ALLEN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANGELO N. CATALANO, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES J. CALAIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT T. EVANS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAULA I. SCHASBERGER AND ENDING WITH JAN E. ALDYKIEWICZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN M. ANGELINE AND ENDING WITH CURTIS E. BORJAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID F. HUNLEY AND ENDING WITH JAMES P. STOCKWELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOHN C. JARVIS, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHANEAL J. HART, JR. AND ENDING WITH DUSTIN R. HEFFEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW J. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ISAAC K. TIBAYAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF EDWARD M. PRENDERGAST, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF THOMAS L. HINNANT III, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SANJAY SHARMA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANGELA TANG, TO BE COMMANDER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

HON. JOSEPH D. MORELLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the National Technical Institute for the Deaf on celebrating 50 years of providing an outstanding education for deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The National Technical Institute for the Deaf, or NTID, is one of the nine colleges at Rochester Institute of Technology in Rochester, New York. With almost 9,000 alumni and a 94 percent average employment rate over the past five years for its deaf and hard-of-hearing graduates, NTID continues to open doors and break down barriers for people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing.

For decades, the deaf community advocated for a technical university, and in 1965, that dream became a reality. After legislation was introduced in April that year, the National Technical Institute of the Deaf was established by Congress via Public Law 89–36 and signed by President Lyndon Baines Johnson on June 8, 1965. Three years later, in September 1968, 70 deaf young men and women arrived at the Rochester Institute of Technology, or RIT, campus to become the charter class of NTID students.

And here we are, 50 years after that charter class was facing the completion of its first year of academic instruction, and NTID is still excelling at its primary mission. ''. . . to provide deaf and hard-of-hearing students with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum, to prepare them to live and work in the mainstream of a rapidly changing global community and enhance their lifelong learning.''

We know NTID has succeeded because NTID students persist and graduate at rates favorable to national rates for two- and four-year colleges and because they are, on average, employed at higher rates and earn more over their lifetimes than deaf peers who do not attend NTID.

Over the past 50 years, NTID has also surpassed expectations for its secondary mission, by establishing one of the country's oldest and most prestigious American Sign Language interpreter training programs, improving the education of deaf children and youth by preparing future educators, and conducting research and outreach that benefit deaf people worldwide.

Serving as the U.S. Representative for Monroe County is a source of great pride for me, a pride that comes from knowing the role that Rochester has played and continues to play in changing the world for the better. NTID has helped make Rochester the diverse, innovative and determined community it is today. We are so fortunate to have this national treasure as part of RIT and part of Rochester. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating NTID on 50 years of excellence

TRIBUTE TO ZYGMUND KOWALESKI

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, today I'd like to congratulate Zygmund Kowaleski on the occasion of his 99th birthday on April 7th, and thank him for his service to the United States Navy and to the United States of America.

Mr. Kowaleski enlisted as a gunner on a twin-engine PBM flying boat in October of 1941, just two months before the ambush at Pearl Harbor would launch the U.S. into World War II. As a part of Torpedo Squadron Eight present at the Battle of Midway, he and his fellow crew members earned commendations for bravery in engagements at Guadalcanal, Midway, and the British Solomon Islands.

Attempting to fly a mail route off the coast of the Fiji Islands, Mr. Kowaleski's plane stalled on takeoff and crashed into the Pacific Ocean. He was forced to free himself from the downed plane and paddle from the wreckage, fearful the ship's 500-pound depth charges would detonate.

Madam Speaker, even after receiving combat honors twice for his heroics, Mr. Kowaleski once again piloted a U.S. Navy plane, instead hunting German submarines in the North Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. Kowaleski moved out to Alaska in 1967 after fulfilling his Naval service, continuing to fly as an FAA Airway Systems Inspection Pilot. But whether he was piloting a torpedo bomber or a twin-engine Cessna, he always conducted himself with valor and should be considered among Alaska's finest Naval Aviators for his service.

An aviator needs quick decision-making and a cool head to fly a plane in combat. Many of us will not know the kind of mental toughness required to see a mission to its conclusion, even under the most dire flight conditions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Zygmund Kowaleski, who now at the age of 99, will have spent nearly one quarter of his life's work in service to his country having flown missions from Dutch Harbor to the Panama Canal. There are few people that can claim to have sacrificed as much under our flag, and he is owed the thanks and gratitude of all of us here in Washington and in Alaska.

RECOGNIZING POLICE CHIEF TROY MCGEE OF HELENA

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Troy McGee of Helena for his four decades of public service in the Helena Police Department, including nearly 23 years as chief of police.

Growing up in the community he would serve, Troy graduated from Helena High School in 1971 and Carroll College in 1975.

Troy began his career with the Helena Police Department in 1975 and worked his way through the ranks. After nearly 20 years in the department, Troy was promoted to police chief in August 1996.

Throughout his career, Troy was dedicated to law enforcement safety and training in Montana. He has contributed his time, experience, and perspective to several organizations, including the Montana Attorney General's Law Enforcement Advisory Council, the Montana Peace Officers Standards and Training Council, and the Montana Law Enforcement Academy Advisory Board. He also has advocated for law enforcement with the Montana Chiefs of Police Association and the Montana Police Officers Protective Association.

As Helena's chief of police, Troy created stronger relationships between his department and the community. He also bolstered the city's relationship with other law enforcement agencies. His commitment to coordination and partnership led the city's police department to work with the Lewis and Clark County Sheriff's Department to form a joint SWAT team.

Troy has dedicated his life to the well-being of his community and law enforcement officers throughout our state. On behalf of the people of Montana, thank you for your service, Chief McGee.

Madam Speaker, for his decades of outstanding service and for his dedication to public safety, law enforcement, and his community, I recognize Troy McGee for his spirit of Montana.

HONORING THE HONORABLE DR. AMELIA ROSS-HAMMOND FOR HER CAREER AND SERVICE TO THE HAMPTON ROADS COMMUNITY

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Honorable Dr. Amelia Ross-Hammond for her tremendous career and service in the Hampton Roads area.

Honorable Dr. Ross-Hammond recently retired from Norfolk State University where she

taught Music Appreciation and the Humanities. Not only has Honorable Dr. Ross-Hammond been dedicated to her work as a Distinguished Professor, but she has been a renowned public servant. She served on the Virginia Beach City Council, and various councils and boards at the State and local level such as the City's Diversity and Inclusion Forums, and co-chaired the Mayor's African American Roundtable—just to name a few. She currently serves as a Commissioner for the Hampton Roads Transportation Commission and President-Elect for the Virginia Beach Beautification Commission. These are only a select few of her numerous titles and positions.

Honorable Dr. Ross-Hammond received awards for her service to the Hampton Roads community such as the Resolution of Appreciation from the Hampton Roads District Planning Commission and the Urban League of South Hampton Roads Young Professionals Award for Community Service. She was also the 2016 Honoree for the Norfolk State University Music Department's Spring Gala.

Honorable Dr. Ross-Hammond's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Honorable Dr. Ross-Hammond's leadership and the role she plays in making our community a better place. Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from her presence.

CONGRATULATING DENNIS BROWN

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dennis Brown on 50 years of employment at the Anheuser-Busch Jacksonville Brewery.

Mr. Brown began at the brewery in April of 1969, working onsite even before it packaged its first barrel of beer.

His attention to detail, unmatched work ethic, and commitment to quality has allowed him to excel as a leader in the brewery.

I have visited the Jacksonville brewery and can personally attest to its productivity and efficiency.

There is great honor in hard work at a job worth doing, and the admirable record of Mr. Brown's longevity speaks to his successful career.

I thank Mr. Brown for his part in making Budweiser the King of Beers and wish him the best in all future endeavors.

Cheers.

HONORING THE 1969 NEW YORK METS UPON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR WORLD SERIES CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise, on this, the greatest day of the year, Opening Day of the Major League Baseball season to honor the 1969 New York Mets upon the 50th Anniversary of their World Series Championship. This scrappy team, led by the remarkable Gil Hodges, disproved their doubters, united a city, and offered hope during a dark time in our country's history. A season that began with a loss to the expansion Montreal Expos ended with Joan Hodges screaming ''We're Champions'' in an exuberant clubhouse under the beautiful Shea Stadium. With a rotation led by the powerful arms of Tom ''The Franchise'' Seaver and Jerry Koosman and a lineup packed with the ability of the likes of Ed Kranepool, Bud Harrelson, Cleon Jones, and Art Shamsky, these Mets jumped over the moon and won the World Series. The team that had been stumbling since the year of its creation somehow managed to outlast the historic Chicago Cubs with three future Hall of Famers, the imposing Atlanta Braves led by Hammerin' Hank Aaron, and the awe-inducing Baltimore Orioles led by Frank and Brooks Robinson. The characters that were these Mets offered hope to a struggling New York City and optimism for a country suffering through the Vietnam War. Fifty years ago, my New York Mets reminded the country why baseball is truly America's pastime. I, along with so many others who were cheering them during those exciting days, say thank you, congratulations on their 50th Anniversary, and Let's Go Mets.

RECOGNIZING THE REINTRODUCTION OF THE LYMPHEDEMA TREATMENT ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, as we near the end of March, which is Lymphedema Awareness Month, I rise to mark my reintroduction of the Lymphedema Treatment Act. When a cancer patient has her lymph nodes removed and experiences swelling and discomfort, it is a jarring experience. She is then often hit with another surprise: many insurers, including Medicare, do not cover a critical treatment for lymphedema—compression garments. This is one more challenge on top of the monumental battle of fighting cancer.

Including medically-necessary compression garments in Medicare coverage is a commonsense solution to increase access for the 10 million people who suffer from lymphedema. That is what my bill would do. Coverage under Medicare sets a precedent and is an important step in increasing access to compression garments for all Americans. 384 of my colleagues cosponsored this bill last Congress, and almost 100 have joined me and Representatives BUDDY CARTER, EARL BLUMENAUER, and MIKE KELLY as original cosponsors today. It is critical that we pass this bill into law.

Finally, I want to thank the Lymphedema Advocacy Group in particular for their tireless work in championing the Lymphedema Treatment Act. Today, my heart is with Elaine Eigeman, board chair of the Lymphedema Advocacy Group, who recently entered hospice care. She has been a champion for lymphedema patients for years, and she is the primary reason this bill was first introduced four years ago. I am proud to reintroduce this bill in her honor.

COMMEMORATION OF THE OPENING OF THE LIFE MESSAGE VETERANS RESOURCE & OUTREACH CENTER IN ROWLETT, TEXAS

HON. COLIN Z. ALLRED

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commemorate a milestone for the community of Rowlett, Texas, the grand opening of the Life Message Veterans Resource & Outreach Center.

This facility is already making a difference in veterans' lives in this community, but Friday, March 29, 2019 will mark the ground-breaking and official opening ceremony of the center.

We owe a great debt to our veterans and their families, and I thank the people of Rowlett for their work on this effort. This is a great example of a community coming together to support those who have sacrificed so much for our nation.

It is an honor to represent them in Congress, and I know that I am deeply dedicated to being a strong and reliable partner for this new center as it works to become a source of long-term support and solutions for our veterans.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF ROBERT J. JAMISON, SR.

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Reverend Robert J. Jamison, Sr., who passed away on Sunday, March 24 at age 82.

Rev. Jamison, a native of Tupelo, Mississippi, was born on May 28, 1936 to Van and Cora Jamison. He was the third of four children and dedicated his life to Christ at an early age at Rising Star Missionary Baptist Church. Robert graduated from George Washington Carver High School and married his high school sweetheart, Minnie Lee Edwards, in 1954. After graduation, he received degrees from Mississippi Industrial College, University of Utah, and Memphis Theological Seminary.

Rev. Jamison served as pastor of Second Baptist Church, New Providence Missionary Baptist Church and founded the People's Community Baptist Church in Tupelo, Mississippi. It was through these roles and many more that Rev. Jamison touched many lives. He was dedicated to making his community better by serving the people any way he could.

Rev. Jamison's life is one that should be celebrated and remembered. His legacy of obedience to God and selfless service to others lives on in all the lives he touched.

Left to cherish his memories are his son, Robert ''Fonda'' Jamison, Jr. of Silver Spring, MD; three daughters, Searcy (Ray) Taylor and Venita Goins of Gulfport, MS, Marcy Jamison of Tupelo, MS; four grandchildren, Christen Shane Jamison of Philadelphia, PA, Julicia ''GiGi'' Taylor of Camp Spring, MD, William (Ashlee) Goins and daughter, Ava Claire of Starkville, MS, Jamison Goins of Atlanta, GA;

three sisters, Jennie Kincaid and Annie Turner of Milwaukee, WI, Dora Thomas of Memphis, TN; one brother, Tyree Jamison of Rockville, MD; two brother-in-laws, Eddie Edwards and Obie Edwards of Verona, MS; one sister-in-law, Leora Edwards of Verona, MS and a host of nieces, nephews, other relatives and friends.

HONORING LOYD RUTHERFORD OF MOULTON, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge the lifetime of service Mr. Loyd Rutherford of Moulton, Alabama has given to the farm community in our nation and the difference he has made in countless lives.

Mr. Rutherford currently serves on the board of directors for Alabama Farm Credit. He will be retiring on April 19, 2019 after almost 30 years of service to the board. In addition to this longevity on the board, he has served as Chairman of the Board for almost the same length of time, taking that title in 1995. He held that title until 2017.

In addition to Mr. Rutherford's service to the state of Alabama, he has also served other parts of our nation. He served on the District Benefits Administrative Committee for the Farm Credit Bank of Texas. Rutherford also worked on the Farm Credit Benefit Alliance plan sponsor committee, which services both AgFirst Bank and the Farm Credit Bank of Texas, the Tenth District Farm Credit Council Board, the National Farm Credit Council board, and the Farm Credit Council Services Board.

Mr. Rutherford retired from working 32 years with a local cooperative in Alabama. He is currently the owner and operator of JRL Inc., a construction and development company in Moulton, Alabama. He also farms cotton, soybeans, cattle and broilers.

I want to commend Mr. Rutherford for his service, especially his time serving Alabama Farm Credit. The organization has helped an untold number of farmers, especially those just getting started in the business, to realize their dreams of making a career out of helping to feed America.

He is married to Janice and they have three children, Jeffrey, Regina and Tanya, eight grandchildren and six great-grandchildren. I am happy to congratulate Mr. Rutherford and I wish him all the best in his well-earned retirement from the Alabama Farm Credit Board of Directors. I know his leadership and knowledge will be greatly missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to circumstances beyond my control.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 130; NAY on Roll Call No. 131; YEA on Roll Call No. 132; YEA on Roll Call No. 133; and NAY on Roll Call No. 134.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 2019

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I was unavoidably detained and unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: Yea on Roll Call 126, the European Energy Security and Diversity Act (HR 1616).

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2063–S2104

Measures Introduced: Forty bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 921–960, S.J. Res. 16, S. Res. 128–132, and S. Con. Res. 10.

Pages S2087–88

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence United States Senate Covering the Period January 3, 2017 to January 3, 2019". (S. Rept. No. 116–20)

Special Report entitled "Report on the Activities of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary During the 115th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 116–22)

Special Report entitled "Legislative Activities Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, One Hundred Fifteenth Congress". (S. Rept. No. 116–23)

Special Report entitled "Legislative Activities Report of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the United States Senate During the 115th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 116–24)

S. 257, to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans. (S. Rept. No. 116–21)

Page S2087

Measures Passed:

Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 276, to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school, and the bill was then passed. **Page S2098**

Vietnam Veterans Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 69, designating March 29, 2019, as "Vietnam Veterans Day", and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2098–99**

McConnell (for Burr/Manchin) Amendment No. 225, to amend the preamble. **Pages S2098–99**

Recognizing American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Women: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 100, recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Pages S2099–S2100

Military Retiree Appreciation Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 118, recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2100**

Condemning the Terrorist Attacks in Christchurch, New Zealand: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 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 the Government of New Zealand, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2100**

Measures Considered:

Supplemental Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S2064–77

Withdrawn:

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 5, of a perfecting nature. **Page S2064**

Schumer Amendment No. 6, of a perfecting nature. **Page S2064**

Pending:

Shelby Amendment No. 201, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2064**

McConnell Amendment No. 213 (to Amendment No. 201), to change the enactment date. **Page S2065**

McConnell Amendment No. 214 (to Amendment No. 213), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2065**

McConnell Amendment No. 215 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 201), to change the enactment date. **Page S2065**

McConnell Amendment No. 216 (to Amendment No. 215), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2065**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Shelby Amendment No. 201 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 28, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, April 1, 2019. **Pages S2064–65**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Shelby Amendment No. 201. **Page S2081**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments with respect to the motions to invoke cloture on Thursday, March 28, 2019, relating to the bill be at 4 p.m., on Monday, April 1, 2019. **Page S2100**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, April 1, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the bill; that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motions to invoke cloture with respect to the bill filed on Thursday, March 28, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, April 1, 2019, and that if cloture is not invoked with respect to the motions filed on the bill, the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate, ripen at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, April 2, 2019. **Page S2102**

Nominations in the Senate—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate. **Page S2082**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. **Page S2082**

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: Senators Duckworth (At Large) and Manchin (Committee on Appropriations). **Page S2098**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 95 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. EX. 54), Nicole R. Nason, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. **Pages S2977–79, S2103–04**

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

8 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

31 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S2082–95, S2103–04**

Messages from the House: **Page S2086**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S2086**

Executive Communications: **Page S2086**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2086–87**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2087**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2088–90**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2090–95**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2085–86**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2095–97**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S2097–98**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2098**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—54) **Page S2079**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:33 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, April 1, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on Page S2102.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification

for fiscal year 2020 for the Coast Guard, after receiving testimony from Admiral Karl Schultz, Commandant, Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Education, after receiving testimony from Betsy DeVos, Secretary of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS: FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Food and Drug Administration, after receiving testimony from Scott Gottlieb, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Department of Energy's atomic energy defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Rick Perry, Secretary, and Lisa E. Gordon-Hagerty, Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, and Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, both of the Department of Energy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported the original concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Gardner, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

PFAS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Federal response to the risks associated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), after receiving testimony from David P. Ross, Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, Environmental Protection Agency; Maureen Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment; and Patrick N. Breysse, Director, National Center for Environmental Health and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Linda S. Birnbaum, Director, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and National Toxicology Program, National Institutes of Health, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Wing Chau, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island, and Ramona L. Dohman, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 50 public bills, H.R. 1941–1990; 1 private bill, H.R. 1991; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 54; and H. Res. 264–270, were introduced. **Pages H2914–17**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H2919**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1598, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a strategy to improve hiring and retention of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel in rural or remote areas, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–22);

H.R. 1639, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–23);

H.R. 1589, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security

and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–24);

H.R. 1593, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–25);

H.R. 1433, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–26); and

H.R. 1590, to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–27). **Page H2914**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 179 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 136. **Pages H2889, H2899–H2900**

Expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals: The House agreed to H. Res. 124, expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals, by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 185 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 135. **Pages H2891–99**

H. Res. 252, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) and the resolution (H. Res. 124) was agreed to yesterday, March 27th.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Dunn wherein he resigned from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. **Page H2900**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 264, electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H2900**

Amending title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 863, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs. **Page H2900**

Cyberspace Solarium Commission—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative McCarthy, Minority Leader, in which he appointed the following Member to the Cyberspace Solarium Commission: Representative Gallagher. **Page H2900**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, March 29th, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, April 1st for Morning Hour debate. **Page H2906**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2898–99 and H2899–H2900. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:06 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service. Testimony was heard from Vicki Christiansen, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS: MAINTAINING A ROBUST ECOSYSTEM FOR OUR TECHNOLOGICAL EDGE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs: Maintaining a Robust Ecosystem for our Technological Edge". Testimony was heard from Michael D. Griffin, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Bruce D. Jette, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army; James F. Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development & Acquisition, Department of the Navy; and William Roper, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of the Air Force.

FY20 PRIORITIES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled "FY20 Priorities for Department of Defense Nuclear Activities". Testimony was heard from David Trachtenberg, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; General John Hyten, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command; Vice Admiral Johnny Wolfe, U.S. Navy, Director, Strategic Systems Programs; and Lieutenant General Richard Clark, U.S. Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff, Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 389, the ''Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Rewards Act''; H.R. 1500, the ''Consumers First Act''; H.R. 1595, the ''Secure and Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019''; H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act''; and H.R. 1856, the ''Ending Homelessness Act of 2019''. H.R. 389, H.R. 1500, H.R. 1595, H.R. 1856, and H.R. 1815 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE COLORADO RIVER DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing entitled ''The Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan''. Testimony was heard from Brenda Burman, Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; Tom Buschatzke, Director, Arizona Department of Water Resources; John D'Antonio, State Engineer, New Mexico; Eric Millis, Director, Utah Division of Water Resources; Peter Nelson, Chairman, Colorado River Board of California; Pat Tyrrell, State Engineer, Wyoming; John Entsminger, General Manager, Southern Nevada Water Authority; and James Eklund, Colorado Commissioner, Upper Colorado River Commission.

ABANDONED MINE LAND RECLAMATION: INNOVATIVE APPROACHES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation: Innovative Approaches and Economic Development Opportunities''. Testimony was heard from Dan Fisher, Treasurer, Gillespie, Illinois; Eric Cavazza, Director, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection; and public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Member Day''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kilmer, and Representatives Gallagher, Brooks of Alabama, and Smith of New Jersey.

PUTIN'S PLAYBOOK: THE KREMLIN'S USE OF OLIGARCHS, MONEY AND INTELLIGENCE IN 2016 AND BEYOND.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Putin's Playbook: The Kremlin's Use of Oligarchs, Money and Intelligence in 2016 and Beyond''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress, without amendment.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

3 p.m., Monday, April 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 268, Supplemental Appropriations Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Shelby Amendment No. 201, at 5:30 p.m. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the bill and Shelby Amendment No. 201, is at 4 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

2:30 p.m., Friday, March 29

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.