The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SHALALA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, May 15, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Donna E. SHALALA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES IS AT RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And still I rise because there is a crisis that has to be addressed.

Madam Speaker, the system of checks and balances that we have instilled within our government, a system that the Framers of the Constitution devised such that there would not be a concentration of power in the hands of the chief executive officer of the government, in fact, is to prevent a concentration of power in any aspect. There is power that is spread across the government.

There are three branches of the government. I want to focus this morning, if I may, on two—the executive and the legislative—because, Madam Speaker, this morning, as I stand before you, a proud American, I must inform all that the system of checks and balances is at risk.

It is at risk because we now have a President who does not believe that he can or will be impeached. We have a President who refuses to allow Congress to perform its constitutionally accorded oversight responsibilities.

When you have a President who does this, Madam Speaker, you lose the power of Congress. It becomes concentrated in the President. The Presidency becomes a place where power is concentrated because the President has no fear:

He doesn’t believe that there are consequences for his going beyond what the Constitution allows;

He will engage in conduct that Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution would prohibit; and

He will engage in impeachable offenses because he knows that the Congress will not impeach him.

It is impeachment that is the ultimate guard against a reckless, ruthless, lawless President; and if we do not exert our authority, this President, knowing that we won’t, is capable of doing things that we cannot imagine.

Madam Speaker, it is up to us, the Members of this Congress, to assure that this government continues to have the checks and balances that the Framers of the Constitution intended. If we do not, if Congress does not fulfill its responsibility, we won’t have a Presidency. The power will be so concentrated that we will have a monarchy.

The Framers of the Constitution never intended for a President to just totally disregard the Congress. And notwithstanding all that might happen in the courts, notwithstanding all of the subpoenas that may be taken to court and have them litigated properly, the ultimate check on a President is Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, and that is impeachment when he commits impeachable acts.

We have the Mueller report. It speaks for itself. And there are many constitutional scholars who have said there has been an obstruction to take place.

There are many lawyers who have worked in the Justice Department. They number hundreds now, the lawyers who have signed on, indicating that the President should be beneath the law just as everyone else is, or the law should apply to him. He shouldn’t be above the law.

They are indicating that, if we don’t act, we are showing the President that he is above the law. He then becomes a monarch, and we then become a weaker form of government.

So I call upon this Congress: Let us do what is expected of us. The Framers of the Constitution gave us the way.

They have shown the way. We but only have to have the will, and it is worth it for us to do this because the country is at stake in the sense that the government is at risk.

Madam Speaker. I love my country.

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

RECOGNIZING LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak...
about an organization that is near and dear to my heart: the Lions Clubs International.

I am a member of my hometown organization, the Howard Area Lions Club. The Howard Area Lions Club has consistently earned the recognition as the largest Lions Club in Pennsylvania.

There are probably many factors that have led them to this, but none more significant than their commitment to the Lions Club motto, “We Serve.”

The members of my club served as the chartering organization for the Howard Boy Scout Troop 353; and, in the past, I was proud to serve as Scoutmaster of that unit.

Simply put, service is of the utmost importance to the Lions. The clubs are places where individuals can join together to give their valuable time and effort to improving their communities and the world.

Where there is a need, there is a Lion. There are 1.4 million Lions around the world, 47,000 Lions Clubs in more than 200 countries. For more than 100 years, Lions have been serving humanity.

The idea of the Lions Club began in 1917. A 38-year-old Chicago business leader named Melvin Jones told members of his local business club that they should reach beyond business issues and address the betterment of their communities and the world. They agreed.

Three years later, Lions Clubs became an international organization. Melvin Jones inspired generations of people to become civic-minded individuals, dedicated to using their talents and ambitions to improve their communities without financial reward.

Melvin Jones had a personal code: “You can’t get very far until you start doing something for somebody else.”

Madam Speaker, service to others is what makes the Lions Clubs International such a powerful force for good in the world.

There are nearly 70 Members of Congress who are involved in service organizations, and that is why I am proud to be working with my colleague Congressman Jimmy Panetta to establish the Congressional Service Organization Caucus. We plan to launch the caucus soon.

It will support the many operations that are dedicated to giving back to their communities. I encourage my colleagues to join because there are few gifts greater than the gift of time and service to others.

Madam Speaker, Lions Clubs International is on Capitol Hill today to raise awareness about how helpful service organizations are to communities across the Nation.

I am grateful that Lions Clubs around the globe serve millions annually, and I am so proud to be a member of an organization that not only lives up to its remarkable ideals but exceeds them time and time again.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I am grateful that the President of the Senate (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the Chair have introduced the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, which will continue the important work of the original bill and expand its critical programs to improve infant health across the United States. Every year, thousands of babies are born with genetic, metabolic, hormonal, and functional conditions that severely affect their development.

Fifty years ago, these rare disorders in infants would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared, often too late to provide them with the essential treatment needed to prevent lifelong disability or even death. Today, we can give newborn babies a simple blood test that can identify life-threatening genetic illnesses before symptoms appear.

In 2008, Congress passed my original bill, which was a major step toward establishing newborn screening guidelines across the United States. Until that time, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required newborn screening for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on these diseases. Today, 49 States and the District of Columbia screen for at least 31 of the 35 currently recommended core conditions.

Each year, newborn screening, healthcare professionals identify approximately 12,000 babies who test positive for one of these rare conditions. This invaluable early detection allows for timely treatment to prevent long-term damage and severe health complications, which gives babies the opportunity to live relatively normal and healthy lives.

For thousands of mothers and families, this early and simple intervention can also reduce the emotional stress of trying to identify their baby’s correct diagnosis.

Investments in newborn screening can also save up to $1 million over a child’s lifetime. This is a significant savings for American families and our financially burdened healthcare system.

While it is true that since the original passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, significant advancements have been made in early detection and treatment, serious gaps in newborn screening remain. The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will build on the current newborn screening infrastructure and strengthen early detection of preventable diseases.

To ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening, the bill reauthorizes the Centers for Disease Control grants, and it continues HRSA grants to empower parents and health professionals with education and resources to improve newborn screening.

The bill also renews the Secretary’s Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children, which maintains and updates the recommended uniform screening panel that States adopt and implement.

The bill funds research to identify new screening technologies and treatments, and a new provision in the bill commissions the National Academy of Medicine to issue recommendations to modernize newborn screening systems into the 21st century.

The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will continue to ensure that parents and health providers are knowledgeable about the value of newborn screening, and it will help ensure that infants across the United States receive comprehensive and consistent testing.

A coalition of public health groups, including the March of Dimes, the Association of Public Health Laboratories, the American College of Medical Genetics, and the National Organization for Rare Disorders, support the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. Their leadership has been critical to advance newborn screening across the United States.

Madam Speaker, newborn screening is one of the most important public health interventions of the 20th century. It is critical that, in the 21st century, we continue and strengthen the programs and research of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act.

I urge my colleagues to sponsor the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act to enhance the lives of hundreds of infants and families each year in the United States.

RECOGNIZING ZANE MOORE OF THE BUCKS COUNTY YMCA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual and organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, working to make our community a better place.

Earlier this month, Zane Moore, the president and CEO of the YMCA of Bucks County, walked across the entire county to raise awareness of the positive impact the YMCA has on our neighbors and funding for its programs.

Last Thursday, Zane began his trek at the YMCA in Quakertown, wrapping up at the YMCA in Doylestown. He picked up on Friday where he left off, completing his journey that same day, all the way to the YMCA in Lower Bucks County in Fairless Hills.

Madam Speaker, I applaud Zane and all the local leaders who joined him along the way on his journey. We appreciate the work of the YMCA and all of its efforts to promote education, physical well-being, and recovery programs for those in our community.
I began my journey at Head Start as an assistant teacher and later became the supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services, helping parents participate and contribute to their children's educational experiences. Head Start services include health screenings, nutrition education, and social support for families with children in the program. Early Head Start provides services like home visits to children at birth. Head Start even funds research and functions as a laboratory for early childhood development.

From the moment I became involved with Head Start, I saw the potential it had to empower and uplift children and their families. Since then, I have worked hard to improve and expand Head Start so that this potential is realized and more families have an opportunity for a better life.

My role as supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services provided me with insights into the unique and pivotal role parents play in the Head Start community.

I am so appreciative of the Head Start and Early Head Start programs in my home district in California. These programs basically provide resources and serve as a laboratory for early childhood development, and family well-being.

These programs serve tens of thousands of low-income children and their families in communities like South Los Angeles, Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, and Lawndale, and demonstrate Head Start's transformative potential.

I will continue to strengthen Congress' relationship with Head Start and parents and encourage more Members and families to become involved.

Since President Johnson first announced Head Start in the spring of 1965, the program and its services have reached more than 17 million children. Study after study shows that providing early childhood education to children is transformative to their future academic success.

Children who joined Head Start graduated high school and attended college at higher rates than their siblings who did not participate in the program. Head Start participants consistently show substantial improvements on test scores early in life. Adults who participated in Head Start as youth are less likely to be charged with a crime or become a teenage parent.

These programs are so much more than federally funded preschool programs for the youngest Americans. They are a lifeline for vulnerable communities and bring future generations a chance to succeed.

This critical program is our national pledge that every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, has an opportunity to achieve and excel in school and in life. There is perhaps no greater purpose for an elected official than working toward the realization of that pledge. I will never stop.

In addition to my support here in making sure that the funding continues and that it grows, I also focus on the oversight, supervision, and management of Head Start programs.

In the greater Los Angeles community, many of our delegate agencies are partner programs of LACOE. This is a county organization.

I want LACOE to get more involved in keeping Head Start programs rather than shutting them down. I believe there must be a strong component that works with compliance, training to make sure that the programs meet all the requirements because our teachers, our assistant teachers, and our volunteers are doing the very best job they can do. Many of them need that kind of support. I am not so sure they are getting all of it, but I am going to pay even more attention to LACOE in the greater Los Angeles area to ensure that they are providing the kinds of services that strengthen Head Start and do the kind of outreach in the communities to make sure that our families know the availability of the Head Start programs.

I believe that Head Start has been one of the most significant programs of the overall poverty program, and I am one of its greatest supporters.

THIS HOUSE IS NOT IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, this Chamber is going in the wrong direction in the effort to combat the BDS movement, to combat anti-Israel hate, to combat anti-Semitism. I went through kindergarten through 12th grade, college, law school, 4 years of Active Duty. I never once experienced anti-Semitism. But now I hear countless stories all across our country and college campuses today. It is infiltrating American politics, college campuses, and the Halls of Congress.

We need to do something about it, not just send a strong message, which is important, but actually pass something with teeth to do something about it.

One of my colleagues from Michigan gave a talk last Friday, gave an interview. She was asked about her support for a one-state solution that would remove Jews from power in their own country, in Israel. Her response was that the Holocaust gives her a calming feeling because of the safe haven that the Palestinians provided to Jews.

Now, that happens to be the opposite of factually accurate. But then, if you have any problem with those words, that makes you automatically an Islamophobe and a racist idiot, according to the person who had said that.

Then the Speaker of the House is calling for us to come to the floor and apologize to Ms. Tlaib.

Well, here I am. My apology is for everyone who is insulted across America.
that we passed a watered-down, spineless resolution, after countless acts of anti-Semitism by another Member, that does not name names.

I apologize to everyone across this country expecting this House to act. We feel the pain of the families of those who passed away.

The students at the University of California who had to read the posting: “Gasm them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew.”

The founder of BDS was blatantly anti-Semitic. Take his own words: “No Palestinian—rational Palestinian, not a sellout Palestinian—will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine.”

Or this other quote: “We are witnessing the rapid demise of Zionism, and nothing can be done to save it, for Zionism is intent on killing itself. I, for one, support euthanasia.”

Or we could take this quote: “Many of the methods of collective and individual ‘punishment’ meted out to Palestinian civilians at the hands of young, racist, often sadistic and ever impervious Israeli soldiers...are reminiscent of common Nazi practices against the Jews.” This is the founder of the BDS movement.

You can even googlize, Madam Speaker? Well, how about the students at Berkeley who sit in the classroom and the maps that go up on the board? Where it is supposed to say Israel, it says Palestine. Uh, the students in Michigan whose professor refused to sign off on a letter of recommendation because the student wanted to study abroad in Israel.

This past Thursday, we had an imam give the opening prayer here before this Chamber. This imam—a simple Google search, by the way, in the vetting would have come up with the background, and it is a long list—is not just a supporter of the BDS movement, but has compared the Israelis to the Nazis and has called for a third Palestinian intifada, and posted in support of the Muslim Brotherhood.

We failed them.

We have Members of this Chamber who have associated themselves with Farrakhan, not just Tamika Mallory.

I mentioned Linda Sarsour. She said: “Only Jews...are the ones that have done violence against Arabs and are cool with mosques being attacked.”

We have an issue in this Chamber, and we need to do something about it, not mask it, not empower it, not elevate it. It must be identified and crushed.

And no, Madam Speaker, I am not coming to this floor and apologizing to my colleagues who push it. I will apologize to everyone across this country offended by the lack of action by the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, your House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF R. NORMAN FRANCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to mourn the passing of Norman Franck, a fire police officer and member of the Willow Street Fire Company.

After responding to a crash this past weekend, Norman fell ill and then passed away at Lancaster General Hospital. It was a tremendous loss to our community and, certainly, even more so to his wife, Marian.

Today, we remember her in our thoughts and prayers and wish her comfort and peace in this time of mourning.

Norman will be remembered as a giving man, described by Willow Street Fire Company Chief Craig Rhineer as someone who would do anything for you. Norman, by the way, was also considered an authority on the history of the Willow Street Fire Company.

He lived a life in service to the community, as a member of the fire service and ambulance company since the 1960s. When he moved to Maryland, he served there, and then Michael’s Volunteer Fire Company. Then, after returning to Lancaster County, he resumed his service once again at the Willow Street Fire Company.

Even at age 81, Norman still selflessly served his community. His spirit of volunteerism, his spirit of giving, should be an example for us all.

We thank him for his years of service.

Madam Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in keeping his family and the members of Willow Street Fire Company in our prayers.

Madam Speaker, members of our volunteer fire companies are true heroes. Today, we honor Norman Franck, a hero who served in my community.

HOLD POLLUTERS ACCOUNTABLE FOR PFAS CONTAMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to shed light on PFAS contamination, a crisis affecting water systems that serve upward of 19 million people across our great country.

For decades, manufacturing companies have known that these chemicals are extremely hazardous to human health, have actively taken steps to bury unfavorable research, and have used false uncertainty to fight off regulations that could help ensure public safety.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2570, the PFAS User Fee Act, to hold chemical manufacturers financially accountable for their role in this contamination crisis. These manufacturers must take responsibility for their role in this crisis and contribute to the solution.

Congress must finally hold these polluters accountable for the harm they continue to cause. The safety of our water systems and the air we breathe is at stake.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Church, Milner, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our most kind, gracious Heavenly Father, we come to You in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ. We lift this body up to You because You admonish us to pray for kings and for all who are in authority.

I, first and foremost, lift up their spiritual lives to You, realizing we are
a spirit that has a soul, housed in a body. May each Member have spiritual peace.

I also pray for each Member relationally. The Scripture admonishes for leaders to lead a peaceable life. May the blessing of peace rest on their homes.

Lastly, I pray for them physically. Would You grant strength, health, and wisdom to each one. Lord, may every Member realize You have placed them here and acknowledge their ultimate accountability is to You.

Lord, I thank You for this great opportunity, and I pray this prayer in the name above every name, the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TAKANO 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.

WELCOMING DR. BENNY TATE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Benny Tate, whose leadership and guidance have made him an incredibly valuable member of his community in Milner, Georgia, and our Third District.

Dr. Tate has been the senior pastor of Rock Springs Church in Milner for over 25 years. In that time, when it started as a church of just 60, it has now grown to a church of over 6,000.

Through this work, Dr. Tate has also shepherded the creation of several ministries, including the Rock Springs Medical Clinic, the Rock Springs Christian Academy, the Potter’s House for Women, and Impact Christian Ministries for the homeless.

Benny has been married to his wife, Barbara, for over 30 years, and they have one daughter, Savannah Abigail, who is here with him today.

I want to commend Dr. Tate for his commitment to our community. There is not a week that goes by where he isn’t a welcoming part of the Third District of Georgia.

The grace and love he has shown to his parishioners and neighbors throughout his 25 years in Milner is unparalleled, and I am truly honored to have Dr. Benny Tate here with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WE THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, “We the People” is a bold opening statement enshrined in our Constitution. Yet, the truth is that in most parts of our country, LGBTQ Americans are not included in “We the People.”

Students in Arizona should go to school free from fear and bullying. Workers in Texas should not be afraid of being fired because of who they are. Renters in Mississippi should not be evicted because of who they love. No person, no matter where they live in America, should face discrimination. Equality should not depend on the ZIP Code where you live. It is time to make equality for LGBTQ people the law of the land and to ensure that we, too, are part of “We the People.”

I urge my colleagues to be on the right side of history and to vote “yes” on the Equality Act.

UMITA WILL HELP STATE AND LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as the national conversation revolves around infrastructure this week, I would like to highlight H.R. 300, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, or UMITA, which I introduced with my Democratic colleague, Representative CUELLAR.

UMITA will further our goal of renewing our country’s infrastructure by making sure that overly burdensome Federal regulations don’t hinder progress on State and local levels.

State and local governments shoulder the greatest cost of infrastructure projects, and any Federal legislation to assist their efforts must account for costs of regulatory compliance. Every dollar spent on compliance with burdensome mandates is less money for the projects States and localities need.

UMITA passed with a bipartisan vote in the last Congress and I call for it to be included in any comprehensive infrastructure legislation considered in this body.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLIMATE RESILIENCY & READINESS ACT

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, climate change is a major threat to our national security; and military leaders agree.

Last year, the Department of Defense studied 79 mission-critical bases and found that climate change threatened most of them. In the past year alone, three of our military installations suffered significant damage from natural disasters, and they are still not fully recovered.

It is clear that the scale of this challenge is great. That is why today I am introducing the Department of Defense Climate Resiliency and Readiness Act to help tackle this challenge.

By setting clear goals and ensuring regular dedicated resources, my bill gives military leaders the tools and flexibility to implement policies that work best for their missions. We will also ensure the DOD budgets for resilience and maintains a focus on cutting-edge technologies like hybrid microgrids and additive manufacturing.

As one of the world’s largest energy consumers, DOD can offer invaluable leadership toward addressing the global climate challenge, while bolstering U.S. national security; and that starts today.

WORK IN A BIPARTISAN WAY TO DEFEAT RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, by expanding American energy, expelling diplomats, and ensuring that the United States takes its position in the world, President Trump has been tougher on Russia than any President in a generation.

But the fact remains that the Russian military attacked the U.S. election. And so it would seem reasonable that, along with the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the CIA, we would want the United States military offering the full suite of capabilities, both offensive and defensive, to combat Russian election interference.

Today, the House Armed Services Committee held a classified briefing on the U.S. military and their participation in this critical mission. I was deeply disappointed in what I learned.

The U.S. military is not sufficiently engaged or informed on critical aspects of the Russian election interference campaign. They don’t even know which two Florida counties were hacked.

And when DOD sent 11 people to go work with the Department of Homeland Security to have the full suite of
Democrats have packaged these bills from delaying the entry of generic drugs to the market fast and to revise and extend her remarks.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, today I rise to highlight the struggle that rail commuters in New Jersey’s Seventh District face each day.

Public transportation is vital to my State, where twice as many of us depend on it than the national average.

Right now, though, the 23,000 people who rely on the main rail line that cuts through the heart of my district, the Raritan Valley Line, are the only commuters in northern New Jersey without one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours. To get to New York, they must transfer to Newark, adding at least 25 minutes to their commutes.

Now you might ask, why am I bringing this local issue to the House? Why can’t New Jersey solve it by itself?

Well, I will tell you why. Because every rail passenger trying to get to work along this economic corridor that is so vital, not just to my State, but to the economy of the United States, must squeeze through a crumbling, 110-year-old bottleneck of a tunnel under the Hudson River that is owned and operated by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government won’t fix it.

The Raritan Valley Line Mayor’s Alliance, representing over 30 mayors, has been working to get one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours.

We need to do our part by passing an infrastructure bill this year that will fund the Gateway tunnel.

HEALTHCARE PRICES

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Payment Commission Data Act, which would make prescription drug prices more transparent, and the BLOCKING Act, which would prevent States from offering lower cost healthcare plans.

Democrats want to increase ObamaCare enrollment regardless of cost, but ObamaCare is not affordable for many Americans. The average monthly premium for a family of four is over $500 per month for New Jerseyans to cut housing and child care so they can pay skyrocketing premiums. It is not a solution. We must take immediate action to allow States to promote choices and affordability.

HIGHLIGHTING THE STRUGGLE OF RAIL COMMUTERS IN NEW JERSEY’S SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, today I rise to highlight the struggle that rail commuters in New Jersey’s Seventh District face each day.

Public transportation is vital to my State, where twice as many of us depend on it than the national average.

Right now, though, the 23,000 people who rely on the main rail line that cuts through the heart of my district, the Raritan Valley Line, are the only commuters in northern New Jersey without one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours. To get to New York, they must transfer to Newark, adding at least 25 minutes to their commutes.

Now you might ask, why am I bringing this local issue to the House? Why can’t New Jersey solve it by itself?

Well, I will tell you why. Because every rail passenger trying to get to work along this economic corridor that is so vital, not just to my State, but to the economy of the United States, must squeeze through a crumbling, 110-year-old bottleneck of a tunnel under the Hudson River that is owned and operated by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government won’t fix it.

The Raritan Valley Line Mayor’s Alliance, representing over 30 mayors, has been working to get one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours.

We need to do our part by passing an infrastructure bill this year that will fund the Gateway tunnel.

BLUE WATER NAVY VETERANS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 299, the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019. This long overdue legislation would finally provide disability benefits to veterans who served in the territorial seas surrounding Vietnam during the Vietnam war and were exposed to Agent Orange.

This change is long overdue but, sadly, thousands of brave Vietnam veterans have already suffered the consequences of Agent Orange-related illnesses.

A longtime resident of Media, Pennsylvania, John Bury, was a 22-year veteran of the Navy and a legendary advocate for sailors sickened by Agent Orange. He, himself, survived cancer six times related to Agent Orange, and knew firsthand the challenges of navigating the VA due to his service being on ships, rather than land.

John passed away in late 2016, but his memory and service will live on. Sailors like John are heroes and deserve to be treated as such by the VA.

I urge the Senate to quickly take up this legislation and send it to the President’s desk so that thousands of others like John can get the care they deserve.

GUN SHOPS SHOULD MEET MINIMUM SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, across our Nation, we face an epidemic. In schools, in churches, on our streets, Americans are dying from gun violence.

We have a moral responsibility to do everything in our power to prevent more people from suffering the loss of a loved one to the scourge of illegal guns. That is why I have introduced the Gun Theft Prevention Act.

Last year, more than 500 gun shops were burglarized nationwide, releasing thousands of deadly weapons onto our streets and into the hands of criminals. In my district, a single gun shop was broken into twice in the same week, seven times in the span of a decade.

Yet licensed gun dealers are not required to take even the most basic precautions, like locking their doors at night, to prevent these dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

My bill requires gun shops to meet minimum security requirements, like locked cabinets and video surveillance, creates strong enforcement mechanisms, requires reporting of stolen guns, and authorizes 650 new ATF inspectors.

This is commonsense legislation that will save lives, and I will work tirelessly to ensure its passage.

PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

(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. Today is Peace Officers Memorial Day, when we pay tribute to local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers who serve and protect our communities.

Today is an extra special day for one of my constituents and his family: Sugarcreek Police Sergeant Anthony Gorman, who was shot April 4, 1997, while investigating a suspicious car in a parking lot in Franklin, Pennsylvania. He never fully recovered from his injuries.

In October of 2014, Sergeant Gorman died at the age of 72, more than 17 years after that initial gunshot. While his death was a direct consequence of the 1997 shooting, a doctor listed his cause of death as natural, which prevented him from being honored at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

His son, Christopher, then embarked on a mission to have his dad’s name
memorialized. After years of research, petitions, and advocacy, it is now en-graved at the East Pathway of Remem-brance at section 25, line 31.

Sergeant Gorman’s family was here this week for the candlelight vigil held Monday on The Mall, and thanks to Christopher Gorman’s determination, his dad’s name is finally where he be-longs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communica-tion from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


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

Dear Madam Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representa-tives, the Clerk received the following mes-sage from the Secretary of the Senate on May 15, 2019, at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1231.

That the Senate passed S. 1490.

Appointment:
The Senate National Security Working Group.

With best wishes, I am, Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIR-MATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 987, MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 377

Resolved, That upon adoption of this reso-lution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit дискримина-tion on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other pur-poses. All points of order against consider-ation of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The amendment, and all further amendments thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking mi-nority member of the Committee on the Ju-diciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consider-ation of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recom-mended by the Committee on Natural Re-sources now printed in the bill shall be con-sidered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking mi-nority member of the Committee on the Ju-diciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentle-woman from Pennsylvania is recog-nized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentle-woman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yield-ed is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-bers be given 5 legislative days to re-visit and extend the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle-woman from Pennsylvania?

There is no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 377, providing for consideration of H.R. 5 under a closed rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution also provides for con-sideration of H.R. 312 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Lastly, this resolution provides for con-sideration of H.R. 987 under a struc-tured rule, with 90 minutes of general debate, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislation: H.R. 987, H.R. 312, and H.R. 5.

H.R. 987 is the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, a package of several bills, many of them bipartisan, that went through the House Energy and Com-merce Committee under regular order. This bill combines three key bills to lower drug costs by promoting generic competition, and four key key to strengthen healthcare, reverse the sab-otage of the ACA by this administra-tion’s efforts to promote junk plans that lack the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The American people are justifiably demanding action by Congress to make prescription drugs more affordable. Prices are so high that recent data show 24 percent of Americans didn’t fill a prescription in the past year due to high costs.

My constituents have been vocal in demanding action on drug pricing, pa-tients like Bill, a senior with diabetes who pays $2,000 a month for insulin, like Sarah with children who have special health needs. Folks like these need help now.

This package would lower costs by banning anticompetitive practices that large drug companies employ to keep generics off the market.

This bill will also tackle many of the reasons we have seen enrollment
through the Affordable Care Act decline in recent years.

Since coming into office, President Trump has cut paid advertising and outreach efforts for healthcare exchanges by 90 percent. This wanton political decision to cut these efforts is but one part of the administration’s attempts to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, lack of transparency on the part of Health and Human Services around funding levels for outreach plan enrollment rates and other vital statistics has created an information vacuum on the performance of the ACA.

Greater transparency is required in order for Congress to hold the administration accountable for its efforts to defund education and outreach for the Affordable Care Act.

Second, we have H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This important bill recognizes and respects the Tribal sovereignty of the Mashpee Wampanoag, a Tribe that has inhabited New England for over 12,000 years and, in fact, welcomed the Pilgrims to the new world.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support in Massachusetts among other Tribal nations and with Tribal allies in Congress, and President Trump not tweeted about this bill last week, it would have likely passed on suspension and been sent to the Senate for consideration. The members of this Tribe cannot wait any longer for recognition, and we need to pass this critical legislation without further delay.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this is a week that will be remembered in our history books because, at long last, this body is taking up consideration of the Equality Act. Forty-five years ago this week, the legendary Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced the first version of the Equality Act, a bill that has always championed New England.

This version of the Equality Act that we consider today is the result of years of careful legislative drafting and amends existing civil rights laws to provide protection from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in key areas of public life: employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and justice services.

Additionally, the Equality Act updates the public spaces and services covered in current law to include retail stores, services such as banks, legal services, and medical institutions. These important updates will strengthen existing protections for everyone.

The journey to this final version of the Equality Act was led by a man who is a hero in my own mind — the co-chair of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island.

It is also important to note what the Equality Act does not do. The Equality Act does not impinge on religious liberty. Religious liberty is a cornerstone value of our Constitution and our country. Religious organizations are able to provide faith-based services and accommodate their version of morality in hiring for religious positions such as ministers, rabbis, or schoolteachers. The Equality Act does nothing to change that.

The Equality Act clarifies what has long been held, though, that religious freedom does not encompass a person’s right to discriminate based on sexual orientation and gender identity in civil rights protections. Instead, the Act accomplishes this by adding protections for LGBTQ people against discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations.

Rarely have Congress have the chance to take up legislation so clearly supported by our constituents. That is probably why, since the day that Congressman CICILLINE first introduced this version of the Equality Act in 2015, it has always earned bipartisan support and currently has Republican cosponsors in both the House and the Senate.

The clear majority of both this Chamber and the American people recognize that, for far too long, LGBTQ people have faced discrimination with no Federal legal recourse. It is beyond dispute that LGBTQ people, especially transgender people and especially transgender women of color, face discrimination across this country.

This is a personal issue for me. It has been personal since my baby sister came out to me about 40 years ago.

For many people in this country, that is when the fight hits home. It gets personal when someone you love is the target of discrimination. And you know and value that person, and you will do whatever you can to make sure that your loved one can live life to the fullest, free from hate and discrimination.

I am sad to say that my home in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the 30 States that defies the will of its people by not having legal protections for LGBTQ people. The idea that my sister, someone who put her life on the line for our country when she served in the armed forces, could drive across State lines and lose protections is heartbreaking.

The Equality Act ends the patchwork of State laws and creates uniform national protections. LGBTQ people won’t have to worry that being transferred to another State by their employer or needing to move home to take care of ailing parents will cause them to lose civil rights protections. From sea to shining sea, LGBTQ people will have hope for stability that comes from knowing that if they face discrimination, they have legal recourse.

The protections provided by the Equality Act give LGBTQ people an equal chance at the American Dream. While discrimination and rejection have ended the lives of too many transgender people, many are succumbing to this sense of isolation and despair.

In Pennsylvania, Dr. Rachel Levine, a transgender woman, serves in the Governor’s cabinet as secretary for health. Mara Keisling, a Pennsylvania native, is the founder and executive director of the National Gay & Lesbian Taskforce’s National Equality Campaign. These injuries compound and lead to poverty, homelessness, and violence.

The impact is felt hardest by transgender women of color, who confront racial discrimination, sex discrimination, and gender identity discrimination. The intersection of these forms of discrimination can even be deadly, as it was for Shantee Tucker, a transgender woman of color from Philadelphia who was murdered last fall.

The protections provided by the Equality Act give LGBTQ people an equal chance at the American Dream. While discrimination and rejection have ended the lives of too many transgender people, many are succumbing to this sense of isolation and despair.
the over-incarceration of transgender people. The list goes on and on. I am proud that the House will finally act to provide Federal protections to LGBTQ people with passage of the Equality Act. The fight for equal rights is far from over, but I am proud to be a Member of this majority that will provide equal treatment for all of its citizens, regardless of whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We, Madam Speaker, are here today on three very different pieces of legislation, which, unfortunately, makes this a complicated rule. One of our bills concerns civil rights, one concerns health care, and one concerns Native Americans. I will move through each of these bills relatively quickly, and then I want to address the process we followed to get here today.

The first bill, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5, is a complicated and complex piece of legislation that would make sweeping changes to our Nation's civil rights laws, if enacted. In general, the bill adds the terms “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” to the list of protected classes under the Civil Rights Act, joining classes like race, gender, religion, and national origin.

As I noted in our hearing yesterday, most Republicans in the House will oppose this bill not because we do not believe that all people should receive equal treatment under the law but because we have real concerns about how this bill will work in practice. A term like “gender identity” has such a vague definition that even proponents of the bill do not agree on exactly what the term means.

That should cause legislators to be especially thoughtful and provide clarity about what the term means and how the law will be applied. But we have not done so here. Republicans have raised numerous questions about how this bill will work in practice. Will female athletes in junior high, high school, and college be forced to compete in women's athletics against competitors who were born biologically male? Will female students be forced to share vulnerable same-sex spaces like locker rooms and dressing rooms with other individuals who were born biologically male? And since the legislation appears to allow people to define their own gender identity, will it allow people to contest who they were born as back and forth between gender as it suits them?

These are not rhetorical questions. They are real concerns that we have raised, with good reason, throughout the process. H.R. 5 is known as the Equality Act, and I know every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat, agrees with the principle that all people should be treated equally under the law. But even as we strive toward that goal, when we are dealing with legislation of this magnitude, we must consider how the bill will work in practice.

Unfortunately, I don't think my friends in the majority have clear answers to very legitimate questions. Last night, during debate at the Rules Committee, our concerns were dismissed as we were told that the courts and administrative bureaucrats would sort out these issues. That is simply unacceptable.

Why would we want any ambiguity when it comes to a person’s civil rights? We should be very clear about congressional intent, and the only way to do that is to write a law the way you intend for it to be carried out. Sadly, this bill falls well short of that certainty.

The second bill, H.R. 987, is actually seven bills: three genuinely bipartisan bills addressing drug costs and four partisan and controversial bills addressing ObamaCare.

As I pointed out last night in our hearing, I don’t particularly understand what the majority is trying to accomplish with these bills that are all bipartisan that could easily progress to becoming law. I am even a cosponsor of one of those bills. Yet, I have to vote against the entire package because I do not support the partisan and controversial bills attached by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, at some point, the majority needs to decide if they are here to score political points or if they are here to govern. If they want to continue scoring rhetorical victories, then by all means, they should keep doing what they are doing, keep putting up partisan bills that won’t go anywhere in the Senate and won’t be signed into law, keep putting up messaging bills that aren’t going to their primary voters, and keep spending their days engaged in show votes that won’t ever improve the lives of those they were elected to represent.

If they want to govern for the American people, then the majority must move forward with real legislation that can get real support here, in the Senate, and at the White House.

We had the chance to do that with this package. The majority chose not to do so. I think that is a real missed opportunity for us, both as an institution and as a country.

Finally, the third bill, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, is a matter I want to discuss at some length because I think there has been, frankly, a lot of misinformation put out about this particular piece of legislation.

The Mashpee Wampanoag is a federally recognized Tribe based in Mashpee, Massachusetts. H.R. 312 would simply reaffirm the taking of land into trust for the benefit of this Tribe.

When the Federal Government takes land into trust for a Tribe, it is reserving that land for the benefit of the Tribe and Tribal members both now and into the future. It ensures that the Tribes have a home, that they have a stable place to build communities and to marshal their resources and conduct business. It ensures that the land that was promised to Tribes, in many cases for many centuries, remains in Tribal hands.

Holding land in trust is a commitment made to Tribes by the Federal Government. It also means that the majority needs to decide if they are going to be able to exercise sovereignty over their own land. That is really all this issue is about today, whether or not the Mashpee Wampanoag will be able to exercise their own sovereignty over their own land.

Unfortunately, some who oppose this bill are doing so because they are viewing this issue through a purely political lens rather than what our own Constitution says about Tribal sovereignty. This isn’t a particular use for the land, and it isn’t a bill about particular Members of this institution or the Senate. Instead, this is a bill about keeping Federal promises to Tribes.

The majority hasn’t always kept those promises, and we have an opportunity today to step up and make clear that regardless of what happened in the past, today, the Federal Government keeps its promises to Tribes, no ifs, ands, or buts.

Before I close, I would like to make a couple of points about the process this week, particularly on the Equality Act and the healthcare issue.

On the Equality Act, 35 amendments were proposed. I thought that many, if not most, of these should have been considered on the floor. Yet, in the final rule, not one amendment was made in order, and we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

The majority is choosing not to make in order many amendments that deserve our consideration on the floor, like Ms. HOLMES NORTON’s amendment to clarify that Washington, D.C., residents cannot be excluded or disqualified from jury service based on sexual orientation or gender identity, or the bipartisan amendment that would restore the application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to this bill, or Representative JOHNSON’s common sense amendment clarifying that nothing in the act should be construed as to deny parents the right to be involved in their minor child’s medical care. These are all deserving amendments that should have been heard on the floor, and yet the majority chose to make precisely none in order.

On H.R. 987, the majority went in a different direction. In total, 51 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, and 15 of those were sponsored by Republicans. Yet with today’s rule 27 amendments were made in order, but just one amendment was made in order that was sponsored by a Republican, along with one bipartisan
manager’s amendment—one out of 15. All the remaining amendments, 92 percent of those made in order, were sponsored solely by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I think we can do better than that.

Last week, I reminded the House that when my party was in charge of the last Congress, we went out of our way to make minority and bipartisan amendments in order. Forty-five percent of all amendments made in order were solely sponsored by Democrats, while a further 17 percent were bipartisan.

As of today’s rule, the stats are looking much worse for the current majority. Seventy-three percent of all amendments made in order are solely sponsored by Democrats through May 14. Thirteen percent are bipartisan. Just 14 percent were sponsored by Republicans.

We had an opportunity today, particularly on H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, to take steps toward remedying this issue.

I must continue to encourage my good friend, and he is my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to work to make more bipartisan and minority amendments in order and to ensure that all Members, regardless of party, have an opportunity to be heard on the floor, as he has often promised.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time. □ 1245

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would just note that, with respect to H.R. 5, we had regular order. H.R. 5, the Equality Act, went through the Committee on the Judiciary. It had a markup in committee of a very good markup. Only four amendments were considered, none were accepted, and, frankly, a number of Members seeking recognition for amendments were not recognized. So to think that this was anything other than a train moving through a station, I think, is to mischaracterize how that particular markup worked.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Bungoess), my very good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and also a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I imagine my surprise this morning checking the email and the Health 202, an email put out by The Washington Post—The Washington Post, for crying out loud—and here is the headline: “Democrats Are Pushing Bipartisan Health Care Reform.” They go on to say: “ObamaCare threatens even the most bipartisan healthcare efforts on Capitol Hill.”

What a strange turn of events. So here we have a rule today that will allow a bill to be brought to the floor where the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, I am on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as the Rules Committee, so I am on the oldest and second oldest committees in the United States House of Representatives. We worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the BLOCKING Act, the CREATES Act, and the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act would deliver drug pricing solutions to Americans.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that keeps the three drug pricing policies—a savings of some $5 billion from those policies—to pay for bipartisan public health priorities. I also introduced the standalone bill, H.R. 2700, if you are keeping score at home. This is the Lowering Prescription Drug Costs and Extending Community Health Centers and Other Public Health Priorities Act. H.R. 2700 couples the bipartisan drug pricing policies with reauthorization of programs such as community health centers, special diabetes programs, and the National Health Service Corps.

Every Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a co-sponsor of H.R. 2700, signifying the broad Republican support for both the drug pricing and the public health priorities.

Look, it is pretty clear: You can say that it is more important to have a navigated program that would never pass through cost benefit analysis, you can say it is more important to have an earmark for the State of New Jersey to set up an ObamaCare exchange; or you can say it is more important to reauthorize Community Health Centers.

These reauthorizations, again, take a substantial amount of time. The clock is ticking, and we should act as soon as possible.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

So maybe it is just me. You know, I am still suffering from trauma, having served in the minority under my Republican friends for 8 years where, routinely, we were given a process where we were almost always shut out.

In the last Congress, we had a record-breaking 103 closed rules on major bills—completely closed. You can’t amend it. And they talk about all the amendments they made in order, but they don’t talk about the thousands they did not make in order.

Now, look, I don’t want them to feel the same way that I did in the minority. I want them to not have to go through the trauma that so many of us went through where we were routinely shut out. And that is why, when we came up with the Rules package, we did things like required that bills had to have hearings in committees of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee, that they had to have markups in the committee of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee.

I mean, they routinely brought legislation to the floor where committees of jurisdiction never had a hearing, never had a markup. They mysteriously appeared. They would come to the Rules Committee; they would get a closed rule; and then we were forced to vote up or down on it.

So I don’t really appreciate being lectured on process. Yes, we need to do better, and, yes, I understand that my
Republican friends want more amendments in order, but let’s not forget why we are here today. We are here to pass a historic civil rights bill. We are here to pass the Equality Act. When I look at the amendments that were right in the Rules Committee amendment after amendment, it would target trans Americans and carve out ways for discrimination to continue. This is on a bill that is meant to eliminate discrimination. They were trying to enshrine discrimination. They were trying to enshrine the Civil Rights Act. And, quite frankly, I think most of us felt: You know what? We are not going to allow that to happen. That is not an appropriate use of the rules of the House, to try to take away the rights of people in this country, to try to allow discrimination to continue.

We believe too strongly in the ideals of the Civil Rights Act to risk letting it be transformed into another weapon for discrimination. In my view, we listened to groups like the National Urban League, the National Action Network, the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and others that asked us to give this bill a straight up-or-down vote.

And let’s be clear, Madam Speaker, a good process is about more than just amendments, as I mentioned. This bill had a hearing, and it had a markup. On the healthcare bill that we are going to deal with, it is about lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle spent what seemed like an eternity trying to rip away healthcare protections for people. I mean, bringing up one bill after another to the floor that never went through regular order, that would literally take away protections from people with pre-existing conditions.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, they did nothing to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Then we had an election in November, and the big issue was healthcare. People didn’t want to have their healthcare protections ripped away. And, again, they are converts, and they say they want to protect people’s healthcare and expand healthcare protections.

The bottom line is this: We are not perfect all the time, and we need to do better, but I believe that we are improving the process. I look forward to working with the gentleman, the ranking member from Oklahoma, to try to find ways forward.

But on the legislation here today that we are going to consider, this is important legislation. This is historic legislation. Quite frankly, every Member of this House who wants to end discrimination in this country ought to support the Equality Act, and every Member of this House who wants to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs ought to support that bill as well.

Madam Speaker, with that, I thank the gentlelady from Ohio.

Mr. Cole. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for just a few minutes to respond to my good friend, the chairman. I want to tell you, there is nobody I hold in higher regard in the House than Chairman McGovern, nobody I consider a better personal friend, nobody I consider a more responsible Member.

On this, we disagree. The gentleman is right, neither side is perfect. In this case, we are going to bring attention to this amendment issue until we see results. That is precisely what my friend did when he was in the minority, and there are some times we should have listened to him and we did not.

In this case, I think an ambush is so egregious that we are going to continue to make that case until we see a change. Maybe we won’t. Hopefully we will, because I know my friend approaches this with good intentions.

Secondly, I say this bill was so important, the Equality Act, it ought to have amendments. That is the point. That is how you build consensus. I think they are missing the opportunity to get a lot of people who would support the basic concept that they are trying to advance.

And, finally, on the drug bill, I have just got to be honest with you. When they had a chance to pass something that would work and chose to bundle it with something that they knew couldn’t pass, that makes me wonder how serious they are about dealing with that problem.

But, hopefully, we will get an opportunity to deal with that again. And that is an area we can work together on. We have provided it in committee.

So, with that, I look forward to continuing to work with my good friend, the chairman. I know that we will occasionally have differences. That is what this is all about. We will work those differences out.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. Hartzler), my very good friend, who is a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. Hartzler. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation, H.R. 5.

Contrary to what has just been said on the floor, this bill does not end discrimination. In fact, the Equality Act imposes top-down, government-led discrimination against all Americans who hold a differing view of human sexuality and gender.

This grossly misnamed bill punishes everyday citizens, silences free speech and viewpoint disagreements, and discriminates against people of faith. In reality, this bill should be called the women’s inequality act.

The policies of H.R. 5 have already been used to trample female athletics, eliminate safe spaces for women, harm children, terminate parental rights, and undermine the free exercise of religious freedom.

The legislation also provides for a universal right to abortion, compromises taxpayers’ safeguards against funding abortion, and eliminates conscience protections for healthcare providers that do not want to participate in an abortion.

As a former track coach, I am deeply committed to providing women and girls with a level playing field. Title IX, however, becomes irrelevant under the women’s inequality act.

Vulnerable women seeking haven in homeless women’s shelters will be re-victimized under H.R. 5. This is already happening.

In California, women who were sexually harassed in the shower by a biological male were threatened with expulsion from the women’s shelter.

In Alaska, a women’s shelter is being sued for sending a transitioning individual to the hospital instead of letting him sleep 3 feet away from rape victims.

This is absurd. Under H.R. 5, women-only spaces will be a thing of the past.

This bill also places children at risk of medical experimentation and bleak futures when they are given the right to hormone blockers and sex change operations.
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Most children, 98 percent of boys and 88 percent of girls, who question their gender identity will grow into their birth gender after passing through puberty.

Parents who dare to oppose doctors using off-label drugs that may sterilize their child, or performing life-altering surgical procedures, will be considered abusive and neglectful. This has already happened with an Ohio couple who lost custody of their daughter.

For the first time ever, H.R. 5 waives the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, enabling unhindered government discrimination against the faith community. It also actively prohibits the religious community from partnering with the Federal Government.

Catholic schools will no longer be able to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Jewish synagogues will lose Federal grant funding to protect against terror threats, and houses of worship will lose FEMA disaster aid unless—here is the catch—they abandon their core teachings on morality, marriage, and sexuality.

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

Mr. Cole. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. Hartzler. Madam Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle,
especially those who claim to be pro-
women and pro-children, need to stop this devastating legislation.

The future of women's rights, pri-
vacy, protection, and athletic potential depends on it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Recent years have brought extraordin-
dary progress in the fight for full equality for our LGBTQ community. Like millions of others across the country, I joined with friends and fam-
ily to celebrate Supreme Court rulings paving the way for same-sex couples to marry. But in the midst of these joyful and historic victories, we knew that the work was just beginning.

Though LGBTQ people could now get married, in a majority of States they could still be fired for having a picture of themselves or others on their desk or kicked out of their home just for being who they are. The fact is, LGBTQ people are still at risk of discrimination across key areas of life in huge swaths of our country.

Recent national surveys of LGBTQ people show that 42 percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people; and 78 per-
cent of transgender people have experi-
cenced discrimination or harassment on the job because of who they are.

One in three have experienced explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation and employment, housing and public accommodations, and only 20 States have such protections for gender identity.

The time to end this patchwork of protections once and for all is now, and to do that, we must pass this impor-
tant legislation.

The promotion of fairness and justice is a hallmark of who we are as Ameri-
cans, as women, as mothers, as care-

deevers. We also urge you to vote NO on any motion to recommit that may be offered to under-
mine the Equality Act (H.R. 5) and to urge you to vote YES on this groundbreaking legislation.

The bill’s provisions that would ensure that sex does not stand as a barrier to full participation in federally funded programs or activities will mean, for example, that a developer with a federal grant couldn’t dis-
criminate against women-owned businesses in its contracting. Women would also have new tools to challenge a police department’s systematically inadequate response to sex-
vical violence and intimate partner violence, if the police department received federal funds; and would be able to challenge denials of reproductive health care where a feder-
al-funded entity otherwise provides compara-
tive or comprehensive health care.

Discriminations and stigmatization are a critical step forward in advancing women’s equality in this country.

As a leading national women’s rights orga-
nization we also feel compelled to state emphatically that the Equality Act’s protec-
tions for transgender and gender noncon-
forming people in no way underwrite the rights or protections afforded to women and do not jeopardize women’s safety or their ability to participate fully or equally in our society.

Transgender women are women, and any at-
tempt to mischaracterize their gender iden-
tity or suggest that they are trying to “take advantage” of protected class status funda-
mentally misunderstands the reality of transgender people’s lives and experiences. Furthermore, it causes real harm to the more than one million Americans who iden-
tify as transgender, a population already subject to high rates of violence and abuse, negative mental and physical health out-
comes, and experiences with discrimination and stigmatization.

The Equality Act is a long-overdue step forward in extending civil rights protections to a population that has been left out. Establishing clear protections is critical at a time when vulnerable communities are
under attack. The Equality Act would provide a consistent, national standard and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live safely and with dignity, at work, to provide for one’s family and to thrive economically.

Sincerely,

National Partnership for Women & Families.


DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation’s largest organization working to achieve lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) equality, I write to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and against any Motion to Recommit. We will consider both key votes.

Everyone—including LGBTQ people—should have an opportunity to earn a living and provide a home for their families without fear of constant harassment or discrimination. The Equality Act would update our nation’s existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity, which would finally provide consistent non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people across key areas of life, including employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service. This would ensure LGBTQ people have access to the exact same protections as are currently provided under federal law based on other protected characteristics.

Currently, 30 states lack non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people. The patchwork nature of current laws leaves millions of people subject to uncertainty and potential discrimination that impacts their safety and their day-to-day lives. In fact, two-thirds of LGBTQ Americans report having experienced discrimination. The Equality Act would provide a nationwide standard for non-discrimination protections.

The Equality Act has unprecedented support. More than 200 major corporations have endorsed the legislation, as well as more than 40 trade associations including U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Social Workers. Recent polling finds that a growing majority of Americans—including Republicans, Democrats and Independents—support LGBTQ non-discrimination protections.

A recent survey by PRRI found that nearly seven in 10 Americans support laws like the Equality Act, including that the federal government cannot remain silent in the face of continued discrimination. The Equality Act extends protections based on sexual orientation or gender identity in employment, housing, access to public places, federal funding, credit education, and jury services.

The Equality Act would provide a national standard for non-discrimination protections. The Equality Act is long overdue legislation that provides a national approach for ensuring the protection of the provisions of core civil rights statutes e.g. the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, etc., even as legislators pursue amendments to those statutes to add additional protections against discrimination. We stand in solidarity and support with our partners and colleagues in the LGBTQ movement to ensure that these protections are extended. We have but also collectively agreed that these efforts must not result in weakening or diluting protections and provisions of other civil rights statutes, each of which represents the powerful and unrelenting demand of civil rights activists and leaders—often at risk to their own lives. While we have been gratified during our conversations with House and Senate committee leaders and bill sponsors, we reiterate this as one such importance that we are memorializing by this letter the understanding we have shared in our conversations for efforts that may arise by individual legislation during the process of advancing these bills.

The reasons for our caution and concern are, no doubt, evident to you. The current environment is one in which we have seen alarming animus and hostility to various ethnic and minority groups, as well as legal challenges to what were once regarded as unassailable civil rights standards. Without question we are confronting a concerted and unremitting effort to chip away and eviscerate existing civil rights protections. This means that there are present dangers in opening any civil rights statutes to legislative debate and review. Thus, the efforts currently underway to extend anti-discrimination protection in our core civil rights statutes, must not be advanced without the clear and explicit agreement among sponsors, committee leadership and party leadership that proposed amendments to our civil rights statutes will be withdrawn should efforts be introduced to weaken or diminish the existing provisions.

Bills which are of immediate concern include, The Equality Act and the American Housing and Mobility Act; however, it is our understanding that that may change. Below is a list of some of the safeguards/guardrails we feel must be in place if/when legislation proposing to amend civil rights statutes is introduced. These safeguards/guardrails have been discussed and agreed to by civil right groups, as well as the current sponsors of the Equality Act. They include:

- Amendments to the bill may be tabled, and a strong statement of the entire coalition against any proposed changes to core Civil Rights statutes. This standard must be maintained; hearings, reports, testimony, etc.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that existing protections will be preserved. Written assurances from Sponsors that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced the bill will be pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

Written assurances from Sponsors that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced they will withdraw their introduction of the bill and work to have the bill pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

A demonstrated and shared understanding from party leadership and legislative sponsors of the ability to impact the process once legislation is introduced given current political dynamics, including an explanation of the procedural path for withdrawal if that becomes necessary.

Inclusion of Congressional Findings section in every bill.

Rollout strategies which include explicit statement(s) about need to preserve existing protections and intent to withdraw the bill if existing protections are threatened in any manner.

Continue to explore standalone legislation that does not amend the existing statute(s), showing this prove to be the safer course.

The history of civil rights in this country is one fraught with violence, hostility and long suffering. The fight for those rights continues to this day with resistance and opposition morphing and growing. As stewards of these critical laws, we all have a responsibility and obligation to ensure that the protections they embody are preserved. We therefore want to be clear and direct in expressing our insistence that any legislation proposing to amend legacy civil rights statutes which is permitted to move forward, do so ONLY when there is a commitment and agreement to do no harm to the existing statutes and where the safeguards/guardrails outlined in this letter are put in place.

Sincerely,

SHERRYLyn PIllL, President and Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
HILLARY O. SHELTON, Director, Washington Bureau/SVP for Advocacy and Policy, NAACP, Network.
REVEREND AL SHARPTON, President and Founder, National Action Network.

MELANIE L. CAMHELL,
President and CEO, National Coalition on Black Civic Participation.

MARK J. MONIAL, President and Chief Executive Officer, National Urban League.

KRISTEN CLARKE, President & Executive Director, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law.

VANITA GUPTA, President and CEO, Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, for nearly a decade, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans get the care they need. It has allowed millions of Americans to keep their kids on their own insurance plans, and it has protected millions and millions of Americans who are living with preexisting conditions, and that piece is so important.

It means to Americans living with cancer, living with heart disease, and living with diabetes can no longer be thrown off their plans or denied coverage simply because of their medical history.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, more than 5.4 million people depend on these protections to treat their asthma, to afford their insulin, and to receive treatments for other preexisting illnesses.

Madam Speaker, I promise these families that I will keep fighting to keep them healthy, which is why this week I am voting for the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act which will ban junk insurance plans that don't offer sufficient coverage, bring lower-priced generic prescription drugs to market more quickly, and invest in helping Americans sign up for healthcare.

That is what Democrats are focused on, moving forward, making sure seniors, veterans, and working families across our Nation have the healthcare they need. I hope the current administration will see this as an opportunity to work with our House majority in order to lower the cost of prescribed medications, and I hope Republicans in Congress will join us in our mission to keep working for the people and to make sure that every American can afford their prescription medications and their healthcare.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to urge opposition to the rule. The majority has proposed three different measures today, and while I am a supporter of the bill concerning Tribal rights, I am opposed to H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, and I regret that.

Quite frankly, had the process on these bills been different, I think the vote that we would see in this Chamber would be very different today. I think, literally, a more fulsome and more open process and amendments on H.R. 5 might have unlocked dozens of additional votes for that legislation.

I think with H.R. 987 we don’t have to speculate. We know three of those bills passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support, all of them dealing with drug prices. That was an easy vote. We could have moved that through.

My friends could have still brought the other four matters that they cared about under a rule, brought it to the floor. They have got the votes to move it. It would have precisely the same prospects of success it is going to have in the United States Senate.

The President has already made it clear, since he issued a statement, that he is not going to veto it if it is lame-duck. There is the opportunity for the President to see we can make it to his desk. So why in the world we threw away an opportunity to do something good for the American people in an area where we agree, in order to advance something that we know cannot become law, is mystifying to me, to say the least.

Again, H.R. 5 is well-intentioned and designed to expand civil rights, but it also adds a term with no clear definition to our civil rights laws without regard for how it will work in practice. H.R. 987 has four bills that are unacceptable, three bills that are eminently acceptable. I do want to close though on a positive note.

Madam Speaker, I do applaud my friends for bringing the Native American issue to fruition today. I am going to be opposing them on the rule but supporting them on that legislation. I think it was a very wise decision to put it under a rule, quite frankly, and I applaud my good friend Chairman Orgen-Jalva for working with my good friend Chairman McGovern and making sure that that happened. This important piece of legislation, which, quite frankly, is important not just to the Tribe in question, but establishes the principle that we won’t let land going into trust be taken out of trust, is very important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “yes” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I include in the Record a list of 364 organizations endorsing the Equality Act, as well as a list of companies supporting H.R. 5 who employ over 9.8 million workers in the United States.

EQUALITY ACT

364 ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE EQUALITY ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women; A Better Balance; ACRIA; ADAP Advocacy Association; Advocates for Youth; AFL-CIO; African American Ministers In Action; AIDS United; Alan and Leslie Chambers Foundation; American Association for Cancer Equity and Disease Control Association of University Women (AAUW); American Atheists; American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union; American Conference of Cantors.

American Counseling Association; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; American Medical Association; American Psychological Association; American Nurses Association; APALA (National Organization of Flight Attendants—CWA; Athlete Ally; Aurora Seminary; Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

BALM Ministries; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black and Pink; Campaign for Youth Justice; Caring Across Generations; Catholic Health Association; Center for American Progress; Center for Black Equity; Center for Inclusivity; Center for Inquiry; Center for LGBTQ and Gender Studies; CenterLink; The Children’s Defense Fund; Children Now; Change the World; Children’s Institute; Children’s Law Center—Civil Rights Clinic; Girls Inc.; GLMA; Health Professionals Advocating for LGBTQ Equality; Older Americans League; Metropolitan Community Churches; GLSEN; Guttmacher Institute; Hadasah, The Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

Community Access National Network (CANN); Consortium for Children; Council for Global Equality; DiversityUS; Disciples Justice Action Network; Disciples LGBTQ+ Alliance; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF); Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Equality Space; Faith in Public Life; Family Equality Council; Feminist Majority; The Fenway Institute.

FORGE, Inc.; Forward Together; Freedom Center for Social Justice; Freedom for All Americans; Freedom to Work; Gay Men’s Health Crisis (GMHC); Gender Spectrum; Generation Progress; Georgetown University Law Center—Civil Rights Clinic; Girls Inc.; GLMA; Health Professionals Advocating for LGBTQ Equality; Older Americans League; Metropolitan Community Churches; GLSEN; Guttmacher Institute; Hadasah, The Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

Community Access National Network (CANN); Consortium for Children; Council for Global Equality; DiversityUS; Disciples Justice Action Network; Disciples LGBTQ+ Alliance; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF); Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Equality Space; Faith in Public Life; Family Equality Council; Feminist Majority; The Fenway Institute.

Japanese American Citizens League; Jewish Women International; Justice in Aging; Keshet; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA); Lambda Legal; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; PHQ; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; PFLAG; League of United Latin American Citizens; Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medical Association (LGVMA); LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute; Main Street Alliance; MANA, A National Latina Organization; MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger; Men of Reform Judaism; Methodists Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; International Association of Providers of AIDS Care.

National American Citizens League; Jewish Women International; Justice in Aging; Keshet; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA); Lambda Legal; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; PHQ; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; PFLAG; League of United Latin American Citizens; Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medical Association (LGVMA); LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute; Main Street Alliance; MANA, A National Latina Organization; MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger; Men of Reform Judaism; Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches; MomsRising; More Light Presbyterians; Movement Advancement Project; Muslim Advocates; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Muslims for Progressive Values; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice America; NASTAD (National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors); National AIDS Housing Coalition; National Alliance for Partnerships in
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Equity (NAPE); National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAWPAF).

National Association for Female Executives; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of School Psychologists; National Association of School Superintendents; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center For Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center on Adoption; National Coalition for LGBT Health; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Council for Occupational Safety and Health (COSH); National Council of Jewish Women; National Crittenden.

National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Latinx Psychological Association; National LGBT Chamber of Commerce; National LGBTQ Taskforce Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National PFA; National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance (NQAPIA); National Taskforce on Tradeswomen Issues.

National Trans Bar Association; National Urban League; National Women's Health Network; Native Women's Law Center—NERAT—National Equality Action Team; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New Ways Ministry; NMAC; North American Council on Adoptable Children; Out & Equal Workplace Advocates; OutServe-SLDN; Oxfam America; Parity; People For the American Way; PFLAG National.

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; Physicians for Reproductive Heath; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Positive Women's Network-USA; Pride at Work; Promundo-US; Public Justice; Rabbinical Assembly; Reconciling Ministries Network; ReconcilingWorks: Lutharians for Full Participation; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; Rooted Robyn; Ryan White Medical Providers Coalition.

SAFEtrAE; SAGE; Secular Coalition for America; Secure Policy Institute; SER Jobs for Peaceful Employees Employee International Union; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); Soulforce; Southern HIV/AIDS Strategy Initiative (SASI); Stop Sexual Assault in Schools (SSAIS); SurvJustice; T'ruah; The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The AIDS Institute; The Episcopal Church; The Imagination Project.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; The National LGBTQ Workers Center; The TransLatinx Coalition; The Trevor Project; The Tyler Clementi Foundation; The Williams Institute; Transgender Law Center; Transgender Legal Defense & Education Fund; Treatment Action Group; True Colors United; UFCW OutTreach; Ultra Violet; UMForward; upcommence the collective; UnidosUS.

Union = Fuerza Latina, Union; Union for Reform Judaism; Union of Affirming Christians; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministry; United State of Women; United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism; URGE: United Research, Gender Equity; Voice for Adoption; Voices for Progress; Vote Common Good, Greater Things; Voto Latino; Witness to Mass Incarceration; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics, and Ritual (WATER); Young Feminists & Allies; National Organization for Women's (NOW) Inaugural Virtual Chapter.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alaskans Together For Equality, AK.
AIDS Alabama, AL.
Equity Alabama, AL.
Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, AZ.
Equal Arizona, AZ.
9106 California, CA.
Bienestar Health Services, CA.
California Employment Lawyers Association, CA.
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, CA.
Equality California, CA.
Hollywood NOW, CA.
Latino Equality Alliance, CA.
Legal Aid At Work, CA.
LGBT Center OC, CA.
LGBT Community Center of the Desert, CA.
Misingathering Christian Church, CA.
Reproductive Coalition for Reproductive Right—California, CA.
Stonewall Democratic Club, CA.
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County, CA.
The Los Angeles LGBT Center, CA.
The Source LGBT Center, CA.
9106 Colorado, CO.
One Colorado, CO.
Out Boulder County, CO.
Rocky Mountain CARES, CO.
Triangle Community Center Inc., CT.
Asian/Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Resource Project, DC.
GLAA, DC.
The DC Center for the LGBTQ Community, DC.
Trans-Latinx DMV (DC, Maryland and Virginia), DC.
Whitman-Walker Health, DC.
Compass LGBTQ Community Center, FL.
Equality Florida, FL.
QLatinx, FL.
The Pride Center at Equality Park, FL.
Visuality, FL, Inc.
9106 Georgia, GA.
Georgia Equality, GA.
Lake Oconee Community Church, GA.
The Rush Center, GA.
One Iowa, IA.
AIDS Foundation of Chicago, IL.
Arab American Family Services, IL.
Association of Latinas & Latinx Motivating Action (ALMA), IL.
Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network, Life Span & Resilience, IL.
Equality Illinois, IL.
Illinois Accountability Initiative, IL.
Pride Action Tank, IL.
Resilience, formerly Rape Victim Advocates, IL.
United Latindx Pride, IL.
Women Employed, IL.
Indiana Youth Group, IN.
End Rape on Campus, LA.
Louisiana Congress Action, LA.
Lousiana Trans Advocates, LA.
MassEquality, MA.
FreeState Justice, MD.
Gender Rights Maryland, MD.
Public Justice Center, MD.
EqualityMaine, ME.
Affirmations, MI.
Equity Morgan, MI.
Kalamazoo Gay Lesbian Resource Center, MI.
Ruth Ellis Center, Inc., MI.
Gender Justice League, MI.
OutFront MN, MN.
PROMO, MO.
St. Louis Effort for AIDS, MO.
Montana Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, MT.
Charlotte Clergy Coalition for Justice, NC.
Equity North Carolina, NC.
Latinos in the Deep South, NC.
National Organization for Women Charlotte chapter, NC.
North Dakota Human Rights Coalition, ND.
OutNebraska, NE.
New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, NH.
Garden State Equality, NJ.
Hudson Pride Center, NJ.
EqualNee Now, NM.
KWH Law Center for Social Justice & Change, NM.
Southwest Women's Law Center, NM.
Tewa Women United, NM.
Association of Legal Aid Attorneys (ALAA) of UAW 2325, LGBTQ+ Caucus, NYC.
Brooklyn Community Pride Center, NY.
Callen-Lorde Community Health Center, NY.
Empire State Pride Agenda, NY.
Equality New York, NY.
Forefront Church NYC, NY.
Gay & Lesbian Independent Democrats (GLID), NY.
Gender Equality Law Center, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of Greater New York, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of New York, NY.
Sakhi for South Asian Women, NY.
The Volunteer Lawyers Project of Onondaga County, Inc., NY.
Theatre of the Oppressed NYC, NY.
VillageCare, NY.
Women's Rights and Empowerment Network (WREN), SC.
Equality South Dakota, SD.
Tennessee Equality Project, TX.
American Association of University Women Texas (AAUW Texas), TX.
Cathedral of Hope United Church of Christ, TX.
Equal Texas, TX.
Esperanza Peace and Justice Center, TX.
Open Arms Rape Crisis Center & LGBT+ Services, TX.
Resource Center, TX.
Texas Freedom Network, TX.
The Alysa Center, TX.
Transgender Education Network of Texas (TENT), TX.
Equality Utah, UT.
Diversity Richmond, VA.
Equality Virginia, VA.
Entre Hermanos, VA.
Gay City: Seattle’s LGBTQ Center, WA.
Gender Justice League, WA.
Legal Voice, WA.
Oasis Youth Center, WA.
Rainbow Center, WA.
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The Business Coalition for the Equality Act is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Equality Act, which would finally extend federal, permanent protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people under our existing civil rights laws.

The companies:
Employ over 9.8 million workers in the U.S.
Have combined revenue that exceeds $4.2 trillion.
Have operations in all 50 States:
A.T. Kearney Inc., Chicago, IL.
Abercrombie & Fitch Co., New Albany, OH.
Accenture, New York, NY.
Adobe Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
ADP, Roseland, NJ.
Advanced Micro Devices Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
Airbnb Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Alaska Airlines, Seattle, WA.
Alcoa Corp., Pittsburgh, PA.
Ally Financial Inc., Detroit, MI.
Amalgamated Bank, New York, NY.
Amazon.com Inc., Seattle, WA.
American Airlines, Fort Worth, TX.
American Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.
American Express Global Business Travel, Jersey City, NJ.
Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA.
Arconic, New York, NY.
Asana Retail Group Inc., Mahwah, NJ.
Aspen Skiing Company LLC, Aspen, CO.
AT&T Inc., Dallas, TX.
Atlassian, San Francisco, CA.
Bain & Co. Inc./Bridgespan Group, Boston, MA.
Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC.
Bayer U.S. LLC, Whippany, NJ.
BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ.
Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield, MN.
Biogen, Cambridge, MA.
Boehringer Ingelheim USA Corp., Ridgefield, CT.
Booz Allen Hamilton Inc., McLean, VA.
Boston Scientific Corp., Marlborough, MA.
Booz Inc., Redwood City, CA.
British Airways PLC, London, UK.
Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY.
Brown-Forman Corp., Louisville, KY.
Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV.
Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA.
Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH.
Carrigil Inc., Wayzata, MN.
Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA.
Chobani, Norwich, NY.
Choice Hotels International Inc., Rockville, MD.
Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
Citigroup Inc., New York, NY.
Citrix Systems Inc., Fort Lauderdale, FL.
CME Group Inc., Chicago, IL.
CNA Financial Corporation, Chicago, IL.
Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, GA.
Compass Bancshares Inc. (BBVA Compass), Birmingham, AL.
Corning, Corning, NY.
Crescent Investments Inc., Boston, MA.
Cox Enterprises Inc., Atlanta, GA.
CSAA Insurance Group, Walnut Creek, CA.
Cummins Inc., Columbus, IN.
CVS Health Corp., Woonsocket, RI.
Danone North America, White Plains, NY.
Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL.
Deloitte LLP, New York, NY.
Dell Technologies Inc., Round Rock, TX.
 Depository Trust & Clearance Corp., The, New York, NY.
our laws in line with the values our country was founded upon. As was recognized in our founding documents, we must continually take steps to make our country more perfect.

Acknowledging in law the challenges facing LGBTQ people, and taking concrete action to correct them, brings us one step closer to that perfect union.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and the underlying legislation.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation and I commend once more the tireless work of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE.

Much has changed in recent years about Americans’ attitude towards members of the LGBTQ community.

While Americans can be happy that we as a society have made strides in marriage equality, there is much work to do.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years—including marriage equality, LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and too often have no recourse.

Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in states where, though they have the right to marry, they have no explicit non-discrimination protections in other areas of daily life.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married one day and legally denied service at a restaurant, be fired from their jobs or evicted from their apartment the next.

The Equality Act is historic legislation that says, unequivocally, that LGBTQ Americans deserve the full protections guaranteed by the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equality Act extends anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans with regard to employment, education, access to credit, jury service, federal funding, housing, and public accommodations.

No American should ever be treated as less than equal in the eyes of the law.

The Equality Act will guarantee that LGBTQ Americans in Texas and across the country cannot be discriminated against because of who they are or whom they love.

It is long past time for this legislation to become law and that is why I proudly joined my colleagues today to get the job done.

In general law prohibiting sex discrimination has already been properly interpreted by federal courts and administrative agencies to include discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Equality Act affirms these interpretations and makes the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity explicit, in order to provide greater clarity to members of the public, employers, schools, businesses and others.

In areas where sex discrimination is not already prohibited, the bill amends existing law to bar discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as sexual orientation and gender identity.

The need for this legislation is all the more urgent following recent news that the Supreme Court has granted a writ of Certiorari to a trio of three cases to test the reach of the Civil Rights Act to determine if they cover gay and transgendered individuals.

With the issue on the Court as it is, this body—the House of Representatives—owes it to our constituents to ensure that critical issues related to the civil rights of our fellow citizens are handled by their elected representatives, and not by a constitutionally elected Supreme Court.

This is why the Equality Act has the bipartisan support of Members of Congress, the strong support of the business community, and the overwhelming support of the American people—more than 9 in 10 supporting the Equality Act.

On behalf of LGBTQ Texans and all Americans, I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors of the Equality Act.

I look forward to voting YES when it comes to the House Floor, tomorrow and working towards full enactment.

With this critical legislation, we will finally, fully and definitively extend anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans, and move our nation closer to fulfilling the promise of equality, opportunity and justice for every American.

In the meanwhile, I support the rule governing debate of H.R. 5 and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. COLI is as follows:

**AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 377**

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

**SEC. 4.** Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 383) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment described in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted, the bill, as amended, shall be considered as ordered to the House of Representatives, and an order of the Conference Committee shall be dispensed with. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto, to its final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

**SEC. 5.** The amendment referred to in Section 4 is an amendment to H.R. 383 to add at the end of the bill the following:

**SEC. 406. CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR REQUIREMENTS TO ESTABLISH AN ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN**

For purposes of section 285(a), the term "establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation" means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1681 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115-254).

**SEC. 407. FORM OF REPORT ON THE COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL CONCERNING THE EFFECT ON COUNTER TERRORISM OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS**

The report required under section 123(d) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 408. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM SYRIA AND AFGHANISTAN**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The foreign terrorist organization al Qaeda, responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001, maintains a presence in Afghanistan.

(2) The Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham, better known by its acronym ISIS, flourished in the chaos unleashed by the civil war in Syria and at one point controlled extensive territory in Iraq.

(3) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have murdered thousands of innocent civilians.

(4) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have proven resilient and have regrouped when the United States and its partners have withdrawn from the fight against them.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) acknowledges that the United States military and our partners have made significant progress in the campaign against al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham, and honors the contributions and sacrifices of the members of the United States Armed Forces who have served on the front lines of this fight;

(2) recognizes the continuing threat to the homeland and our allies posed by al Qaeda and ISIS, which maintain an ability to operate in Syria and Afghanistan;

(3) expresses concern that the United States has supported the Taliban in Afghanistan and Hizballah and the Assad regime in Syria, and has sought to frustrate diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts in these two countries;

(4) recognizes the positive role the United States and its partners have played in Syria and Afghanistan fighting terrorist groups, countering Iranian aggression, deterring the further use of chemical weapons, and protecting human rights;

(5) warns that a precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from the ongoing fight against these groups, without effective, countervailing efforts to secure gains in Syria and Afghanistan, could allow terrorists to regroup, destabilize critical regions, and create vacuums that could be filled by Iran or Russia, to the detriment of United States interests and those of our allies;

(6) recognizes that al Qaeda and ISIS pose a global threat, which merits increased international cooperation to counterterrorism, diplomatic, and stabilization efforts underway in Syria and Afghanistan;

(7) recognizes that diplomatic efforts to secure peaceful, negotiated solutions to these conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan are necessary to long-term stability and counterterrorism efforts in the Middle East and South Asia;

(8) acknowledges the progress made by Special Representative Khalilzad in his efforts to promote reconciliation in Afghanistan;

(9) calls upon the Administration to conduct a thorough review of the military and diplomatic strategies in Afghanistan, including an assessment of the risk that withdrawal from those countries could strengthen the power and influence of Russia and Iran in the Middle East, and undermine diplomatic efforts toward negotiated, peaceful solutions;

(10) requests that the Administration, as part of this review, solicit the views of Israel, our regional partners, and other key troop-contributing nations in the fight against al Qaeda and ISIS;

(11) reiterates support for international diplomatic efforts to facilitate peaceful, negotiated resolutions to the ongoing conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan, and to respect the rights of innocent civilians and deny safe havens to terrorists;
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 188, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows: [Roll No. 206]

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.
REPORT ON H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. DE LAURO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–62) on the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2740, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentlewoman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is known as the Carceri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, up until 2009, the Department of the Interior, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, had consistently construed that the IRA authorizes the placement of land into trust for any Tribe so long as the Tribe is federally recognized at the time of the trust application.

The decision overturned 75 years of agency practice, both Democratic and Republican administrations, and created a two-tiered system for trust land acquisition. This also opened up the Department of the Interior to frivolous lawsuits on land...
that they had held in trust for years, sometimes decades.

While this has been great for lawyers and their firms, it is detrimental to the health of a Tribe. The money to defend these lawsuits could, instead, be used to provide and improve the lives of their members.

We have had to pass standalone bills for individual Tribes on a piecemeal basis to protect their lands, and we should, since these Tribal lands are under direct assault right now. We must address this going forward so that other Tribes do not find themselves in the same dire straits.

Passage of H.R. 375 will restore clarity and stability for all federally recognized Tribes by ensuring they are all treated equally, regardless of date of recognition.

Let’s not forget history and the declination of Tribes and their homeland by the hand of the Federal Government. It has taken almost a century for us to attempt to undo the damage we inflicted upon the indigenous peoples of this Nation.

This work is not complete. We are still federally acknowledging Tribes to this day. We are still striving to return merely a portion of the land back to Tribes. To say that Tribes that were recognized after 1934 are somehow inferior to Tribes that were recognized by 1934 is dangerously ignorant of history.

H.R. 375, introduced by Representative COLE of Oklahoma, is short, simple, and to the point. It will amend the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of their date of recognition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding the floor.

I want to thank both my friends, the chairman and the ranking member, for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor. It could not have happened without both of their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375, legislation that would amend the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes.

Before passage of the Dawes Act in 1887 and the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, the Indian landmass in the United States shrank by 86 million acres.

Since the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act, the Department of the Interior has taken back approximately 9 million acres of land into trust status. Tribes have used their trust lands to build community facilities such as schools, health centers, and housing that serve their Tribal members. This land is also used for Tribal enterprises and promotes economic development in communities that are often underserved and poverty-stricken.

In 2009, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned long-existing precedent in the Carcieri v. Salazar case. The Supreme Court ruled specifically that the Secretary’s authority to hold land in trust under the Indian Reorganization Act was limited only to recognized Tribes at the date of enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act.

Previously, lower courts have viewed the word “now” as the instant when the Secretary invoked trust acquisition authority. However, the Supreme Court reversed the lower court ruling on the interpretation that the term “now under Federal jurisdiction” in section 19 of the Indian Reorganization Act was to be interpreted. It found that the phrase refers only to those Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction of the United States when the Indian Reorganization Act was enacted in 1934.

As a result, the Secretary of the Interior may no longer use the Indian Reorganization Act to acquire trust land for any post-1934 Tribe without specific authorization from Congress. Because the Secretary has acquired lands in trust for dozens of Tribes recognized after 1934, the Carcieri ruling calls into question the validity of the trust status of such lands and jeopardizes their immunity from State and local taxation and regulatory jurisdiction.

Many Tribes have been forced into court to defend the status of their trust land, costing them millions of dollars and compromising their investments and jurisdiction.

H.R. 375 would amend the Indian Reorganization Act and clarify the language the Supreme Court ruled against by striking “the term,” which I have previously referenced, and inserting the words “effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term.” It would also amend the statute language from “any recognized Indian Tribe now under Federal jurisdiction” to “any federally recognized Indian Tribe.”

The modest changes clarify that the Secretary does have authority to take land into trust for any Tribe that the Federal Government has recognized.

As a member of the Chickasaw Nation and co-chair of the Native American Caucus, I recommend the Natural Resources Committee for favorably marking up this legislation and this body for moving forward with the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 375.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, first of all, if the gentleman from Arizona has any speakers. I do have several.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, we have one speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be here. I also appreciate Mr. COLE for his work on this particular issue and the time he has put in over the last decade in trying to find a Carcieri fix.

That 2009 Supreme Court made the decision, but it actually opened up more questions than it provided solutions and answers in the process.

In the years since that decision, the Democrats, when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, did not find a solution. Republicans, when we were in the same situation, didn’t find a solution either, probably because there is even a bigger question than what was decided in this particular case. That bigger question is one that is extremely complex and grave, and it indicates the complexity of this particular issue.

Let’s be clear that, prior to Carcieri, the fee-to-trust process was broken and fraught with conflicts. In fact, many will still argue that even today, the current Bureau of Indian Affairs process provides very limited incentives for any community or stakeholder to be partners in this process. As a result, we are often left with conflict and political turmoil and accusations and retributions on the local level.

Some areas of local government, especially the California State Association of Counties, have been repeatedly asking us to try to come up with a reform to the overall process because the process impacts taxes and zoning in communities where these trust lands are acquired.

Local governments, States, and stakeholders who have some kind of role to play in this area, should they have a seat at the table? Should they be consulted? Should they have some kind of input? Yes, obviously.

Should they have a veto in the process? I don’t think so.

Where we draw that line to ensure that there is consultation, so you ensure that people have a voice in the process, that is the underlying question. That is the complex question.

During markup of this bill, Mr. HUFFMAN from California and Mr. GOSAR from Arizona entered into a colloquy. They actually had a discussion, one of the few times a committee did what a committee is supposed to do, talking about the need to come up with some kind of variance to this underlying issue that is not necessarily the crux of the 2009 decision. But how do we come up with this process?

If this bill is going to go all the way to the Senate and ultimately become law, we need some help in finding a solution to the bigger issue of how much
consultation should take place and who should have their voices heard in the overall process, a process that does not happen right now.

There is a pathway to solve these problems. We can address Carcieri or we can address the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and allow Tribes to have their voices heard and accept the consent of their own people. We can reduce the litigation that has plagued the land-in-trust process. The Tribes and every stakeholder in this process deserve as much.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG), my colleague and chair of the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States.

Mr. GALLEG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375 introduced by my friend Representative COLE from Oklahoma.

H.R. 375 is a simple, straightforward fix to a problem that has caused chaos and uncertainty in Indian Country for a decade.

Ten years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is now known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that eligibility for trust status under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were federally recognized as of 1934.

The acquisition of trust land for the benefit of Indian Tribes is absolutely essential to Tribal self-determination, economic development, and protection of Tribal homelands. The Carcieri decision created an unfair, impractical, two-tiered system for Tribes that wanted to engage in this essential function of Tribal sovereignty.

H.R. 375 simply amends the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of the date of recognition.

The Carcieri decision and its consequences exacted a toll on the Federal Government’s shameful history of oppression in Native communities. The decimation of Tribes and their homelands by the Federal Government is well documented. For centuries, we ignored their treaties and systematically stripped them of their land. It has taken almost a century for us to even begin to undo the damage we have inflicted on indigenous peoples.

Mr. Speaker, that work is nowhere near complete. This way, we could still be federally recognizing tribes that the government tried to destroy. We are still striving to return merely a small portion of ancestral land back to Tribes so they can have homelands to call their own.

In order to continue to undo the harm we have done, we must end this system of haves and have-nots for trust land acquisition. We must level the playing field and alleviate the catastrophic consequences this decision has had in Indian Country.

We must pass H.R. 375, the clean Carcieri fix. If we do not, this administration will continue to strip trust land from Tribes like the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which is the subject of another bill on the floor today. Tribes will continue to suffer needlessly, once again at the hands of the Federal Government.

Indian Country has been clamoring for this clean, simple fix for a decade, and we cannot make them wait any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the current form of H.R. 375.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, or IGRA, with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations. H.R. 375 reverses a major 2009 Supreme Court decision, and the bill would lead to future abuses of IGRA.

The bill gives unelected bureaucrats a blank check to take any land in trust without respect for impacted communities, including other Tribes. More importantly, H.R. 375 allows reservation shopping and for lands to be taken into trust for off-reservation casinos in places where States, local governments, and other Tribes oppose such action.

H.R. 375 will result in a flood of new off-reservation casinos that cause harm to States and local communities. Many of these casino locations that are nowhere near Tribes’ historic reservations will be handpicked by gambling investors and Washington bureaucrats.

If H.R. 375 passes, all Tribes would have to do in order to get land taken into trust and open off-reservation casinos is to show that they are federally recognized by the Department of the Interior.

In the Natural Resources Committee markup of this bill, the gentleman from the Second District of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, and I engaged in a productive debate on this bill. We both agreed to try to find common ground on which to respond to my concerns about off-reservation casino abuse and the valid concerns brought to the committee by State and county governments. Bringing H.R. 375 up via suspension is not allowing any amendments prohibits us from making good on that agreement.

H.R. 375 should have been amended prior to being brought to the floor to address these bipartisan concerns.

Taking land into trust divests the affected State and local governments of jurisdiction. When land is taken into trust, for example, the Tribe will not pay any applicable taxes on the land, but the county or city in which the land is located might nonetheless be responsible. We see this with county and city services, and non-Tribal residents will pay for it. At least consultation should be a minimum.

The bill as currently drafted therefore increases the power of an unelected bureaucracy to divert non-consenting State and local governments of jurisdiction over their land. This, by itself, is a great cause of concern.

Let’s be clear about H.R. 375 and how a bill of this scope and magnitude deserves more careful consideration than is being given here today.

Currently, there are almost 600 recognized Tribes in the United States, about 240 of which have gaming operations. H.R. 375 removes the dam that provided some restraint on the number of Tribal casinos and would be a dramatic departure from existing Federal law that has been in place for almost a century.

Before voting on this bill, I hope Members all understand that H.R. 375 will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States. If H.R. 375 passes, all federally recognized Tribes would be able to receive land in trust and potentially open off-reservation casinos. This includes any Tribe recognized by the Department of the Interior that was ineligible to receive land in trust and/or was denied land in trust prior to H.R. 375.

According to the National Indian Gaming Commission fact sheet, as of 2016, approximately 329, or 58 percent, of the recognized Tribes had no gaming operations.

President Trump opposes H.R. 312 and with good reason. That bill gives land in trust and a casino to a single Tribe that is otherwise ineligible to receive those benefits, as well as reverses Federal court and Interior decisions. But H.R. 375 does all that and more.

Instead of giving land in trust to only one Tribe, it lets an unelected bureaucracy give whatever land it wants to all recognized Tribes. Thus, the same concerns that exist with respect to H.R. 312, which we will be talking about, exist here to an even greater level with respect to H.R. 375.

The purpose of considering bills under suspension is to dispose of non-controversial measures expeditiously, but H.R. 375 has controversy written all over it.

H.R. 375 has ridden alongside H.R. 312 largely unnoticed, and no one has pointed out two crucial facts: one, that it exists as a contingency plan in case its sister bill, H.R. 312, fails; and two, that its effect would be national rather than local.

H.R. 375 and H.R. 312 are two heads of the same snake, one large, one small. Senator WARREN, regardless, will get her casino if either bill passes.

Further, passage of H.R. 375 will allow for new off-reservation casinos to be opened in your States and communities and for land to be ripped away from local jurisdictions without recourse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for the opportunity to
speak on this important issue. I urge all Members to vote “no” on H.R. 375. Send it back to get consultation, at least, put in.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his assistance, for his leadership on this important issue, and for the time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been 10 years in the making for Indian Country. A decade ago, a Supreme Court ruling created unnecessary confusion in the interpretation and application of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. This bill, H.R. 375, would clarify the ongoing confusion. Among other things, it would ensure the IRA applies to all Native American Tribes recognized by the Federal Government, regardless of their date of recognition.

For the last 10 years, the unnecessary confusion has caused uncertainty for Tribes seeking recognition and recognized lands, has halted economic development projects on Tribal lands, and has resulted in costly and protracted litigation. Members and staff on both sides of the aisle deserve significant recognition for getting us to where we are today. But, in particular, Chairman Grijalva, Representative McColloch, and Representative Cole have been extraordinary. I thank them for their incredible leadership on Tribal issues, and their perseverance in pursuing a clean Carceri fix.

I am honored to have the opportunity to speak on this. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Grijalva).

If we, indeed, are going to be serious about a legislative solution to Carceri, then we need to work out some kind of compromise that could pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President.

I have been encouraged by the debate not only on the floor here, but also in our committee, regarding the need to consult with affected parties before land is taken into trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Mr. Grijalva whether he’s willing to work with us on this type of legislation to solve this underlying problem as this bill moves forward?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, when a Tribe applies to have land taken into trust through the Department of the Interior, local concerns are already strongly considered, even more so when the land is located away from existing reservation lands.

However, I do recognize there is a desire from some Members on both sides of the aisle to work on stand-alone legislation that would codify some of the process.

I agree with the gentleman’s statement about veto abilities. Any provision which would give counties or local governments sole power over trust land decisions, is, frankly, a nonstarter. Local input is vital to these decisions and should be taken into account. However, Tribal consultation is solely the responsibility of the Federal Government, as is any final decision on transferring lands.

And I think because of the national implications of the question of trust land and the role that communities, i.e., counties and municipalities, would play, I think there is a need to somehow accommodate a level of Tribal consultation, because they are going to be the most affected party by any decision that is made.

With that said, I do commit, Mr. Speaker, to looking at any proposal on the issue and to work moving forward if it is to the benefit of all the stakeholders and I would assist the legislation in its final passage.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman’s commitment and I appreciate the comments that he will be there.

There is this bigger question that needs to be addressed. Where we draw the line is a matter that still needs some kind of discussion. I recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a brilliant letter from me to Chairman Grijalva on this particular issue.


DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is frustrating that the Democrat Leadership has scheduled H.R. 375, legislation to reverse Carceri v. Salazar, under suspension of the rules for the committee markup of the bill. It disregards what I believe was a bipartisan agreement to work on a compromise between the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and states and counties to mitigate the impacts of taking land in trust in their jurisdictions. The Carceri decision created vast uncertainty over the fee-to-trust process for tribes and impacted stakeholders. I voted for H.R. 375 in committee as a display of my support for resolving Carceri. My support for the bill’s advancement is contingent upon the inclusion of reasonable safeguards on BIA’s powers.

During markup on H.R. 375, Messrs. Huffman and Gosar discussed a bi-partisan desire to respond to long-standing state and local concerns. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), in a letter submitted for the markup record, reiterated the counties’ “longstanding, valid concerns” they have with a fee-to-trust process conducted under a “fundamentally flawed regulatory scheme.” They also submitted proposals to resolve these problems. I can attest that many counties in Utah share these same concerns.

Mr. Huffman and I found him- self in partial agreement with CSAC’s position, and that there should be “meaningful good faith consultation” with local governments. While saying the Gosar amendment went too far, Mr. Huffman expressed a willingness to “continue collaborating on this issue to come up with something that would at least codify that good faith consultation part of a better process.”

Bringing the bill to the Floor this Wednesday is a sign that consultation is being taken seriously by Democrat Leadership nor is it a pragmatic approach to resolving Carceri for the benefit of Indian Country.

The fee-to-trust system is broken because of a provision of a 1934 law that has not been updated since that law’s enactment. Realistically, H.R. 375 offers an opportunity to change which is why we need to act now without consultation safeguards on BIA’s authority will undermine successful resolution of Carceri.

It was our hope that after debate on the bill during markup you’d allow Messrs. Huffman and Gosar, and other interested Members (on and off the Committee), an opportunity to explore solutions with H.R. 375’s sponsor, Mr. Tom Cole. We need to work on a compromise bill that solves the underlying issues and can become law.

Sincerely,

Rob Bishop, Ranking Member.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Carceri decision has caused anxiety and confusion in Indian Country, creating dangerous legal ambiguities related to Indian trust lands.

Today, we can finally end all that. We can remove the ambiguity and uncertainty, and finally offer Tribal nations peace of mind that their lands are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of H.R. 375, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be post-poned.

MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 377, I call up the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.
The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 312
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”.

SEC. 2. REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The taking of land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe of Massachusetts as described in the final Notice of Reservation Proclamation for Mashpee (941, January 4, 2008) is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) APPLICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action (including an action pending in a Federal court as of the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the land described in subsection (a) shall not be filed or maintained in a Federal court and shall be promptly dismissed.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 28, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), shall be applicable to the Tribe and Tribal members, except that to the extent such laws and regulations are inconsistent with the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement, dated April 22, 2008, by and between the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Town of Mashpee, Massachusetts, the terms of that Intergovernmental Agreement shall control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Grijalva) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Gosar) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Grijalva).

Mr. Grijalva. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 312.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, will reaffirm the trust status of Mashpee’s Tribal land and protect the Tribe from further attacks on its land and its sovereignty.

The Mashpee relationship with the Federal Government is one of the oldest in the United States. In fact, their ancestors are the ones who welcomed the pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock, as well as the people who aided those pilgrims through hard times in 1621, in what we now refer to as the “First Thanksgiving.”

Like many Tribes, the Mashpee were intentionally and systematically rendered landless, through no fault of their own. They fought long and hard over the years to reestablish both their Tribe and their land base.

The Tribe first petitioned the Federal Government for recognition in 1978. Finally, after 30 years, the Bush administration granted formal recognition to the Tribe in 2007. However, they still remained landless.

This was remedied in 2015, when the Department of the Interior took approximately 320 acres into trust to serve as the Tribe’s reservation lands. The two parcels that compose the 320 acres are both within the Tribe’s historic and ancestral homelands.

The Tribe constructed a government center on the land, which includes their schools, courthouses and multipurpose room, as well as a medical clinic facility. And they broke ground on a gaming facility that would eventually bring in much-needed revenue for Tribal operations and programs.

However, in 2016, a group of Taunton residents, led by an out-of-state commercial gaming company, filed a Carceri suit in federal court to challenge the Department of the Interior’s action.

Initially, the executive branch defended the decision to create the Mashpee reservation. However, in May 2017, the Department of Justice, under the Trump administration, inexplicably withdrew from the litigation and is no longer defending the status of the Tribe’s land.

Then, in September 2018, the Department of the Interior issued its first Carceri decision in which it refused to reaffirm its own authority to confirm the status of the Tribe’s lands into trust. The effect of this decision cannot be overstated. For the first time in this century, a Tribe was stripped of its sovereign rights to its land. It would mark the first time since the dark days of the termination era that the United States acted to disestablish an Indian reservation and render a Tribe landless.

These attacks on the reservation and on the Tribe’s very status have been devastating. The legal uncertainty that has been imposed by these events is forcing the Tribe to borrow thousands of dollars every day just to keep its government running, resulting in devastating cuts to essential services, and massive layoffs of Tribal members. This is completely unacceptable. We cannot idly stand by as Tribal people are once again harmed by yet another action by the Federal Government.

Let’s be honest, the Federal Government has done a terrible job of living up to its moral and legal obligations to Indian Country.

Housing, education, healthcare, and basic needs often go unmet in Tribal lands. These are not extras or handouts to Tribal people. It is part of a trust responsibility, enshrined in numerous treaties, court rulings, and laws.

But the needs still need to be met, despite the Federal Government’s failings. So how do Tribes attempt to make up for that shortfall? By utilizing their land for economic development, including gaming.

Economic development on Tribal lands is vital to the prosperity of a Tribe and the ultimate goal of self-determination and self-sufficiency. We have seen it numerous times across the Nation: Tribes using those dollars to fund their programs, construct housing and health clinics, and take care of the needs of their people.

The Mashpee Tribe should not be hindered from economic development on their land solely because the State of Rhode Island wants to protect its own State-run gaming interest.

H.R. 312 is widely supported in Indian Country, with letters of support from over 50 individual Tribes and pan-Tribal organizations.

Additionally, the bill has strong support, including from the cities of Taunton and Mashpee, the Chambers of Commerce of both Taunton and Mashpee, the State of Massachusetts, numerous Members of the Massachusetts State House and State Senate, the Mayflower Society, and many local businesses and business leaders.

The passage of H.R. 312 will protect the Mashpee Tribe’s reservation lands and make clear that the Tribe is entitled to be treated the same way as other federally recognized Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.
In short, H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, bails out a foreign corporation from major financial problems of its own making, reverses the judgment of a Federal court, and contradicts the Supreme Court ruling.

Mr. Speaker. I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to vote against H.R. 312, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ORJIALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may continue to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for all his hard work on this bill and so many others that are related to this.

I also want to thank the Natural Resources subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. GALLEGOS and Mr. COOK.

I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts who has worked so hard and is a cosponsor, Mr. KENNEDY.

I also want to give particular thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his support and also voice my support for H.R. 375, the bill that was just debated. It is well thought out, well worked through—over a decade—and well worth the support of everyone here.

Mr. Speaker, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has resided in southern New England for more than 12,000 years. To not have their land federally recognized is simply a disgrace.

We have seen them in our history books, in historical paintings, in iconic murals. They are the Tribes that welcomed the Pilgrims for the first Thanksgiving. This President even put them in his own Thanksgiving proclamation just last year. He recognized them.

tragically, like so many Native Americans, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has lived through centuries of injustice, the latest of which this House is debating today.

For years, I have worked personally with the Tribe as they have used hard-earned Federal recognition to provide adequate housing, jobs, job training, and essential services, including native language learning, early childhood education.

And this is important. We all know, in my region, the plague of the opioid epidemic, through Cape Cod, in that region. The incidence of overdose for the Wampanoag Tribe is 400 times. I will repeat that, 400 times more, the number of overdoses for that Tribe. I have worked with them and will continue to work with them, if they are in existence, to try and help them deal with this scourge.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is also a Tribe that has, as you look at the landscape for Tribes around the country, is suffering so many things that other Tribes are—the uncertainty of their status.

And this is the Tribe, I think, that best shows the inequities that are involved in these types of recognition.

I will just say, I introduced this bill last Congress when we first heard rumors that the Department of the Interior, acting on its own, is going to reverse the position of the previous administration and refuse to defend the Mashpee Wampanoag’s right to their historic land. They are the only Tribe that has received recognition and then had it taken away from them.

Now the Tribe’s reservation is hanging by a thread, and they have been left to defend their land on their own. This is an existential threat.

Without support from Congress, it will be nearly impossible for the Mashpee to engage in any kind of true self-government because they won’t own their own land; no economic development, no Tribal headquarters, no elder care, no pre-K programs. It means being treated as a second-class Tribe with no future.

Bipartisan legislation to help a Tribe like the Mashpee would normally pass the House without issue. Just 2 weeks ago we passed a parallel Republican bill for a Tribe in California without a single Member objecting—not a peep from the other side. President Obama signed a bill like this into law just last year.

Regrettably, although the substance of H.R. 312 is noncontroversial, the tactics employed by the bill’s few opponents are not. Throughout this process, we have seen gross mischaracterization and outright lying for personal and financial gain.

My Republican colleague, ranking member in the Rules Committee, a member of the Chickasaw Nation, a Republican from Oklahoma and an expert on these issues, said last night at the Rules meeting, never has he seen such misinformation about a simple bill, to the point of being scurrilous.

This is not about gaming. It is not about picking winners and losers. It is simply about a Tribe’s rightful place in its native land. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the best in this institution. I believe that many of us in Congress are here to lead. We are here to debate issues on their merits; we are here to find common ground when we might otherwise disagree; and we are here to set an example to show the American people what is right.

We have not seen gross mischaracterization of special interests, dirty lobbying, and outright bigotry.

The cast of characters behind the scenes spewing information is revealing: a rightwing lobbyist, Trump loyalist, Trump campaign operative in the name of special interests, dirty lobbying, and outright bigotry.

We have seen the President, through his tweets, trying to sink an entire Native American Tribe in the name of special interests, dirty lobbying, and outright bigotry.
are counter to the Tribe, including two former Trump Plaza Casino officials and a major financier with both casino and National Enquirer interests.

Cultural warfare to benefit bank accounts, corrupt intent for personal gain, all in the form of a racist tweet. And the Members of this body are eager to let him get away with it. But not me, not my cosponsors, and not the majority of this House.

I still believe this House has an opportunity to do what is right. We can show the Native American people that we will stand up for them, that after nearly 250 years since our country’s founding we would not be where we are without them. They deserve that dignity; they deserve that respect; and they deserve that sovereignty for their historic homeland.

Mr. Speaker, let’s be on the right side of history today. Vote “yes” and save the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are yielded time from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues on the other side understand that, as the city of Mashpee, no one has any problems, but it is the city of Taunton that is part of the problem, and that is where we have the gist. So I caution them to watch their rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. It is a very generous gesture when we have a different point of view on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

Mashpee Wampanoag people have lived in the Massachusetts area for thousands of years. In fact, our shared Thanksgiving tradition highlights a celebration of Pilgrims and Indians breaking bread together over the first Thanksgiving. It is a Thanksgiving tradition that has been practiced over more than 400 years and the Tribe is responsible for thousands of jobs and is responsible for more than $300 million in economic activity.

In 2007, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe was federally recognized. Mr. Speaker, 8 years later, the Bureau of Indian Affairs approved the decision to take land into trust on behalf of the Mashpee for a reservation. The Tribe was then able to provide services directly to its citizens, become eligible for Federal programs, and explore economic opportunities.

Shortly after, in 2016, the Mashpee’s reservation decision was challenged in court by plaintiffs stating that, because the Tribe was federally recognized after 1934, the Department of the Interior could not take land into trust on behalf of a Tribe. This decision stems from the 2009 Supreme Court decision, Carcieri v. Salazar. It is an example of why that law needs to be fixed.

In 2018, the administration issued a decision that would take the Mashpees’ reservation out of trust. This marked the first time since the termination era that a Tribe has lost their trust land.

Frankly, from my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, an attack on trust land anywhere threatens trust land everywhere, so I am very happy to be working with my good friend, Mr. KATZING, on H.R. 312. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This bill will allow the Mashpee Tribe to open massive off-reservation casino right on the border of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, nearly 40 miles away from their historic Tribal lands in Cape Cod.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe became federally recognized in 2007. Under the Indian Reorganization Act, the United States Department of the Interior is only allowed to take land into trust for Tribes recognized before 1994.

In 2009, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed this Federal standard in the Carcieri v. Salazar decision. In 2015, the U.S. Department of the Interior ignored the Indian Reorganization Act and the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling and took land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe.

A year later, the residents of Taunton, Massachusetts, sued and won in U.S. district court to stop the casino from being built in their town. The district court ruled that the Department of the Interior should not have taken land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe and instructed the Department to conduct a further review of the Tribe’s eligibility.

After reviewing the Mashpee Tribe’s application last year, the U.S. Department of the Interior rejected the Tribe’s claim based on the finding that the Tribe was not under Federal jurisdiction in 1994, which meant the Department lacked authority under Federal law to take land into trust on their behalf.

Today’s bill would reverse this final decision of the Federal court and the Department of the Interior and disregard the U.S. Supreme Court precedent in allowing the Tribe to build an off-reservation casino in Taunton, Massachusetts.

If H.R. 312 passes today, it would be the first time—after 250 years since the first time Congress ever reversed a final Federal court ruling that determined a Tribe did not meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The passage of this bill would be disastrous and would open a floodgate for Tribes to come to Washington to hire the biggest lobbyists they can to get their carve-out from Congress.

Do we really want to go down this road? Does Congress want to be in the business of picking winners and losers? That is exactly what this bill does.

The Tribal land system shouldn’t depend on which Tribes hire the most expensive lobbyists. Instead, it should be based on fairness under our law and applied equally.

Instead of this bill directly benefiting the Tribe, as some have suggested, the bill will bail out Genting, the Malaysian hedge fund that is financing this deal. Even if this bill passed today and they build a casino, it is very unlikely, according to all the experts, that the Mashpee casino will ever be profitable for the Tribe because they owe Genting a half-billion dollars.

Supporters of this bill have argued that Congress is the last hope for the Mashpee Tribe and that they will go bankrupt without this casino, but Genting Malaysia has already written off the half-billion dollars it gave to the Tribe as a loss on its financial statements. If today’s bill fails, the Mashpee Tribe does not need to pay back this money because, under the agreement with Genting, it is contingent on the casino being built. The debt is erased.

Regardless of what happens with this bill today, the Mashpee Tribe will still be a federally recognized Tribe and will continue to receive Federal benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I started off opposing this bill because of the damage it would do to Rhode Island’s economy. The casino in Rhode Island generates over $300 million in economic activity and is responsible for thousands of jobs in Rhode Island. I am very proud of my financial interests in my State, and putting an off-reservation casino on the border will have a significant, negative impact on Rhode Island.

But the more I learned about this legislation, the more I realized I was wrong. The more I discussed the dangerous precedent this bill would set if it became law, H.R. 312 would reverse a Federal court ruling, undermine the Indian Reorganization Act, ignore a U.S. Supreme Court ruling, and reject the 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that this bill is a special deal for a single Tribe, and that is just wrong.

I stand here in opposition to this bill not only because of the impact on my
State, and not because I am unsympathetic to the challenges the Tribe faces, but this legislation will continue their exploitation by a powerful foreign entity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island so that we may have a quick colloquy.

As the gentleman made mention, it was locals in Taunton that actually sued; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. Does the gentleman think that the court in which they sued had any of the information sketched in front of it, in front of their jurisdiction?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am not aware of the information they had.

Mr. GOSAR. All this information that we are hearing, that is myth versus fact; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Again, I don’t know about the legal proceedings. I know that the litigation was begun by the people in the local community.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for engaging in the colloquy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address a point that was brought up during the debate on this bill, that the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition if H.R. 312 does not pass. That is true. We have never stated the Federal recognition was in jeopardy.

What we are talking about, which is fundamental to the survival of the Tribe, is destroying a Tribe’s sovereign government. That is really what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), another sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this critical piece of legislation forward and for shepherding it to the House floor today.

I thank my colleague and friend, Congressman KEATING, for his advocacy on behalf of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which calls both of our districts home.

Nearly four centuries ago, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe opened their homes and their lands to the Pilgrims who sailed to our shores. That same welcoming spirit survives in their ancestors, who live in Massachusetts today.

That is why I am proud to have the Wampanoag people call my district their home. They have planted their roots deeply in Massachusetts, and they have fostered self-determination and prosperity in the city of Taunton.

But I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated them in the 398 years since they shared their precious resources with those strangers, not to mention the generations before them that called the region home for nearly 12,000 years.

I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated many Native people throughout our history and how we have taken their voices, poisoned their water, and disrupted their culture. We have dismissed their very humanity.

It is that shame that leaves us here today with this stake. Today as this House debates this bill, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is on the verge of dissolution. An unjust Supreme Court decision, followed by a reversal by the Department of the Interior to take the Tribe’s land into trust, has left the Tribe with no other options. They are without access to critical Federal funds to support their public services, including health centers and schools.

The question today is, do we allow this to become a closing chapter in the story of an indigenous people who put their faith and trust into strangers? Do we allow a legal loophole to define American citizens out of existence?

Or do we begin to right the wrongs of our past, shepherding it to the House floor, and give the Wampanoag Tribe the recognition as a Nation that is fundamental to the survival of the Tribe, is destroying a Tribe’s sovereign fund, is dictating what they can do. We write laws. The courts interpret them. They strike down laws all the time. We write them again. That is in the Constitution. That is inherent in our responsibilities, in our obligation.

The actual court decision, if you read it, indicates that Congress has the inherent power to do exactly what we are doing, 100 percent.

Three, our colleagues referenced the Gun Lake decision and the Gun Lake legislation. Gun Lake was a response to a decision by the Supreme Court as well, 100 percent.

We have heard allegations of lobbyists. The lobbyist for our colleagues in Rhode Island for their casinos is making a dangerous precedent is going to be set. The dangerous precedent that is going to be is that Massachusetts residents legalized gambling. The Tribe went through a compact with the State that was approved. They went through a referendum with the people of Taunton that was approved nearly 60–40 that townspeople in Taunton want this bill.

They want this development.

The gentleman for engaging in the colloquy, that project has been approved by the White House. You can’t possibly be saying that that isn’t a French company that isn’t a French company that’s saying that there is some issue here with Federal lobbying that is not directly and 100 percent in line with lining their own pockets for the opposition to this bill.

There is a precedent that is going to be set. The Tribe is about to go bankrupt. The Tribe is about to go bankrupt, but all of a sudden, the Tribe doesn’t owe the financiers money. Which one is it?

Next, Federal benefits, they are saying that all the Federal benefits will remain. That ignores the Federal benefits that come with Federal recognition of reservations; the Indian Business Development Program, Financial Assistance and Social Services, employment assistance for adult Indians, vocational training for adult Indians, educational contracts under the Johnson-O’Malley Act, food distribution programs on the Indian reservation, Tribal transportation programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance Tribal justice system grants, treatment as a State under the Clean Water Act, treatment as a State under the Clean Air Act, exercise of Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction. All of those are contingent on this bill today.

A dangerous precedent is going to be set. The dangerous precedent that is going to be set is that Massachusetts residents legalized gambling. The Tribe went through a compact with the State that was approved. They went through a referendum with the people of Taunton that was approved nearly 60–40 that townspeople in Taunton want this bill.

They want this development.

It is a billion dollars for a working-class community. The folks who don’t care, yes, a few residents of that community whose lawsuit has been financed by a rival casino developer to end this project so they can build a different one down the road.

That is why I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that I won’t take the whole 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

This bill will have enormous impacts on my home State of Rhode Island. The
intent of this bill is to allow for the construction of a new casino resort near the State line between Rhode Island and Massachusetts, which would rival the existing casinos in our State.

The Twin River Casino Hotel and the Tiverton Casino Hotel of Rhode Island generate $300 million each year, representing the State’s third largest source of funding. These dollars support vital education and infrastructure programs in Rhode Island. Rhode Island would suffer tremendously if H.R. 312 became law.

Beyond the economic damage that would occur to Rhode Island, the precedent that would be set by this bill is fundamentally unfair. The bill would overturn a 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and it would reverse a 2016 ruling by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

If Congress grants the Mashpee Tribe this exception, then other Native American Tribes would seek individual relief. Congress would be creating an unbalanced patchwork process for Tribes to put land into trust. Such a system would be based on lobbying, not on firm principles or deliberative rulemaking.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have been around here a little while, and I have never heard so many people from Arizona directly say anything that is going on in Rhode Island. For that matter, I haven’t heard many people in Rhode Island that concerned about what is happening in Massachusetts.

But this is what it is about, I guess. It is not what it is about to me. It is not what it is about to our cosponsors. I know it is not what it is about to Mr. KENNEDY. I know it is not what it is about to the chairman of this committee.

I am puzzled. People are saying this is a circumvention dealing with gaming. This bill isn’t about gaming. Let me bring it back into focus, but let me just address one thing first.

I am puzzled because this Tribe went through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ process for deciding gaming institutions. The State decided this. Congress isn’t deciding this. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts decided this. They created an area in southeastern Massachusetts along with two other areas in the State where this would be located.

So I have got news for the people in Rhode Island. They can do their best to try to build this Tribe, but it is still going to get a casino because the State of Massachusetts said so.

So now that I am through just pointing out what this bill isn’t about, let me just make the last point about what it is about.

It is about justice. It is about doing the right thing. It is about taking a Tribe that, through its whole history, has lost all of its land even though it did occupy that land where it is in Taunton, where it occupies it now.

This is about doing the right thing, and it is a disgrace in this Congress that politics, special interests, lobbying, and conflicts have taken over this debate. Let’s do the right thing. This is part of our history. We wouldn’t be here where we are without this Tribe. Let’s respect that. Let’s pass this bill.

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

My rhetoric coming from the other side is hot and heavy like I don’t know what I am talking about with Native American Tribes when I have lived my whole life in association with Tribes. So let’s get through some of the false myths that are out here that continually are being talked about.

Now, the myth is that Congress has done this for other Tribes, i.e., we have heard about the Gun Lake Tribe.

Fact: That is false. This bill will be the first time, as my colleague from Rhode Island said, that Congress would overturn a Federal Court decision where the court ruled that the Tribe did not meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust, a State-recognized Tribe.

Myth: The Tribe is facing extinction unless Congress acts.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass. Further, if this is not solely about a casino, then my amendment should have been considered and adopted in committee. The amendment would have included a compromise that would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee for all purposes but not gaming.

Myth number three: H.R. 312 is not a casino giveaway nor a case of reservation shopping.

Fact: It is both. There is no reason for the second reservation other than to build an off-reservation casino 50 miles away from where the Mashpee Tribe currently resides. If this weren’t solely about a casino, then my amendment would have also been adopted in committee.

Myth: The two tracts of land in the town of Mashpee and the city of Taunton both are sites within the Tribal historical territories. My colleague from Massachusetts actually alluded to this.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will build a massive, 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation casino away from their Tribal land on the border that would be Taunton, Rhode Island.

In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations. By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton 50 miles away from the Tribe’s historic reservation—he also brought that point up, that it wasn’t their traditional land—what Congress intended in the Gaming Regulatory Act would be severely hampered.

Myth: This bill has nothing to do with approving a specific casino project.

Fact: We actually heard it again from the other side. If that were the case, then my amendment would have been made in order and received votes or deemed adopted at the committee level. The amendment would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee Tribe for any nongaming purposes.

This may include, but not be limited to, the construction and operation of Tribal government facilities and infrastructure, housing, a hospital, a school and library, a museum, a community center, assisted living for Tribal elders, business development, natural resource management, the Tribe’s exercising its government jurisdiction over Tribal members, and many other Tribal uses.

The next myth is that H.R. 312 is not a bailout.

Fact: That is false. H.R. 312 is not a bailout. In fact, the Malaysian hedge fund, Genting Malaysia, that is underwriting the casino—yes, underwriting this casino.
The Mashpee Tribe will not receive a penny of revenue from the casino for many years, if ever, because of the massive size of the $500 million-plus debt they have incurred to Genting. Genting, therefore, will be the real owner of the Tribe. That is what we are doing right now.

This kind of arrangement where the creditor practically controls the financial future of a debtor Tribe is contrary to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which requires every Tribal casino to be 100% owned by the Tribe.

The last myth: The Mashpee Tribe will go bankrupt if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Fact: The Mashpee Tribe will only be required to repay its debt to the Malaysian company underwriting the deal if H.R. 312 is enacted and the casino is approved.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. I have heard a lot of rhetoric today about the role of Congress and the role of the administration in recognizing or not recognizing Tribal lands, Tribal governments, reservations, and the ability of Tribes to participate in whatever kind of economic development they so desire.

I have also heard a lot of talk and discussion. I am pleased to hear talk and discussion on this House floor about Tribal sovereignty and to make sure that Tribes are recognized, that Tribal sovereignty is recognized, and that this government needs to do right by Native people and indigenous people to this land.

But the basis for support of this bill today is not necessarily rooted in whether or not we are doing the “right thing.” Congress has a duty to properly exercise our plenary power over interactions with Tribal people and with Tribal governments. The Constitution gives Congress plenary power over interactions with Indian Tribes. What is at stake here today is how Congress and the Federal Government are going to continue to interact with Indian Tribes.

Tribes don’t need Congress Members’ sympathy. What Tribes need is for us to properly exercise our duty. This bill does that. This bill exercises Congress’ proper power to recognize a Tribe, to recognize Tribal reservation lands, and it has nothing to do with what happens afterwards.

This bill wouldn’t abrogate or alter the application of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act or any other piece of legislation. This bill would simply do exactly what Congress’ job is to do: recognize the Federal-Tribal relationship that exists and the Tribal lands that are properly held in trust and should be held in trust for an Indian Tribe. That is what we are doing right now.

All the talk and discussion about other pieces of legislation that might be called into question after this bill is passed should be debated later. That has nothing to do with what this specific bill applies to.

Our role here is very simple. We have got to recognize the Mashpee Tribe’s reservation into law without recognizing their sovereignty and their self-determination.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address Congress’ intent, under article I, section 8.

As I said before, the Mashpee reservation of the city of Mashpee is not of consequence. It is the area outside of their previous homeland of Taunton that is of discussion. That is only the aspect here. What has happened here is the bypassing of protocol and law that actually causes the problem.

So let me give you a little bit of background about why I have this problem.

We had seen previous abuse in the past where the off-reservation land was taken in a trust against the will of States, compacts, and local communities for the sole purpose of building new casinos.

This was certainly the case of the Tohono O’odham Nation right in Arizona when they acted against the fellow Tribes, the State of Arizona, and the general public to open an off-reservation casino in Glendale, despite agreeing to a voter-approved compact not to build any more casinos in the Phoenix metro area until the compact was renegotiated. Litigation discovery and audio recordings affirm this shameful conspiracy implemented by the Tohono O’odham.

I am concerned that this bill as written will encourage future abuse in that regard and allow for more off-reservation casinos built against the objections of local communities.

Furthermore, there is no CBO score for this bill. There is no committee report that I have seen. We are pushing this bill through that has no chance of being successful without mismanagement and without knowing the full ramifications of this legislation.

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

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

Let’s go back to some more of the myths.

The Mashpee Tribe will lose its Federal recognition and benefits if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Once again, that is false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Here is the next myth. It was the intent of Congress for all Tribes to have land and trust under the IRA of 1934 regardless of when the Tribes obtained Federal recognition.

Fact: That is not what the Supreme Court said in Carceri v. Salazar. The Supreme Court said that the Tribal aspect of the IRA of 1934 does not authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place land in trust for Tribes that were not under Federal jurisdiction on the date of enactment of IRA, or 1934.

Fact: There is no evidence that Congress, in 1934, thought that off-reservation gaming would turn into the controversial mess it has become today.

Myth: After a Federal judge struck down the Obama administration’s second definition of Indian analysis, the Trump administration chose not to defend the decision.

Fact: The Trump administration chose not to defend the decision because the judge said it was “not even close,” and the Obama administration had not used this analysis in any other Tribe’s trust land case. It was used once only for the Mashpee. The Court remanded the matter back to Interior for an examination under the same “first definition of Indian” analysis used for all other Tribes.

In applying the Obama administration’s analysis used for all other Tribes, the Trump administration determined the Mashpee did not qualify, and yet Tribes blame the Trump administration for something the Obama administration could have done years ago but chose not to.

Could the fate of a billion-dollar casino be the reason why the Obama administration bent the rules? I wonder. H.R. 312 doesn’t amend the IRA. It doesn’t amend any law. Rather, H.R. 312 declares the Obama action struck down by the U.S. district court to be lawful and proper. The bill also orders the court to dismiss the lawsuit concerning the casino property and to prohibit the filing of any future lawsuit over it.

Mr. Speaker, we constantly see over and over again, the problem with H.R. 312 is it is once again being rushed to the floor.

I want to reference a letter from Eagle Forum and highlight, basically, their reservations.

“This bill is a deceptive plan to undermine the Federal Government’s decision to deny the Mashpee Tribe land for a new casino. The Mashpee Tribe has previously engaged in questionable financial and lobbying dealings. They are currently $450 billion in debt to Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company, because of this project.

“The Tribe has no way of paying the company back, which means Genting will be the true owner of this project. Taxpayers should not be responsible for the bailout of their irresponsible dealings.”

Down further it goes:

“Just the issue of gambling alone has been devastating to families across the United States, especially among Native Americans.”

Further down it goes:

“For these reasons, we urge you to vote ‘no’ on H.R. 312, Mashpee
Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.”

I also want to reference Americans for Limited Government:

“The House of Representatives should reject H.R. 312, the Senator Elizabeth Warren Amendment, that would make it possible to place holes through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. This is not about the ability of Tribes using land that is part of their long-established heritage for casino development, but, instead, it is about whether Congress should place holes in the Swiss cheese of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. This punch piecemeal holes through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

This isn’t about the ability of Tribes using land that is part of their long-established heritage for casino development, but, instead, it is about whether Congress should place holes in the Swiss cheese of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. This punch piecemeal holes through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

All of this opposition was enough to have the bill pulled from consideration by the House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules procedures one week after it was considered in committee with no bill report or score—actually, there was a bill report but no score from the Congressional Budgetary Office.

So, I ask all my colleagues to vote “no” against this bill. Send a clear message that we have got to follow the law or change it wholesale for every Tribe, not do it one piece at a time, not allowing lawful actions to occur.

Once again, I want to reiterate, if you have a problem with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, let’s do the wholesale changes on a massive scale, not do it one piece at a time, one Tribe at a time, not allowing lawful actions to occur.

Once again, I want to reiterate, if you have a problem with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, let’s do the wholesale changes on a massive scale, not do it one piece at a time, one Tribe at a time, not allowing lawful actions to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 312, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the following letter from the President:

KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY, as well as the American Values, Eagle Forum, the Governor of Rhode Island, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, Congressmen David Cicilline, James Langevin, and President Donald Trump in opposing this bill.

President Trump tweeted that he opposed the bill and urged Congress to do the same last week. House Minority Whip Steve Scalise also sent an email recommending Members vote “no” on H.R. 312.

The bill is also strenuously opposed by the only other Federally-recognized Tribe in Massachusetts, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe.

All of this opposition was enough to have the bill pulled from consideration by the House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules procedures one week after it was considered in committee with no bill report or score—actually, there was a bill report but no score from the Congressional Budgetary Office.

Now, contrast this with American Values, Eagle Forum, the President. It is not about the scare tactics and hysteria of off-reservation gaming that is constantly used in trying to fight the self-determination and the ability of Tribes to take care of themselves.

It is about protecting a market share. It is not about the tweets from the President. It is not about the scare tactics and hysteria of off-reservation gaming that is constantly used in trying to fight the self-determination and the ability of Tribes to take care of themselves.

And it is about identity.

I want to just follow up on the gentlwoman from Kansas’ comment. To ensure Tribal sovereignty and self-governance, land is critical to the connection of people to their land. And the real-world decisions that we are making have real consequences.

To strip people of their land is to strip them of their identity, to strip them of their self-governance and their self-determination. It is a sad state that, nearly 400 years later, the Mashpee still have to fight for land that is rightfully theirs.

But we can remedy that today.

I want to thank our colleagues Mr. KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY, as well as the entire Massachusetts delegation, for spearheading this effort to save the Mashpee’s land, preserve their way of life, and reestablish and not allow a precedent to stand where trust land that was given is taken away.

This is an important piece of legislation with implications across Indian Country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 312, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the following letter from the President:

KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY, as well as the American Values, Eagle Forum, the Governor of Rhode Island, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah expressing their concern.

I want to reiterate that I support this legislation. However, I believe it is important that the concerns of this sister tribe be included in this debate.

Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah, Aqinnah, MA.

To: The United States House of Representatives, Honorable Representatives
From: Chairwoman Cheryl Andrews-Maltais

H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, built out as a for-profit corporation from major financial problems of its own making, and reverses the judgment of a Federal court and contradicts Interior and Supreme Court decisions. It is no wonder that the majority had to resort to these drastic measures.

I urge everyone to vote “no” and to oppose this bill that sets a dangerous precedent that will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States if enacted into law.

I urge everyone to vote “no” and to oppose this bill that sets a dangerous precedent that will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States if enacted into law.

State, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles away.

The bill forever strips the Federal Government of its jurisdictive over this Tribal casino and overturns a well-reasoned decision from a Federal judge.

The Tribe is one of the only other Federally-recognized Tribes in the United States if enacted into law.

The Tribe’s lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the previous administration to obtain the two reservations through administrative action.

Once again, the Federal judge, however, ruled against the previous administration and said it was unlawful, so now they need legislation to authorize this off-reservation casino.

The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans in the committee markup. Ranking Member Rob Bishop was one of those.

The bill creates two reservations for the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe of Massachusetts, one reservation which we have no problem with, in the town of Mashpee, the Tribe’s historic reservation lands. No casino will be allowed from Mashpee in the city of Taunton. This site is not part of the Tribe’s historic reservation and was selected by the Tribe and Genting for a billion-dollar casino project because of its proximity to the Providence, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles away.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations.

By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton, H.R. 312 creates an off-reservation casino, which is inconsistent with congressional intent. This is often called “reservation shopping.” It is an abuse of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Tribe’s lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the previous administration to obtain the two reservations through administrative action.

Once again, the Federal judge, however, ruled against the previous administration and said it was unlawful, so now they need legislation to authorize this off-reservation casino.

The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans in the committee markup. Ranking Member Rob Bishop was one of those.

The Tribe’s lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the previous administration to obtain the two reservations through administrative action.

Once again, the Federal judge, however, ruled against the previous administration and said it was unlawful, so now they need legislation to authorize this off-reservation casino.

The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans in the committee markup. Ranking Member Rob Bishop was one of those. These Members are joined by Ameri-
omitting the other Wampanoag Tribe (the Aquinnah Wampanoag) from this remedy from which the Aquinnah Wampanoag are also suffering. The Aquinnah Wampanoag would support this bill, H.R. 312 if included as part of “and for other purposes”. The simple purpose is for a simple amendment to create fairness, equity and parity for both Wampanoag Tribes within Massachusetts.

SEC. (d) REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND TO ALSO INCLUDE THE WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF GAY HEAD AQUINNAH (THE AQUINNAH WAMPANOAG)

(a) In order—Mr. Speaker, taking of any land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah of Massachusetts is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)), shall be applicable to the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah and its Tribal members.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GOSAR, 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 passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 375, and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1892.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 146, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—275

Adams Calvert Crist
Aguilar Aguilar Crow
Allred Carcieri Cuellar
Amodei Carson (IN) Cunningham
Armstrong Carwright Davis (KS)
Case Castor (FL) Davis (CA)
Baumgartner Castor (TX) Davis (VA)
Bass Castor (LA) Danny, D.A.
Beatty Castor (OH) DeFazio
Beatty Cisneros DeGette
Bera Clark (MA) Delaney
Berman Clark (NY) DelBene
Beyer Clay Delgado
Bishop (GA) Clyburn Delgado
Blumenauer Cohen DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester Cole Deutch
Boehner Conyers Delahunt
Boyle, Brendan Cook Dingell
Brindisi Cooper Doggett
Brown (MD) Cortney Duffy
Brown (CA) Clyburn Eggers
Butlerfield Craig Escobar

NAYS—146

Collins (GA) Collins (NY)
Aumack Connors Conaway
Arrington Crawford Cook
Baird Cummings Crow
Baldridge Cummings Delaney
Barr Cunningham Delaney
Begaye Bass DelBene
Bilirakis Barr Delaney
Bishop (UT) Bishop (CT) Delaney
Brooks (AL) Brooks (GA) Delaney
Buchanan Buck Delaney
Burbo Burchett Desiderio
Butler Bushyager Deschaines
Byrne Buxton DeGette
Carter (GA) Carter (TX) DeGette
Cicilline Casey DeGette
Cloud Cleaver DeGette

Graves (MO) Green (TN)
Griffith Grothman Guest
Guthrie Harris Hartzler
Herrera Beutler Himes Jones
Hunt Hunter Keating
Jordan Joyce (PA) Johnson (OH)
Kent Kaufman King (NJ)
Kildee King (SC) Kinzinger
Kelly (MI) King (WI) Kinzinger
Kelly (AL) King (WA) Kinzinger
Kerry King (OH) Kinzinger
Kirk Kunstler Klinefelter
Kirkpatrick Lake Levin
Kosinski Lee (CA) Lewis
Kuster Lewis Lee (NY)
Kulmala Lewis Lewis
Kuster Lewis Lewis

REAFFIRMATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 375) to amended the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Grijalva) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 96, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—323

Adams Bilirakis Byrne
Aguilar Bishop (GA) Calvert
Allred Bishop (UT) Carcieri
Amash Blumenauer Cardenas
Armstrong Blunt Rochester Carson (IN)
Axne Bonamici Carter (TX)
Babin Boyle, Brenda Castor (FL)
Baker Boyle, Brenda Castor (OH)
Barr Boyle, Brenda Castor (TX)
Bauer Boyle, Brenda Castor (VA)
Beatty Boyle, Brenda Castor (WV)
Bera Boyle, Brenda Castor (WY)
Beyer Boyle, Brenda Castor (WY)

Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BERGMAN, AUSTIN SCOTT of FLORIDA, SMITH of Washington, HORSFORD, BABIN, and MASSIE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 96, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]
Mr. GRANGER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. COHEN moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the bill to the House with amendments, which the yeas and nays were ordered to be taken. [The instruction to the committee appears at the end of this blank page]
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. CLOUD. 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. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

REPORT ON H.R. 2745, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-63) on the bill (H.R. 2745) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

EXPAND HEALTHCARE ACCESS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, the contrast between Republicans and Democrats on the issue of healthcare could not be any clearer.

Why do Republicans in the Trump administration want to make Americans sick again?

They want to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions. They want to take us backward.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to make America healthy.

We want to expand healthcare access. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and we want to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are not denied insurance coverage.

Madam Speaker, more than 200,000 people in New Jersey who purchased their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions. That is why H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act, is so important.

It would block the Trump administration’s efforts to weaken the Affordable Care Act’s protections for preexisting conditions, because there is no going back to healthcare discrimination.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2019

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize this week, May 12 through 18, as National Police Week 2019.

It is a privilege to take time this week to remember and honor our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who courageously defend American citizens and protect our communities.

They selflessly put their lives on the line to ensure that this Nation is one of safety and order.

Just this past week, in the First Congressional District of Georgia, this reality hit home when Sergeant Kelvin Ansari passed away in the line of duty.

We must come together and recommit ourselves to protecting our law enforcement officers.

In fact, my own district in Central Florida, one of the fastest growing in America, is crisscrossed by Interstate 4, which has been deemed one of the most dangerous highways in the entire Nation.

To all of our police officers, thank you for your service to our communities. God bless you.

REBUILDING OUR NATION’S CRUMBLY INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Infrastructure Week, a week to highlight the importance and necessity of rebuilding our country’s crumbling infrastructure, thus investing in our own future.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives U.S. infrastructure a “D plus” with over 56,000 bridges considered structurally deficient, major airports unable to keep up with the demand and outdated water pipelines experiencing an estimated 240,000 water main breaks annually.

In fact, my own district in Central Florida, one of the fastest growing in America, is crisscrossed by Interstate 4, which has been deemed one of the most dangerous highways in the entire Nation.

The need to invest in highway improvements, auxiliary roads, public
HONORING THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, from the moment of their founding in 1882, the Knights of Columbus have made charity their first principle. Their Liberty Council 1910, based at the parish of the Holy Cross in Bridgeton, New Jersey, is made up of a diverse group of men of the Catholic faith who are guided by the principles of charity, unity, fraternity, but particularly, by charity.

A short list of the good works they do includes: blood drives, planning and implementing youth activities, painting the parking lines in their churches, helping the homeless, advocating for the most vulnerable in our society, leading a diaper drive for new mothers in need of assistance, and helping with various fundraisers in the parish.

The Knights are committed to serving their parish, their community, and their country, and they do it without fanfare and without expecting thanks.

I want to thank the men of Liberty Council 1910 and all the local councils for their service to South Jersey, and the National Organization for its service to the United States of America.

ENSURING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, all Americans deserve equal treatment under the law and should have their rights protected, including individuals in the LGBT community. They should be able to compete equally for jobs, be assured equal opportunity in education, housing, financial, and judicial settings. At the same time, the free exercise of religious beliefs is a core ideal of our country, protected in the Constitution and through Federal law.

The Equality Act explicitly prevents application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to this law. This law was passed nearly unanimously in 1993 by a Democratic House, Senate, and White House.

Congress has never passed a law that shrinks or exempts itself from RFRA. It is critical to ensuring that religious freedom stands a chance of being fully lived out and fairly treated in court.

This week, I will vote for the Equality Act for the broader goals. But before it becomes law, we must do more to ensure religious liberty.

THE EQUALITY ACT ENDGAME

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, usually it is easy to identify the endgame for bad policy. Those who want open borders are looking for more votes. Those who support things like the Green New Deal want to eliminate fossil fuels and American energy strength along with it.

But here is the endgame for the Equality Act, or H.R. 5. It would flip our moral, social, legal, and religious fabric of this Nation upside down.

By erasing the recognition of gender from Federal law, the traditional family, laws, religious beliefs, morality and identity get erased with it.

Madam Speaker, every man and woman in this body are special, and they should vote “no” on H.R. 5.
media accounts as ‘specialists.’ Starting as early as 2014, the IRA’s U.S. operations included social media specialists focusing on Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. The IRA later added specialists who operated on Tumblr and Instagram.

‘Initially, the IRA created social media accounts that pretended to be the personal accounts of U.S. persons. By early 2015, the IRA began to create larger groups, or public social media pages that, over time (and opera-
lity) to be affiliated with the U.S. political and grassroots organizations. In certain cases, the IRA created accounts that mimicked real U.S. organizations. For example, one IRA-controlled Twitter account, @TEN—GOP, purported to be connected to the Tennessee Republican Party. More commonly, the IRA created accounts in the name of fictitious U.S. organizations and grassroots groups and renamed the Facebook pages anti-immigration groups, Tea Party activists, Black Lives Matter protesters, and other U.S. social and political activists.

The IRA closely monitored the activity of the social media accounts—redacted. By February 2016, internal IRA documents referred to support for the Trump campaign and opposition to candidate Clinton. For example,—redacted—directions to IRA operators—redacted. Main idea: Use any opportunity to criticize Hillary Clinton and the rest, (except Sanders and Trump—we support them)—redacted.

The focus on the U.S. Presidential campaign continued throughout 2016. In—redacted—2016 internal—redacted—reviewing the IRA-controlled Facebook book ‘Secured Borders’ the author criticized the ‘lower number of posts dedicated to criticizing Hillary Clinton’ and reminded the Facebook pages specialists, ‘it is imperative to intensify criticizing Hillary Clinton.’ IRA employees also acknowledged that their work focused on influencing the U.S. Presidential election—redacted.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for reading.

Madam Speaker, I am going to read a quote from the Mueller reporter dealing with Russian interference.

‘The first form of Russian election influence came principally from the Internet Research Agency’—and you will hear this evening, over and over again, the name IRA, and that is what it is—the Internet Research Agency, LLC (IRA), an Russian organization, funded by Yevgeniy Viktorovich Prigozhin and companies he controlled, including Concord Management and Consulting LLC and Concord Catering, collectively ‘Concord.’ The IRA conducted operations targeted at large U.S. audiences with the goal of sowing discord in the U.S. political system. These operations constituted ‘active measures’—and it is translated into Russian—‘a term that typically refers to operations conducted by Russian security services aimed at influencing the course of international affairs.’

That is volume I, page 14.

I am going the read one more, and this is from volume I, pages 14 and 15. ‘By the end of the 2016 U.S. election, the IRA’—that is that Russian organization that has influenced the media in the United States, in our elections—‘the IRA had the ability to reach millions of U.S. persons through their social media accounts. Multiple IRA-controlled Facebook groups and Instagram accounts had hundreds of thousands of followers. IRA-controlled Twitter accounts separately had tens of thousands of followers, including multiple U.S. political figures who retweeted IRA-created content. In November 2017, a Facebook representative testified that Facebook had identified 470 IRA-controlled Facebook accounts that collectively made 80,000 posts between January 2015 and August 2017. Facebook estimated the IRA reached as many as 126 million people through its Facebook accounts. In January 2018, Facebook reported that it had identified 3,814 IRA-controlled Twitter accounts and notified approximately 1.4 million people Twitter believed may have been in contact with an IRA-controlled account.’

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) to read a quote.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is from volume I, page 6. ‘The IRA outreach to the Trump campaign continued into the summer of 2016, as candidate Trump was becoming the presumptive Republican nominee for President. On June 9, 2016, for example, a Russian lawyer met with senior Trump campaign officials Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and campaign chairman Paul Manafort to deliver what the email proposing the meeting had described as ‘official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary.’

‘The materials were offered to Trump Jr. as “part of Russia and its government’s support for Mr. Trump.” The written communications setting up the meeting showed that the campaign anticipated receiving information from Russia that could assist candidate Trump’s electoral prospects, but that Russian lawyer’s presentation did not provide such information.’

Testimony of Colin Stretch, the general counsel of Facebook. This is in volume I, page 15.

‘We estimate that roughly 29 million people were served content in their news feeds directly from the IRA’s...’ and that stands for the Internet Research Agency’s, ‘80,000 posts over the 2 years.’

The IRA is the Russian organization in which some 30 persons have been indicted.

‘Posts from these pages were also shared, liked, and followed by people on Facebook, and, as a result, three times more people may have been exposed to a story that originated from the Russian operation. Our best estimate is that approximately 126 million people may have been served content from a page associated with the IRA at some point during the 2-year period.’

‘The Facebook representative also testified that Facebook had identified 170 Instagram accounts that posted approximately 120,000 pieces of content during that time. Facebook did not
offer an estimate of the audience reached via Instagram.’”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Reading from volume I, page 33.

“The investigation identified two different forms of connections between the IRA and members of the Trump campaign. (The investigation identified no similar connections between the IRA and the Clinton campaign.) First, on multiple occasions, members and surrogates of the Trump campaign promoted, by linking, retweeting, or similar methods of posting—pro-Trump or anti-Clinton content published by the IRA through IRA-controlled social media accounts.

Additionally, in a few instances, IRA employees represented themselves as U.S. persons to communicate with members of the Trump campaign in an effort to seek assistance and coordination on IRA-organized political rallies inside the United States.’’

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I will be reading now from volume I, page 36.

“Beginning in March 2016, units of the Russian Federation’s Main Intelligence Directorate of the General Staff (GRU) hacked the computers and email accounts of organizations, employees, and volunteers supporting the Clinton campaign, including the email account of campaign chairman John Podesta. Starting in April 2016, the GRU hacked into the computer networks of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) and the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

“The GRU targeted hundreds of email accounts used by Clinton campaign employees, advisers, and volunteers. In total, the GRU stole hundreds of thousands of documents from the compromised email accounts and networks. The GRU later released stolen information in the Clinton campaign and DNC documents through online personas, ‘DCLeaks’ and ‘Guccifer 2.0,’ and later through the organization WikiLeaks. The release of the documents was designed and timed to interfere with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election and undermine the Clinton campaign.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in the WikiLeaks releases and, in the summer and fall of 2016—redacted. After releasing WikiLeaks’ release of the stolen Podesta emails on October 7, 2016, the same day a video from year-earlier was published of Trump using graphic language about women.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Volume I, page 35.

“Starting in June 2016, the IRA contacted different U.S. persons affiliated with the Trump campaign in an effort to coordinate pro-Trump IRA-organized rallies inside the United States. In all cases, the IRA contacted the campaign while claiming to be U.S. political activists working on behalf of a conservative grassroots organization. The IRA’s contacts included requests for signs and other materials to use at rallies, as well as requests to promote the rallies and help coordinate logistics.

“While certain campaign volunteers agreed to provide the requested support (for example, agreeing to set aside a number of signs), the investigation has not identified evidence that any Trump campaign official understood the requests were coming from foreign nationals.”

Volume I, page 35.

“In sum, the investigation established that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election through the active measures social media campaign carried out by the IRA, an organization funded by Prigozhin and companies that he controlled. As explained further, the grand jury (and a grand jury has alleged) that Prigozhin, his companies, and IRA employees violated U.S. law through these operations, principally by undermining through deceptive acts the work of Federal and state election official and reestablishing foreign influence in the U.S. elections.”

That is also volume I, page 35.

Volume I, pages 42 and 43.

“On June 14, 2016, the DNC and its cyber-response team announced the breach of the DNC network and suspected theft of DNC documents. In the statements, the cyber-response team alleged that Russian state-sponsored actors (which they referred to as ‘Fancy Bear’) were responsible for the breach.

“Apparently in response to that announcement, on June 15, 2016, GRU officers, that is, the Russian spy agency officers, ‘using the persona Guccifer 2.0’ and ‘Guccifer 2.0’ named in a complaint, released the stolen DNC server hack to a lone Romanian hacker who controlled. As explained further, the grand jury (and a grand jury has alleged) that Prigozhin, his companies, and IRA employees violated U.S. law through these operations, principally by undermining through deceptive acts the work of Federal and state election official and reestablishing foreign influence in the U.S. elections.”

This is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

“The GRU continued to target these victims through the elections in November. While the investigation identified evidence that the GRU targeted these individuals and entities, the office did not investigate further. The office did not, for instance, obtain or examine servers or other relevant items belonging to these victims. The office understands that the FBI, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the States have separately investigated that activity.”

This is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in WikiLeaks’ releases of hacked materials throughout the summer and fall of 2016—redacted.

“On June 12, 2016, Assange claimed in a televised interview to have emails relating to Hillary Clinton which are pending publication,” but provided no additional context.

“In de briefings with the office, former Deputy Campaign Chairman Rick Gates said that—redacted. Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated Clinton emails had not been found.”

“Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated”—again it
says—'that the Clinton emails had not been found.'

Again, that is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

I am hoping that some more Members come down, but if not, I am going to remain just as ample time as there is.

‘Many IRA operations used Facebook accounts created and operated by its specialists—redacted.’

‘IRA Facebook groups active during the 2016 campaign covered a range of political issues and included purported conservative groups (with names such as ‘Being Patriotic,’ ‘Stop All Immigrants,’ ‘Secured Borders,’ and ‘Tea Party News,’), purported Black social justice groups (‘Black Matters,’ ‘Blacktivist,’ and ‘Don’t Shoot Us’), LGBTQ groups (‘LGBT United’), and religious groups (‘United Muslims of America’).’

‘Throughout 2016, IRA accounts published an increasing number of materials supporting the Trump campaign and opposing the Clinton campaign. For example, on May 31, 2016, the operational account ‘Matt Skiber’ began to privately message dozens of pro-Trump Facebook groups asking them to help plan a ‘pro-Trump rally near Trump Tower.’

‘To reach larger U.S. audiences, the IRA purchased advertisements from Facebook that promoted the IRA groups on the news feeds of U.S. audience members. According to Facebook, the IRA purchased over 3,500 advertisements and the expenditures totaled approximately $100,000.

‘During the U.S. Presidential campaign, many IRA-purchased advertisements explicitly supported or opposed a Presidential candidate or promoted U.S. rallies organized by the IRA (discussed below). As early as March 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements that overtly opposed the Clinton campaign. For example, on March 18, 2016, the IRA purchased an advertisement depicting candidate Clinton and a caption that read in part, ‘If one day God lets this liar enter the White House as a President—that day would be a real national tragedy.’

‘That was a quote from the ad that they paid for.

‘Similarly, on April 6, 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements for its account ‘Black Matters’ calling for a ‘flash mob’ of U.S. persons to ‘take a photo with #HillaryClintonForPrison2016 or #noHillary2016.’ IRA-purchased advertisements featuring Clinton were, with very few exceptions, negative.’

Again, this is a Russian agency, Russian operation.

‘IRA-purchased advertisements referencing candidate Trump largely supported his campaign. The first known IRA advertisement explicitly endorsing the Trump campaign was purchased on April 19, 2016. The IRA bought an advertisement (from its Instagram account ‘Tea Party News’ asking U.S. persons to help them ‘make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters’—’I will say that again: ‘make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters’—‘by uploading photos with the hashtag #KIDS4TRUMP. In subsequent months, the IRA purchased dozens of advertisements supporting the Trump campaign, predominantly through the Facebook groups ‘Believin’, ‘Stop All Invaders’ and ‘Secured Borders.’

‘Collectively, the IRA’s social media accounts reached tens of millions of U.S. persons. Individual IRA social media accounts attracted hundreds of thousands of followers. For example, at the time they were deactivated by Facebook in mid-2017, the IRA’s ‘United Muslims of America’ Facebook group had over 300,000 followers, the ‘Don’t Shoot Us’ Facebook group had over 250,000 followers, the ‘Being Patriotic’ Facebook group had over 200,000 followers, and the ‘Secured Borders’ Facebook group had over 130,000 followers. According to Facebook, in total the IRA-controlled accounts made over 80,000 posts before their deactivation in August 2017, and these posts reached at least 29 million U.S. persons and ‘may have reached an estimated 126 million people.’

‘That is Volume I, pages 24 to 26.

Madam Speaker, I am going to yield back my time.

I think it is worth people taking a look at the Mueller report. You can get it in book form. You can also download it for free. It can be downloaded for free. I think it is the Justice Department, isn’t it? The Justice Department website.

I think, seeing the extent and reading the words that talk about the extent of Russian interference in our elections is really important, especially as we head into a new election cycle where Americans want to have confidence that their vote really matters, that the messages that they are getting are legitimate ones from inside America, the United States of America, the U.S. and any other foreign influence is not using the internet, using names that are supposed to sound like they are American organizations and American websites and American Facebook pages.

I think it is very important for people to learn about that. It is worth the read.

Actually, if you consider all the redactions, it is not as long a read as you might think. And then all of us would be informed of their death.

About 3 percent of Americans have read the Mueller report, and I would certainly encourage more.

One of our colleagues, MARY GAY SCANlon, I know, is going to begin at front tomorrow with full reading. It is going to be done in one of the House rooms here, upstairs in the Rules Committee, a reading of the Mueller report.

Otherwise, I think people have misguided information about what is in it and there is really nothing at all that is important.

Those Americans who are interested in the sanctity of our elections, I would very much encourage. You could even watch the reading that is going on starting at noon tomorrow of the full Mueller report. And consider the threat to our elections and that we have to do everything we can to make sure that there is no outside interference.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE BUDGET

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, called our national debt “the single biggest threat to national security.”

Since then, we have added more than $7 trillion more in red ink. Our national debt today stands at $22 trillion, and it is only getting worse.

The Congressional Budget Office is projecting trillion-dollar deficits in perpetuity. These deficits will leave future generations like my daughter’s generation saddled with higher taxes, stagnant growth, and a lower standard of living. This is simply unacceptable.

Thankfully, pro-growth policies implemented by President Trump and congressional Republicans have led to a booming economy with 3.2 percent GDP growth and unemployment below 4 percent.

Our strong economy provides Congress a unique opportunity to tackle this problem, but bold leadership is required to do so.

Unfortunately, it is clear that there will be no such leadership from the Democrats. The Democrats have failed to perform the most basic function of government, which is passing a budget. In fact, they have not even bothered to bring a budget to the floor for a vote. Why, you might ask? Because the radical left is now in control of the Democratic agenda and demanding trillions of dollars in additional spending for programs like the Green New Deal, which aims to eliminate everything from air travel to requiring every single building in the United States to be rebuilt or upgraded, banning farting cows, and will cost upwards of $92 trillion in debt, or, another budget-busting initiative like Medicare-for-all, which would increase government spending by $32 trillion over the next decade.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

Thank you for your time.
Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I am very proud to have worked with a task force of eight of my colleagues, as well as the rest of our 141-member strong Republican Study Committee, on the "Preserving American Freedom" budget resolution.

This budget reduces government debt by cutting $12.6 trillion in wasteful spending over the next 10 years. It ensures permanent solvency for Medicare and Social Security so that these programs will exist for the seniors who rely on them today, as well as for future generations.

It repeals ObamaCare and gives unprecedented control to the States to design healthcare programs that fit the unique needs of their citizens.

It reforms welfare to move more people into employment with a sense of purpose and self-reliance.

Finally, it matches President Trump's commitment to national security by fully funding the border wall and making the necessary investments in our military to ensure the safety of the American people from foreign threats.

The "Preserving American Freedom" budget is the only serious proposal from Congress to address Washington's addiction to spending and a bloated and growing national debt. I am very proud to have led the RSC's effort to tackle this generational challenge and ensure a brighter future for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, tonight, we are going to hear from some of my colleagues about this very important budget, and I hope that what we can do to address fiscal responsibility so desperately needed in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I am rising also to join my coworkers in advocating for fiscal responsibility as Congress seeks to craft a budget.

The RSC budget is bold, and I am pleased to see it include such proposals as requiring the Congressional Budget Office to account for debt servicing in the cost estimates they prepare for Congress. My bill, H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, would do that very thing.

Before legislation passes either the House or the Senate, lawmakers should know how much it will actually cost. This would seem to go without saying, but lawmakers consistently overlook one key cost, the new interest payments their spending will create. Folks back home understand how important this should be honest about the true cost of spending.

If you were budgeting for monthly car payments and only considered the list price of the car itself and didn't factor in the extra cost of interest payments, you would later discover that the total cost is more than you could afford. Unfortunately, this is exactly what Congress does when considering new spending.

Congress relies on the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to estimate the cost of legislation. But Congress does not require either of them to include the cost of servicing the additional debt we authorize or reauthorizing or reauthorizing spending. This results in an incomplete picture of the total actual cost.

Servicing national debt is becoming a substantial part of Federal spending. Within just a few years, our Nation will be spending more on interest payments than on the entire Department of Defense. This should alarm all of us, as this will increasingly crowd out other spending priorities.

When I introduced H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, to address these problems by requiring the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to add the cost of servicing the debt to the cost estimates of legislation.

In essence, Congress is not considering the comprehensive budgetary impact of spending and tax proposals. This distorts congressional decision-making in favor of more spending and debt accumulation.

Congress routinely ignores the true costs and overstates the benefits of new spending. The American people have to account for the cost of debt in their family budgets, and providing Congress with accurate cost estimates that include the cost of debt servicing is a commonsense reform that would hold Congress to the same standard, forcing lawmakers to reckon with the actual cost of raising our national debt.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and fellow classmate of the last congressional class, a great conservative leader in the Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the budget action team chair for this fine work and for yielding time.

We should be debating right now in Congress a budget. We should be debating the Democrats' ideas from the Republicans, the RSC budget. We should be doing that to develop a road map for the current year and for future years for appropriations, what our priorities are.

You will note that we are talking about it, but it is pretty quiet down here today. Why? Because, unfortunately, the leadership of the Democratic Party has been unable to produce a budget. They can't agree, even among themselves, what a budget should look like.

I spent 35 years in private business. Budgets are pretty basic. Without them, I don't know how you operate. Apparently, we are going to try, and that is unfortunate.

My focus tonight is on the Federal budgeting and appropriations process and what we need to do to fix it. We can fix individual items in our budget, but long term, we need to fundamentally restructure how we spend. As noted earlier by Mr. CLOUD, doomed for some pretty dire outcomes.

The Federal budget and appropriations restraints under current law are totally ineffective. They simply do not work. And you know what? We can fix this.

Virtually all Federal spending right now is mandatory. Two-thirds of what we spend every year is called mandatory spending. It is on autopilot.

Let me give you some examples of what that means. $2.523 billion is mandatory. Our interest payments in 2018 will be $325 billion. I want you to stop and think about what a massive number that is.

The Federal debt crossed $22 trillion last year. It now exceeds the entire annual production of the United States and equates to more than $67,000 for every American in this country. Over the next 10 years, interest alone on the Federal debt will be the third largest Federal expenditure.

Now, at home, if that was what you were dealing with, you would be calling a debt counselor. If your interest payment alone was the third highest expense you were facing, you would be principal, just the interest—you are in serious trouble. Here, we call it government.

This process robs the American people of their voice, their representation. Long term, it will rob them of the basic opportunity for services if we don't get this under control.

The RSC "Preserving American Freedom" budget proposal and what I propose address that issue.

Budgets are what we need to do. And for our part, we must address what is called mandatory spending. Mandatory spending has taken on this huge component. As I said, it is two-thirds of Federal expenditures.

We need to move everything except Social Security, Medicare, and TRICARE to discretionary spending and require everybody in this room and this building to vote, to put their priorities forward, rather than have it be on autopilot.

The one thing we need to do is not have it simply be whatever we spent last year. How much more are we going to spend? We need to require zero-based budgeting of all agencies every few years—maybe 3 years because they are so big. Frankly—where they have to justify down to the penny what they are spending money on. Because you know what a budget cut is in Washington? A budget cut in Washington is you get less money than the increase you asked for and they tell you they took the budget cut.

I spent 35 years in private business. A budget cut means you actually spend less than what you spent last year. You
spend less money, less real cash, not that you didn’t get as much as you asked for.

Frankly, that is like my teenagers and allowance. Well, you cut my budget. No, I didn’t give you as much as you asked for.

Second, the next thing we need to do is we need to use a 51-vote requirement for budgets, 51 votes to pass a budget, a simple majority. We need to say 51 votes to make any change in discretionary outlays. That way, in fact, we can make our budget appropriations, not have the system manage us, not have the Senate decide no, we need 60 votes, and we just go along our merry way, putting out money hand over fist.

Additionally, we need to change a few rules about how we manage ourselves. We need to require there be no recess until budget appropriations are completed. Everyone stays here. Frankly, I think we just lock the doors and stay here until we get it done because, far too often, we will just do a continuing resolution.

You would be disgusted at the number of continuing resolutions that happen for a week, 3 days. All these continue, and all we do is spend the same money. So, sorry, no recess until we get it done.

Additionally, we need to withhold the pay for all Members of Congress until we get the job done, until there are budget and appropriations resolutions done for the year.

When we hit the time that we should be funded already for the year, if it is not done, everyone on the payroll here that is a Member of Congress doesn’t get paid, because I know how to get folks’ attention after 35 years in private business.

There is one way to put it: Follow the money. Other ways are not appropriate on the floor of the House, but you have the idea.

We have to address this issue. The only way to address this is to get our appropriations under control.

One of the things I proposed, in conjunction with another Member, is the Protecting Our Children’s Future Act, which talks about these changes that must be made in how we do budgeting and appropriations in a process. Otherwise, we just do the same thing over and over again here in Congress, and that is a sad thing. Frankly, that is like my teenagers.

I appreciate the time to talk about something I think is so urgent because, without this fundamental change, we are tilting at windmills. We need to make this change sooner than later.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, what I hear from Hoosiers all over my district is that they sent their Representatives here to bring back fiscal sanity, to balance our budget. That is what hardworking Hoosier families do every day. It is the only way they have come to find in their State legislature in my great home State of Indiana as well. Indiana has a balanced budget amendment. We have legislators who go to the State house and pass fiscally responsible budgets every 2 years.

It was a pleasure of mine for 6 years to serve with the next speaker, somebody who is a true American hero and one of the great conservative leaders of this freshman class in the new Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the RSC 2020 budget resolution and urge our colleagues to support it.

I have a copy of that here, so I encourage everyone to take the opportunity to study it and look for those positive aspects that are important that Congressman BANKS and his team put together to have a balanced budget.

It reduces Federal spending by over $12 trillion in the next decade and balances our Federal budget in the next 6 years.

As the gentleman mentioned, the State of Indiana passed an amendment to the constitution in 2018 to require our budgets to balance, and Hoosiers have enjoyed a balanced State budget since 2012.

We are among a minority of States that have a Triple-A credit rating, and Indiana has cut 15 different taxes while still balancing our budget and funding key State priorities.

This proposed budget addresses out-of-control spending and rightfully aims to significantly decrease our national debt. We are $22 trillion in debt as a Nation. That is not my money. That is money that belongs to the taxpayers.

Because we have been paying interest on this debt for decades, it is really the money of our next generation of American taxpayers, our kids and our grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of what Hoosiers have been able to do in our State, and I will continue to fight for that same Hoosier common sense here in D.C.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the State of Indiana has so much to be proud of. Indiana provides a road map for the rest of the Nation when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

There are few leaders in the House of Representatives who do as much for the conservative cause and promote fiscal responsibility as Representative HICE from the great State of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I appreciate those kind words.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues this evening in support of the Republican Study Committee budget for 2020.

Here in Congress, there are immense problems and vast issues that we deal with, and sometimes they can feel overwhelming. For that reason, it is important that we have a purpose, that we have a vision, that we have a pathway to get us out of some of the issues that we face and to give us a sense of purpose for getting through those things, a playbook, if you will.

Madam Speaker, I just want to publicly commend my colleagues who have labored so diligently to put together this draft. I especially want to recognize the RSC chairman, MIKE JOHNSON, and the Spending Task Force chairman, JIM BANKS, my good friend. Their leadership has been invaluable, and we are truly appreciative to put all of them.

I am particularly pleased that in this budget they have included a proposal to eliminate official time. This is something I have been working on for a long time.

For those who may not be familiar with it, official time allows a Federal employee who is part of a union to conduct union activities in the course of their workday even if that means not doing the job that they were hired to do.

In many cases, people are hired to do a job and yet 100 percent of their time is spent doing Federal union activities, and so the taxpayer is paying these people to do a job which they are not doing.

It ends up these agencies have to hire someone else to do a job while the first individual is doing union activities rather than that for which they were hired.

Over the years since I have been here, I have personally tried to cut some of the official time usage. That didn’t work. We have tried diligently to reform official time, to no avail.

We have even tried to just provide some degree of transparency, and yet in every attempt, everything that we have tried to do, we have faced tremendous opposition both from Federal employee unions and many of their allies here in Congress.

Make no mistake, the opposition is real; it is strong; it is entrenched in this place. And yet we have got to continue to move forward.

To add to the problem, it is virtually impossible to remove a Federal employee. According to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, it can take between 170 and 370 days to remove a bad actor, a bad worker in a Federal position, and this is because of the appeals process, grievances that can be filed, complaints that just drag on and on and on.

There are thousands, by the way, of Federal employees who agree with me. Recently, a survey found that 31 percent of Federal employees feel that there are few to little steps taken to remove or deal with poor-performing employees in the Federal Government.

So, Madam Speaker, we need to restore fiscal sanity around here. We
need to enforce accountability and in-still transparency in our Federal Gov-ernment, and I believe this RSC budget is a step in that direction. It rises in stark contrast to the nonexistant budg-ent of the Democratic majority.

So with that again, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentle-eman for his comments to-night.

Madam Speaker, as I said before, there are 140 members of the Repub-lican Study Committee. Many of those 140 members are new freshman Mem-bers who were elected just beginning of this Congress, who are conservative Members who stepped up to the plate to preach fiscial responsibility, to keep the commitments that they made on the campaign trail. One of those new Members is my colleague and friend, Representative HERN from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentle-eman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentle-eman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand with my col-leagues today to stress the importance of fiscial health in our country.

There is a very real problem here. If we don't address it, we are condemning our children to doom.

My colleagues across the aisle like to use the 12 years left hyperbole to talk about the necessity to act on climate change, but they ignore the fiscial cliff we are standing on, a much more im-mi-nent threat to the well-being of our country and our people.

Instead of addressing the debt crisis, the Democrat majority chose not to draft a budget at all this year. That tells us all we need to know about their priorities.

Speaker PELOSI herself said: Show me your budget, and I will show you your values.

So, without a budget, what are the major priorities?

The RSC budget addresses our defi-cits and aims to balance by 2025. This budget refocuses spending on our core constitutional responsibilities and lim-its the growth of government.

Forty-nine out of the 50 United States are required to have a balanced budget, but the Federal Government does not have that requirement. A budget that balances is the first and most important step towards financial well-being for our country.

I spent more than 30 years as a busi-ness owner before coming to Congress. In the business world, a company will fail if they continually spend more money than they bring in. You just can't do that.

That is a foreign concept to many of my colleagues here. In fact, several people in this building believe that the best way to address our debt is to ig-nore its existence entirely. That is just simply ridiculous. Problems don't just disappear. They don't disappear for you or me. You have to take corrective ac-tion, and this budget does just that.

So what do we do about it?

I am very proud to talk about what JIM BANKS and his leadership and what the Republican Study Committee have done in presenting here this evening. This budget exemplifies fiscal sanity and preserves America's future.

As most of you know, I spent my ca-career in the running of small businesses, starting out in the construction indus-try, then participating in the banking indus-try and electronic medical records and real estate development. I did this in conjunction with my wife, Robin, as my partner.

Many times, we would sit down at the kitchen table, just like every other American family, and we would map out a budget. I knew that spending more than my means was simply out of the question.

Well, folks, why can't we do that here in Washington? We need more fis-cial common sense here in Washington, and the RSC fiscal year 2020 budget does just that.

Picture this: $12.6 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years, bal-ancing the budget in just 6 years by 2025. On that fact alone, I would hope that every Member of this body would offer their support.

This budget also fosters a rewarding environment for economic growth and job creation.

We have heard it over and over again from those who deal in investments and deal with the economy and the growth of the economy that the biggest wind at our face is this budget deficit.

If we do not address the budget deficit, it is a headwind against the growth of this economy if we don't get serious about a budget.

This budget will give us that opportu-nity for economic growth and job creation.

Right now, we have the best economy in the world: 263,000 jobs were created last month, and over 7 million jobs are available throughout this Nation, far exceed-ing the number of job seekers.

I was so glad to work with my col-leagues here in Congress the last 2 years and with the President in mak-ing this happen. But the American peo-ple made it happen. All we did was pro-vide an opportunity. We reformed regula-tions and we passed a tax reform bill that gave the economy a boost.

Frankly, in dealing with the budget deficit and going forward, our only hope in this is to grow our economy. We have GDP growth we have never

In a telephone townhall with con-stituents from Georgia's 12th District last night, 73 percent of participants reported that our economy is headed in the right direction. When I ran for Con-gress in 2014, 70 percent of people in my district said that the economy was going in the wrong direction, and we have flipped it.

However, a soaring economy also cre-ates challenges. As we face increasing workforce needs, this budget prioritizes moving Americans off the sidelines and back into the workforce, rewarding work and promoting innovation.
Madam Speaker, I am the grandfather of 13 beautiful grandchildren, and the last thing I want to do is leave an insurmountable debt behind for our future generations. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to get onboard with the Republican Study Committee to restore a sense of fiscal responsibility to Washington. Our future depends on it.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, a great friend and a great conservative in the House of Representatives, for being here.

Madam Speaker, when the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, MIKIE JOHNSON from Louisiana, asked me to take on this task as chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force, I was very proud to do so, not just because I have enormous respect for Chairman JOHNSON as a conservative leader in this Congress, but because of the stature and reputation of the Republican Study Committee.

At one point, our Vice President, from my home State, MIKE PENCE, one of the greatest conservative leaders in this Congress, and the chairman of the Republican Study Committee. And so, too, was another man whom I respect just as much, one of the greatest leaders in our Nation, the Republican whip, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from Louisiana, chairman of the Republican Study Committee, too. The reputation of RSC is important because it is the conservative vehicle in the Congress to advance conservative principles. No one does that more on a daily basis than my friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for his kind words, too, especially. He has been a great friend and a great leader on this front. I want to commend him for taking on the task of putting together a budget. Madam Speaker, that confronts some of the challenges that our country is facing in a way that not only protects those promises that were made, for example, to seniors.

Seniors were promised the safety net of Medicare, and yet, if we do nothing—and there are some suggesting that we leave Medicare where it is today—it actually goes bankrupt, Madam Speaker, in the next 8 years. It would be irresponsible for us, as Members of Congress, to sit back and say we are afraid to confront these important issues, because failing to confront them literally would lead to a bankruptcy program for seniors today and a broken promise by the Federal Government to those seniors.

So we save Medicare from bankruptcy and, in fact, do it in a way that we can make sure that current beneficiaries—current seniors. In fact, the only thing that would change is if we didn’t do this, it would go bankrupt. So the program is actually solvent again, not only for current seniors, but for younger people, too, who don’t think it will be there. In fact, it won’t be there for them the way it is for current seniors if we don’t make these bold reforms.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, this Republican Study Committee budget proposal was a gigantic effort: over 300 members of the Republican Study Committee who offered ideas and proposals to include in this budget proposal.

Over the past several weeks, we met on a weekly basis, almost a dozen times, to put together this budget proposal, assembling a task force of eight conservative members, who gathered on a weekly basis to comb through the President’s budget to find that we could put forth something that conservatives, not just in Congress but throughout the country, could be very proud of.

I am really proud that, on our task force, we had Members who came from different States, different perspectives, who had different ideas. That made the effort stronger and, in the end, it allowed us to produce a stronger budget proposal. One of those members, I am very proud to say, is my friend, the representative from Florida, my colleague, Representative Yoho.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Yoho).

Mr. Yoho. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the RSC Budget Committee for yielding to me, along with Chairman MIKIE JOHNSON, for leading the way on this task. I thank all of my colleagues who participated in this, and the RSC staff who held the hard work. They were there every night and every day to bring this budget together—Richard Stern, Jay, and Mark. Many times, they don’t get recognized for the work that they did, but yet they put in a lot of effort.

So why do a budget? Everybody asks, why do you guys worry about a budget? Well, this House is tasked with the power of the purse. We are the ones who are supposed to bring in a budget and spending the people’s money, because the American people care how we spend their money. They want us to spend it smartly, prudently, and responsibly. If you don’t have a budget, can you do that?

We have got a budget. Right here, we have got a budget. This is a budget. This is a good budget. We are at $22 trillion in debt. This Nation is at $22 trillion in debt.

In the previous administration, we saw the debt double. This administration, it will probably double again. And if a Democrat gets in, or a Republican, it will probably double again. If this body does not come together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, this problem will never be addressed. What happens is a political divide happens because we can blame the other side for not doing what they are supposed to.

We didn’t have a budget last year and the Democrats don’t have a budget this year. So how serious is this body about correcting this? The Republican Study Committee has a budget. This budget needs to be looked at.

I was born in the fifties—1955—and I grew up during the sixties. Our mandatory spending in this country was roughly 30 percent; 70 percent was discretionary spending. Do you know what that allows you to do? That allows you to do an interstate system, and it allows you to have a space program and have aspirations of going to
the Moon and coming back by a Demo-
cratic President who put country above politics. We came together, and we did
that because we could.

Do you know what? We can’t do that
today, because, today, 71 percent of our
spending is mandatory, and 29 percent
is discretionary. But let me tell you who
can do that.

China can go to the Moon. China can
do infrastructure. In fact, they are
doing it all over the world. Do you
know why? Because they are cash rich.
We are not. So, in fact, they hold a
large portion of our debt.

Let me tell you what $22 trillion in
debt is. If you take $22 trillion and di-
vide it by 330 million Americans,
roughly, that comes down to $67,000,
not per family, but per individual. So
for 300 million Americans, they are
$67,000 in debt.

Is it my fault? Yeah, I guess so, be-
cause I am here. It is your fault, it is
their fault. If we are here, this is our
generation’s fault, and this is some-
thing that we have to come together as
Americans to fix.

If we don’t have a budget, can we fix
a budget problem? If we don’t have a
budget, can we acknowledge a problem?

As I pointed out, the other side
doesn’t have a budget. There is a bud-
get and if we come together as Ameri-
cans and put down the crazy politics of
fighting one side over the other, we can
fix the problems of this country. We
can fix education, we can fix healthcare,
we can fix infrastructure, and we can plan for a future brighter
than today. We can create a vision for
this country 50 to 100 years down the
road, but we can’t do it if we are fighting
over budgetary problems in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the
honor of being able to be on this com-
mittee. I hope it sinks into the other
side that we come together, and we
come together as Americans.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, we
need to confront this fiscal challenge
now, as it is no longer a far-off con-
cern.

Currently, we are set to run trillion-
dollar deficits in perpetuity. The So-
cial Security trust fund will be bank-
rupcy by 2035. The Medicare trust fund
will be bankrupt by 2026. Without bold
and immediate action, this growing debt will condemn America to a future
that is less prosperous and less free.

My colleagues and I from the Repub-
lican Study Committee are determined
to make sure that this never material-
izes. The Republican Study Committee
preserving the American freedom bud-
giet would not only prevent that bleak future, it would ensure even greater
prosperity for all Americans for years
and generations to come.

I could not be prouder to lead this ef-
fort of the better of the Republican Study
Committee and its 141 conservative
members.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the ba-
 lance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
A message in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States was commu-
nicated to the House by Ms. Mariel
Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTA-
TIVES
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be-
fore the House the following commu-
nication from the Honorable Chuck
GRASSLEY, President pro tempore of
the Senate, and the Honorable Nancy
PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Rep-
resentatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Pursuant to the provisions of Section
201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Im-
pendment Control Act of 1974, Public Law
93–344, the President pro tempore of the Sen-
ate and the Speaker of the House of Rep-
resentatives hereby appoint Dr. Phillip
Swagel as the Director of the Congressional
Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore
of the Senate.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

DECLARING A NATIONAL EMER-
GENCY TO SECURE THE INFOR-
MATION AND COMMUNICATIONS
TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES
SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116–35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be-
fore the House the following message
from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emer-
1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), the National
Emergency Acts (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.),
and section 301 of title 3, United States
Code, I hereby report that I have issued an
Executive Order declaring a na-
tional emergency to deal with the
threat posed by the acquisition or use in the United States of
information and communications tech-
ology or services designed, developed,
manufactured, or supplied by persons
owned by, controlled by, or subject to the juris-
diction or direction of a foreign ad-
versary; and

(i) the transaction involves informa-
tion and communications technology
or services designed, developed, manu-
f actured, or supplied, by persons owned
by, controlled by, or subject to the juris-
diction or direction of a foreign ad-
versary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage
to or subversion of the design, integ-
rity, manufacturing, production, dis-
tribution, or supply of information and
communications technology or services in
the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of cata-

trophic effects on the security or re-
siliency of United States critical infras-
tructure or the digital economy of the
United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable
risk to the national security of the
United States or the security and safety
of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the
authority to be, in consultation, opera-
ted with, or, upon referral of a particular trans-
action, from the heads of other agen-
cies as appropriate, take such actions,
including directing the timing and manner
of the cessation of transactions
prohibited pursuant to the Executive
Order, adopting appropriate rules and
regulations, and employing all other
powers granted to the President by
IEEPA, as may be necessary to imple-
ment the Executive Order. All agencies
and departments and agencies (agencies), has
determined that:

(i) the transaction involves informa-
tion and communications technology
or services designed, developed, manu-
factured, or supplied, by persons owned
by, controlled by, or subject to the juris-
diction or direction of a foreign ad-
versary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage
to or subversion of the design, integ-
rity, manufacturing, production, dis-
tribution, or supply of information and
communications technology or services in
the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of cata-

trophic effects on the security or re-
siliency of United States critical infras-
tructure or the digital economy of the
United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable
risk to the national security of the
United States or the security and safety
of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the
authority to be, in consultation, opera-
ted with, or, upon referral of a particular trans-
action, from the heads of other agen-
cies as appropriate, take such actions,
including directing the timing and manner
of the cessation of transactions
prohibited pursuant to the Executive
Order, adopting appropriate rules and
regulations, and employing all other
powers granted to the President by
IEEPA, as may be necessary to imple-
ment the Executive Order. All agencies
and departments and agencies (agencies), has
determined that:

(i) the transaction involves informa-
tion and communications technology
or services designed, developed, manu-
factured, or supplied, by persons owned
by, controlled by, or subject to the juris-
diction or direction of a foreign ad-
versary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage
to or subversion of the design, integ-
rity, manufacturing, production, dis-
tribution, or supply of information and
communications technology or services in
the United States;
I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,  

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) for 30 minutes.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be excused from their legislative duties in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, there are over a dozen caucuses in Congress today that address issues facing servicemembers and/or veterans, but none of these are geared towards addressing the issues faced by the fastest-growing cohort in our Nation's military: women.

Today, that changes.

My name is CHRISSY HOULAHAN, and I represent Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. Today I am announcing the launch of the first ever Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus.

When the draft ended in 1973, women represented just 2 percent of the enlisted force and 8 percent of the officer corps. Today, those numbers have grown to 16 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Currently, there are 2 million living women veterans in the United States, and in the next 25 years, women veterans are projected to nearly double their population and will account for one in five living veterans.

We cannot afford to wait, and the time to act is now.

Twenty-seven years ago, I gave birth to my first child, my daughter Molly. I was Active Duty at the time, and I was given 6 weeks of maternity leave. When I returned, I intended to enroll my daughter in the on-base childcare but discovered that there was a 6-month-long waiting list. I looked for private care in Boston where I was serving, but the cost was too high. In fact, my entire paycheck would have gone to childcare.

I was a lieutenant in the Air Force, stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base at the time, and my assignment, my job, was to determine what kind of information people needed and in what order and in what visual display when ballistic missiles were raining down on them and the end of the world was coming.

I am a very well-educated engineer. I became an engineer in the Air Force, and yet I couldn’t, with my skills and my education, figure out how I was supposed to make ends meet and make childcare work to fulfill my military responsibilities and serve our country.

I was going against the system in many ways, a new mother serving in the military with a working civilian husband. That is a lot of pressure, and I didn’t think of it as a problem until I was pregnant again and saw the picture when they picture a traditional military family. It wasn’t even what I saw as a young girl when I was growing up.

I was the daughter and granddaughter of career Naval officers and career Navy wives, and I watched as my mother and my grandmother moved us all around the country and cared for us while my father and my grandfather served. My mother’s job was to create a sense of home in every new place that we moved. Her job was my brother and I.

So there I was with a new baby of my own and a mission to deal with ballistic missile defense, no viable options for childcare, and working within a system that I thought up with and for me. So I decided to make a very difficult choice, and I separated from the Air Force.

You see, at that time, I didn’t really have any role models, anyone that I knew that had walked in my boots, so to speak, and had navigated being a new mother while simultaneously serving our country. So few women were really high up in the Air Force’s ranks at the time, so there were very few I knew who could show me what Active Duty looked like as a mother.

But that is changing. In 2019, women represent the fastest-growing cohort in America’s military. More and more women are hearing that same call that I and my friends here heard—the call to serve.

What is upsetting, though, is 27 years later, despite women’s increased presence across all branches of the military, we still struggle with many of the same issues, including access to quality and affordable childcare, and I find this unacceptable.

In this 116th Congress, we set a record. For the first time in history, there are more than two women veterans serving in the House of Representatives. There are now four. It was the realization that I was surrounded by three other women who served our country that inspired me to start this caucus.

Now is the time to address these issues that have been plaguing our servicewomen and women veterans for years, and that is what today is about. That is what the Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus is about.

We four women are here to enact change to better support the brave women who have also answered the call to serve. We four are here as four women veterans who will lead this caucus with our lived experiences in the Armed Forces and who will evaluate the unique issues that our women face and who will work towards enacting legislation that better serves them and better serves their families.

This is not a Democratic issue nor is it a Republican issue. It is neither a man’s issue nor a woman’s issue. It is an intrinsically American and human issue, and that is why this caucus has members from both sides of the aisle, and that is why we have veterans and nonveterans as participants, men and women.

This caucus is comprised of people who are held together by a shared understanding that, when we neglect its duty to support the men and women who serve, it hasn’t done its job. It undermines our country’s national security and our military’s readiness.

I remember thinking to myself when I got here that I was just one person. Then when I got here, I met Representative TULSI GABBARD, Representative ELAINE LURIA, Representative MIRIE SHERRILL, and the one became four. And now, today, I am launching that Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus, the very first caucus in our country’s history to specifically address the issues facing servicewomen and women veterans.

In three months we've went from one to number one; I became 4, and 4 became more than 50. We have a mission. We have our marching orders. And speaking as an Air Force veteran, I can promise I won’t stop fighting until our mission has been accomplished.

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

MAKING THE MATH WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is actually something we try to do about once a week, come in here and actually sort of talk about our unified theory in our office: What do we do to, basically, keep our promises?

Here is a thought experiment.

Social Security and Medicare are two of the greatest fragilities we have in our society because we are getting older very fast. Remember, we have talked about this over and over and over. In about 8 1/2 years, 50 percent of the people in this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

How do you make the math work? And in an intellectual, lazier time, you would get some that would say: Well, we could raise taxes here or we can do entitlement reform here.

Well, it turns out that math really actually doesn’t work anymore. Now, we actually have to do everything to make the math work. So we have been trying to actually sell this concept that it is economic growth, and within economic growth, how do we design our tax system, how we design trade, how we design our regulatory environment, how we actually do population
stability—and this one actually gets complicated.

You saw the article in The Wall Street Journal today about what has happened to U.S. birth rates. How do you encourage family formation, but also how do you do it with the immigration system that maximizes a talent-based immigration system to maximize that economic velocity?

Remember, this is about us having a vibrant enough economy so we can keep our young people here. But within that, there also have some other issues. How do you do what we call labor force participation?

Countries like Japan and some in Western Europe are dealing with how they get those who are older, and if they are healthy and want to, how they create incentives to actually say: Are you willing to stay in or come back into the labor force?

We actually have this quirky math here in our country of millennial males. We started to see this breakthrough of millennial females entering the workforce. We still actually have a whole bunch of millennial males who are missing in the workforce who should be there. How do we build that society that encourages participation in that labor force?

It turns out, if you actually look at a lot of our economic data, from the Joint Economic Committee to the Joint Committee on Taxation, when they write about what are the barriers for us to be able to keep growing and continue this actually incredibly robust cycle we are having right now, it is capital stock.

Well, actually, the numbers since tax reform have been dramatically healthier than we modeled for, with folks having savings, and that savings actually becoming lendable capital. You actually can see that in just national interest rates.

The real vitality that was being written about was labor force participation, and we now live in a society where we have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs and no workers. So who would have ever thought a couple years ago you would live in a society with more job openings than available workers?

This is a wonderful problem, but it actually does genuinely become a barrier to economic growth, and it is something we have to find a way to deal with.

Part of this is actually really optimistic, though, as we started to see in the data over the last several months the number of business organizations and others who are taking a chance on people, hiring right out of correctional facilities, making accommodations for our brothers and sisters who may have a personal impairment, a personal handicap; and we actually see that in some of the Social Security disability numbers of individuals actually moving into the labor force.

So, look, this is just our unified theory.

Today, we are actually going to start to talk about technology, which is one of our five pillars, and how aggressively I believe the adoption of technology has to be to keep the economic growth going.

We have done lots of floor time over the last couple months on the healthcare technology, the revolution that I believe, our office believes, some of the people we work with believe, that is about to happen and the ability for you to take care of yourself, the wearables—the kazoo you blow into that instantly tells you if you have the flu, to the other side of the spectrum, the single shot cure for hemophilia—and how do we finance those types of disruptions?

Wouldn’t it be amazing if this body were no longer having the, actually, in some ways, insane debate we have had for decades about who gets subsidized, who gets to pay in healthcare, and we stopped talking about what we pay and how we are going to cure our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions? We all know, the 5 percent of Americans with those chronic conditions are over half of our healthcare spending.

So what happens when we actually bring cures to market? And then our obligation: How do we finance them so we roll them out as fast as possible?

But today, we are going to talk about another fixation of mine, and that is environment issues.

I wish I had a more delicate way to talk about this. Often, the discussion around here is almost Malthusian, saying the pie is only so big. If you care about global warming, if you care about greenhouse gases, we must shrink the economy; we must get individuals to drive less; we must generate less power; we must do these types of things.

And a decade or so ago, maybe that was a legitimate view, but they have missed an entire technology revolution that is going on around us, and there should be an opportunity by that, if you are someone who cares about greenhouse gases in our national and world environment, the revolution is here, and it is a technology one.

How does this body start to remove the barriers that have slowed the adoption of this clean generation, these alternative generations that are in our marketplace? A simple thought: solar generation.

I hope I get this story, which is coming out of New Mexico, correct. They wanted to run a power line to Arizona. They have been working on the power transmission lines for a dozen years.

We have seen the discussion in the upper Midwest. I believe it is Iowa, with wind generation, finally figuring it out and saying maybe we can run the power lines in the railroad right-of-way because we want this power to make it to Illinois. That is where the demand is, and over here is where the clean generation is.

These are things we often don’t think about. It is not enough to have the technology. How do you get the power to where it needs to be consumed? We have never fixed the bureaucratic barriers to moving that power.

One of the discussions we have had in our office. A couple of years ago, we did a math experiment. A pipeline in west Texas, a pipeline route that would capture methane so you didn’t have to flare it off, had a really impressive calculation in U.S. greenhouse gas emission but it requires permitting a pipeline.

I need us to remove some of our ideological blinders and think of pro-growth, pro-environment, pro-effectiveness. We have to be willing to change the permitting system and so much of the litigation and bureaucracy that slows these things down.

We are going to walk through a couple of these boards, just because I think there is incredible optimism out there.

This one I am sort of thrilled with. This is a chart that talks about battery efficiency. For those of you that seek out on this stuff with me, you probably all saw the article—I think it was April Fool’s Day—some new battery technology. It looks like they finally have a major breakthrough on what we call power density.

This chart here, do you see that coming down? That is the cost of battery storage. It is a remaining gap.

In Arizona, we have our largest and best utility, Arizona Public Service. When you read some of the articles that are going on right now with them, the amount of solar that is now in their portfolio, they have baseline nuclear and now the holy grail. What happens when you live in the desert Southwest as I do? I am blessed to live in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. We produce lots of solar.

In the peak of the afternoon, California now produces so much alternative solar generation that they can’t use it all. On some days, they paid Arizona to buy it off them.

What happens when a company like APS gets really creative and says: How do we have solar power at night when, if you live in the Phoenix area, you are still running your air-conditioner into the evening? It turns out the battery investment is about to bring solar generation into the hour because they will store it. If you design that type of battery storage that holds for about 4 hours, you get us through the peak.

It is referred to as the duck curve. If you see the back of a duck, we all have duck. You have the duck for a while and then it collapses. Yet, we still have all this demand. How do you cover that gap?

In the past, we used peaking power plants, fire them up to cover those few hours. Now, with what is happening with battery storage, it is here.

Our privately owned utility in Arizona, APS, recently did an RFP or RFQ. The numbers that came back...
were remarkably competitive. It is happening.

When on this floor we discuss global warming, greenhouse gases, and what we are going to do in alternative generation, it is here. We just need to understand what is happening right around us.

How do you keep curves like this line continuing? When we are reading that there is a breakthrough in battery technology, we remove barriers so that technology rolls out and becomes part of what we do here in the United States and around the world?

Here is something else. I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. Last year, we updated a tax credit mechanism for carbon sequestration. It turns out that we have multiple facilities now that were an experiment, but they are growing. They are about to go to large-scale commercial where they capture all the carbon.

This first one, I believe this is the NET Power facility outside Houston. It is a natural gas-fired facility, so they are using a hydrocarbon and they have no smokestack. They capture not only the methane CO₂, but they even capture any other gas throw-off.

The remarkable design is that they throw a little oxygen. They heat it up, and heat it really, really hot. They use that to spin the turbines. Then they cool it down and pull out the CO₂ and then use that to sell for other purposes.

They don’t have a smokestack.

This technology is up and running today. The proof of concept is done. Now we last year, toward, I believe, a fairly substantial expansion in the scale of the facility.

This was research that has been going on for years. Those of us here in this body, a year ago, we updated the carbon sequestration tax credits. It is paying off.

The next one is another facility that is also in Texas. This one was really an interesting experiment because, in many ways, it broke through a bit of folklore.

It sits right next to an existing coal-fired generation facility. It is a coal-fired carbon capture plant. They are spinning the turbines, burning coal, and they capture the carbon.

It was only 2 or 3 years ago when we had witnesses around here saying this is absurd, that you are not going to be able to do it.

We had a very smart professor in Arizona at Arizona State University who had been working on sort of a carbon capture artificial tree. This technology is rolling out. It is under production right now, and they are moving up to industrial scale. The amazing thing is, they think they can do it for about $100 a ton, which is remarkable if you have actually played the math game. This is for the new facility.

What happens if they start to break that curve? If you understand that carbon that has been captured, to have the ability to refine it and do other things, even make another fuel source out of it?

The other thing is, think about the article we hopefully all saw last week about that the Dutch are doing. The Dutch are basically about to take a depleted oil field and take carbon that they have captured and shove it back in the ground and sequester it.

All of a sudden, it is a negative calculation. This is a lot of the debate, for a lot of the witnesses we have had in previous years, the concept of mining and having negative emissions was considered absurd. It is here.

The technology is here.

This is a facility that has, apparently, really smart, really wealthy people investing in it because they are so excited about the technology. We need to understand that there is optimism out here.

How do we get ourselves up to date on the cutting-edge technology? How do we move it forward and promote it?

We also need to understand that the theater that we engage in here often is not good math. I wish I had a more recent date, but the latest we could find is 2015 on this.

Do you see the yellow bar on the side? That is all the photovoltaic solar that rolled out in 2015. It was an impressive year. There were fairly aggressive subsidies, State, local, and Federal.

Do you see the other bar chart next to it? That was all the nuclear that went offline that year.

The real one is, in 2015, if you were thinking about power generation in the United States that did not produce CO₂ and you were joyful that this much solar hit the grid, understand that almost the equal amount of nuclear came off the grid. We were pedaling in place.

We need to be honest about the math, and we need to be honest about that baseload nuclear being really, really important if you care about this issue.

There are a couple of quirky things I wanted to throw out here. This one is just fun. It is sort of an odd thought experiment.

In the desert Southwest and mountain Southwest, uranium mining has always been a dodgy issue. We need it. We know we need it. We need it for everything from our X-rays to refining and refining for a nuclear power plant.

In previous decades, we have been able to take very high grades and step it down, but that was some of the excess that was out there after the Cold War. That stock has been substantially used up. So what are we going to do?

There is a technology breakthrough of mining seawater for uranium. We should be joyful and pushing these technologies. They solve some of the moving problem of wanting nuclear generation but where are we going to find the uranium? How are we going to step it up? It turns out, even on that, the technology has moved forward.

Look at other little thought experiments. How many of us in high school with Popular Science magazine used to excited about generating power from ocean waves? It turns out that a new design is rolling out. It is sort of a bobbing power generation. It exists now, and it works. It is much more robust than anything that has even been designed.

We should be joyful and trying to promote more of this type of technology, but we have to deal with how you bring the power in from the shore. All of a sudden, you have a whole other layer of regs, rules, and permitting.

You want clean power. We all want it, but we have to deal with the bureaucratic malaise, mess, and blocks that stop us from being able to pull this type of new power generation into our communities and our country.

What is exciting about that is that is a type of power generation that, if we make it work, it can be all over the world. Being someone who, as a youngster, trekked Indonesia, Vietnam, lots of India, and Sri Lanka, think about most of the world’s population living near coastal communities. Wouldn’t that be exciting?

Why aren’t we promoting these types of technologies? We need to get rid of this Malthusian mindset that the pie is only so big, that we can cut it only so many ways, that once you cut it those ways, there is never an opportunity for it to grow.

There are still people who believe that the 1968 book “The Population Bomb” was real. The only thing they got accurate was the author’s name.
about this because this one is really disruptive, but it is worth the thought experiment.

For anyone who might be watching or having an interest in this Google, "photosynthesis 40 percent." Read the complete articles that have been written.

Madam Speaker, you remember your high school biology class talking about plants and plant cells having a certain inherent inefficiency, where there is a flaw that has been there for millions and millions of years where it reaches out and grabs the oxygen molecule when it should have grabbed the carbon molecule.

Through some synthetic biology they fixed the inefficiency. It now will reach over and grab the carbon molecule every time. All of a sudden it means a 40 percent efficiency in growth.

So, what happens tomorrow when crops require 40 percent less water, 40 percent less land, and 40 percent less fuel?

What does it mean to the world?

Thought experiment: I need you to take it a step further. World agriculture represents 2.2 times the total greenhouse gases of every automobile on this planet. Just adopting this plant technology in our agriculture equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

As this rolls out, how fast would it take to change the seed stock around the world?

There are solutions, and they are not always a linear thought. They sometimes require some creativity. Let's face it. We work in a math-free zone that also lacks creativity. This exists. This is rolling out. It is a revolution.

Yes, it is going to be incredibly disruptive to agriculture around the world. It is going to be incredibly disruptive.

At the same time, what happens when you want to plant trees and you can grow them 40 percent more efficiently, and they are just little carbon capture machines?

This is here. We should be excited about it.

The last one is just more of the thought experiment of trying to say, if we really care, we need to stop the theater that seems to be what happens behind these microphones and actually understand the problem, understand the math, and then focus on that solution. Because often around here I believe a solution is a problem for us because the very thing that we got elected on, that we love coming and complaining about, oh, dear heaven, what happens if we solve it?

So let's actually talk about something that is part of our pop culture right now, but it is a real issue. For someone like myself, I grew up scuba diving. I love scuba diving, and I have been able to do it in a lot of really neat places. Ninety percent of the plastic in the world's oceans come from 10 rivers. Eight of these rivers are in Asia, and two of those rivers are in Africa.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers. If you give a darn about plastic in the ocean, banning straws in your community is theater. It is absurd math. It may make you feel better and get you in the local newspaper, but you didn't do anything.

The first one is just more of the warning. It is a real issue. It is something that is part of our pop culture.

Madam Speaker, you remember your high school biology class talking about plants and plant cells having a certain inherent inefficiency, where there is a flaw that has been there for millions and millions of years where it reaches out and grabs the oxygen molecule when it should have grabbed the carbon molecule.

Through some synthetic biology they fixed the inefficiency. It now will reach over and grab the carbon molecule every time. All of a sudden it means a 40 percent efficiency in growth.

So, what happens tomorrow when crops require 40 percent less water, 40 percent less land, and 40 percent less fuel?

What does it mean to the world?

Thought experiment: I need you to take it a step further. World agriculture represents 2.2 times the total greenhouse gases of every automobile on this planet. Just adopting this plant technology in our agriculture equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

As this rolls out, how fast would it take to change the seed stock around the world?

There are solutions, and they are not always a linear thought. They sometimes require some creativity. Let's face it. We work in a math-free zone that also lacks creativity. This exists. This is rolling out. It is a revolution.

Yes, it is going to be incredibly disruptive to agriculture around the world. It is going to be incredibly disruptive.

At the same time, what happens when you want to plant trees and you can grow them 40 percent more efficiently, and they are just little carbon capture machines?

This is here. We should be excited about it.

The last one is just more of the thought experiment of trying to say, if we really care, we need to stop the theater that seems to be what happens behind these microphones and actually understand the problem, understand the math, and then focus on that solution. Because often around here I believe a solution is a problem for us because the very thing that we got elected on, that we love coming and complaining about, oh, dear heaven, what happens if we solve it?

So let's actually talk about something that is part of our pop culture right now, but it is a real issue. For someone like myself, I grew up scuba diving. I love scuba diving, and I have been able to do it in a lot of really neat places. Ninety percent of the plastic in the world's oceans come from 10 rivers. Eight of these rivers are in Asia, and two of those rivers are in Africa.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers. If you give a darn about plastic in the ocean, banning straws in your community is theater. It is absurd math. It may make you feel better and get you in the local newspaper, but you didn't do anything.

The first one is just more of the warning. It is a real issue. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO O N-BUDGET AGGREGATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,709,585</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2,740,533</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–2029</td>
<td>34,847,515</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>34,847,515</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2020 to 2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Directary Action</th>
<th>CBA</th>
<th>Program Integrity (H. 92745)</th>
<th>Overseas Contingency Operations (H. 92745)</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,740,533</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1,360,935</td>
<td>3,707,348</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: 1026. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a semi-annual report titled, 
``Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Agreement'', pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2808(b); Public Law 101-305, title II, Sec. 202(a)(1); Public Law 103-263, Sec. 1105(b); (107 Stat. 1750); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. A letter from the Under Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting an annual audit of the American Red Cross's consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2018, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 501(a)(b); Public Law 105-295, Sec. 300110(b); (112 Stat. 1493); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5306(b); Public Law 107-297, Sec. 1(b)(2); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1029. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802 note; Public Law 109-148, Sec. 802(a) (as amended by Public Law 110-305, Sec. 804(f)); (120 Stat. 2342); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1030. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Enterprise Agency, transmitting the Agency's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by federal employees for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-276, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1031. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 131(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by employees for fiscal year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.


1034. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020”; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Small Business, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WIEBER of Texas, and Mr. KILMER): H.R. 2739. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. DINGGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSU, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARRANES, Mr. MCNEIL, Mr. LECLAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KEFLIN, Mr. MOBS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PETER, Ms. DINGELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. COLVIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. O'BALLER): H.R. 2741. A bill to rebuild and modernize the Nation's infrastructure to expand access to broadband and Next Generation 9-1-1, re-establish drinking water infrastructure, modernize the electric grid and energy supply infrastructure, redevelop brownfields, strengthen health care infrastructure, create jobs, and protect public health and the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as may be determined by the Speaker, in consultation with the ranking member of each of the Committees to whom the bill was referred, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, accompanied by the report of the Committee of Conference.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. WEREF of Texas, Mr. MURD, Mr. STEELE, Mr. BILIRAKAN, Mr. MUK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GEEH, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GARTZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM): H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that authorizes a deduction for payment of premium for health insurance premiums for individuals who are enrolled in Medicare, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MOONKEY of West Virginia, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio): H.R. 2743. A bill to repeal the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCUHL (for himself and Mr. MILLER): H.R. 2744. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which any consideration are identified overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHREDER, and Mr. YORO): H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1862 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterans student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DENT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TITUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SCHIPP, Ms. DELBRENN, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLY of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GUTJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. PETSEK, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SKA PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COREY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MORELIR, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD): H.R. 2747. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANKITTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. DELGADO): H.R. 2748. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDRUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LIEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. McBATH, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. MCÉACHIN, Mr. MCÉACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MCMURDO of Powell, Mr. NORTON, Ms. OSACO-CORTÉZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHELTON of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VELA, Ms. VEZAKIE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WELCH, Mr. WISELEY, and Ms. WISELEY): H.R. 2749. A bill to prohibit forced arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as may be determined by the Speaker, in consultation with the ranking member of each of the Committees to whom the bill was referred, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, accompanied by the report of the Committee of Conference.
By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that operate to prevent service members and veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, and Energy and Commerce, for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, and Mrs. DINGRILL):

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas and midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 2752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLEMBO:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require certain consumer reporting agencies to include a credit score when providing consumers with a annual consumer report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LOUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Lewis, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Heck, and Mr.Cuellar):

H.R. 2754. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require paper ballots and rules for recounting in all Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGEO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CINNERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SOTO, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. VRASKY):

H.R. 2755. A bill to standardize and extend certain provisions to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. BROWN of Maryland (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2756. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop workforce development programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Ms. Hill of California, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. Cuellar, and Mr. CINNERS):

H.R. 2758. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department to respond to climate change and to improve the energy and resource efficiency of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. SHUMKUS):

H.R. 2760. A bill to further deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1 to enhance and upgrade the 9-1-1 systems of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. FLETCHER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRISHAM, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. McCaul, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2761. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to immediately release certain grant funds awarded for mitigation activities under the Community Development Block Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGEO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CINNERS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VELA, Ms. TRAHAN, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the modification and clarification of notification and authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. GARCÍA of Texas (for herself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. OCÁSCOZ-CORTEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 2763. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing certain rules; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the Home Energy Assistance Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2765. A bill to allow qualified current or former law enforcement officers to purchase their service weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2766. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a mid-decade census of recognized postsecondary credential; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2767. A bill to direct the Speaker of the House to assign to the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. KRASNOFF, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself, Mr. SAN BERNARDINO, and Ms. RAYBAUCK):

H.R. 2769. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a periodic census of the population for the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide, without a deductible of certain primary care services by high deductible health plans, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHAALALA (for herself, Ms. Hill of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETTIT, Ms. PAPPAS, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GARCÍA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CINNERS, Ms.
By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. King of New York):
H. Res. 383. A resolution expressing support for recognizing the week of May 13 through May 19, 2019, as ‘National Police Week’; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Kauffman, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Bracy):
H. Res. 384. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway to be enjoyed by all in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS
Under clause 3 of rule XII.

50. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 3, urging the Congress of the United States to enact the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

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. ROUDA:
H. R. 2739. 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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:
H. R. 2741. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power ‘to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.’

By Mr. HIGGS:
H. R. 2742. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:
H. R. 2743. 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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCaul:
H. R. 2744. 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. KIND:
H. R. 2745. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. POHAN:
H. R. 2746. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H. R. 2748.
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Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mrs. FLETCHER:
H.R. 2761.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. GALLEGOS:
H.R. 2762.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:
H.R. 2763.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MOOLENAAR:
H.R. 2764.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. LEVIN of California:
H.R. 2765.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MOOLENAAR:
H.R. 2766.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2767.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. NEGUSS:
H.R. 2768.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2769.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. PASSARELLI:
H.R. 2770.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:
H.R. 2771.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 2772.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 2774.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. SHALALA:
H.R. 2775.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:
H.R. 2776.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. AMODEI:
H.R. 2777.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 2778.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2779.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. TRAHAN:
H.R. 2780.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2781.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. SHALALA:
H.R. 2782.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MOOLENAAR:
H.R. 2783.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MOORE:
H.R. 2784.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2785.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. EUGENIO HERNÁNDEZ:
H.R. 2786.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 2787.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. FLEischman:
H.R. 2788.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 2789.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. AXNE:
H.R. 2790.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 2791.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2792.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 2793.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. WATERS of California:
H.R. 2794.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. VANDERHEDEN:
H.R. 2795.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2796.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MOORE:
H.R. 2797.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 2798.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 2799.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2800.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 2801.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. VANDERHEDEN:
H.R. 2802.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 2803.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2804.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 2805.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. VANDERHEDEN:
H.R. 2806.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 2807.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2808.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 2809.
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H.R. 1830: Mr. Bost, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Westerman, Ms. Underwood, Mr. Schrier, and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.

H.R. 1832: Mr. Phillips.

H.R. 1846: Mr. Quigley, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Himes, Miss Rice of New York, and Mr. Cummings.

H.R. 1851: Mr. Dunn.

H.R. 1873: Mr. King of New York, Mr. Rouda, Mr. Marshall, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Joyce of Ohio, and Mr. Cox of California.

H.R. 1903: Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1910: Mr. Green of Connecticut.

H.R. 1948: Mr. Ferguson, Ms. Scanlon, Ms. Garcia of Texas, Mr. Strube, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. Collins of New York.

H.R. 1959: Mr. Newhouse.

H.R. 1965: Mr. Vargas.


H.R. 1979: Mr. Lowenthal.

H.R. 1982: Ms. Jackson Lee and Mr. Swalwell of California.

H.R. 1994: Ms. Schrier, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. McCaul, and Mr. Marshall.

H.R. 2009: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 2010: Mr. Marchant, Mr. Olson, Mr. Hice of Georgia, and Mr. DesJarlais.

H.R. 2015: Ms. Cheney and Mr. Hurd of Texas.

H.R. 2042: Ms. Lofgren.

H.R. 2053: Mr. Swalwell of California.

H.R. 2088: Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Slotkin, and Ms. Matsui.

H.R. 2091: Mrs. Kirkpatrick and Ms. Lofgren.

H.R. 2093: Mr. Schiff, Mr. Heck, Ms. Schakowsky, and Mr. Cárdenas.

H.R. 2096: Ms. Spanberger, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Tonko, and Ms. Pingree.

H.R. 2113: Ms. Slotkin.

H.R. 2123: Mr. Olson.

H.R. 2148: Mr. Himes.


H.R. 2150: Mr. Gallego, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, and Ms. Stefanik.

H.R. 2151: Mr. Engel.

H.R. 2164: Mr. Lowenthal.

H.R. 2167: Mr. Malinowski.

H.R. 2178: Mr. Delgado, Mr. Engel, and Mr. Peterson.

H.R. 2180: Mr. Pappas.

H.R. 2213: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

H.R. 2247: Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. DelBene, Ms. Jayapal, and Ms. Schrier.

H.R. 2249: Mr. Westerman.

H.R. 2253: Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 2262: Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Payne, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Pressley, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Ms. Pugh, Ms. Moore, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Bass, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Evans, Mr. Jackson Lee, Mr. Meeks, and Mrs. Watson Coleman.

H.R. 2256: Mr. Rooney of Florida.

H.R. 2319: Mr. Kind.

H.R. 2329: Ms. Schakowsky.

H.R. 2334: Mr. Escobar.

H.R. 2335: Mr. Cloud.

H.R. 2340: Mr. Pappas.

H.R. 2348: Mr. Evans and Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois.

H.R. 2349: Ms. Pingree.

H.R. 2352: Mr. Crist.

H.R. 2354: Mr. Cartwright, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Carper, Ms. Moore, and Ms. Schakowsky.

H.R. 2377: Mr. Kim, Mr. Cohen, and Mr. Luján.

H.R. 2382: Mr. Schiff, Mr. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Brindisi, Miss Rice of New York, Mrs. Axne, and Ms. Roybal-Allard.

H.R. 2388: Mr. Crist and Mr. Cartwright.

H.R. 2402: Mr. Crist, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Lamke, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Omar.

H.R. 2410: Mr. Cárdenas and Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 2415: Mr. Meeks, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Raskin, and Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 2428: Mr. Green of Texas.

H.R. 2430: Ms. DeFazio.

H.R. 2439: Mr. King of New York and Mr. Katko.

H.R. 2441: Ms. Wild.

H.R. 2457: Mr. Grijalva.

H.R. 2474: Ms. Meng, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Schrier, Ms. Bass, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Foster, Ms. Slotkin, and Mr. Heck.

H.R. 2480: Mrs. McBatch and Mr. Castro of Texas.

H.R. 2481: Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Timmons, Mrs. Axne, Mr. Engel, and Mr. Gallagher.

H.R. 2482: Mr. Watkins, Ms. Hill of California, Ms. Norton, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Taylor, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, and Ms. DeLauro.

H.R. 2483: Ms. Spanberger, Mr. Cuestas, Mr. Soto, and Ms. Hill of California.

H.R. 2508: Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Pinnow, and Ms. Skelton.

H.R. 2516: Mr. Norma.

H.R. 2525: Mr. Cartwright.

H.R. 2534: Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York and Mr. Heck.

H.R. 2561: Mr. Cicilline.

H.R. 2570: Mr. Khanna, Mr. Lujan, and Ms. Dingell.

H.R. 2585: Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Engel, Mr. Cisneros, and Mrs. Napolitano.

H.R. 2591: Ms. Slotkin.


H.R. 2615: Mr. Sherman, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Hurd of Texas, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 2619: Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Norton, and Mr. Pocan.

H.R. 2634: Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 2635: Ms. Omar.

H.R. 2649: Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

H.R. 2655: Mr. Turner.

H.R. 2662: Mr. Soto.

H.R. 2692: Ms. McCollum, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Collins of New York, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Swalwell of California, and Mr. Stivers.

H.R. 2733: Mr. McNerney.

H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. Watson Coleman.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. Langevin, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Payne, Mr. Bush, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Ms. Thalia, Mr. Lujan, and Mr. Cartwright.

H. Res. 23: Ms. Wild and Mr. Pascrell.

H. Res. 45: Mrs. Craig.

H. Res. 60: Ms. Wild.

H. Res. 138: Ms. Johnson of Texas.

H. Res. 152: Ms. Lofgren and Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York.

H. Res. 222: Mr. Phillips, Mr. Soto, Mr. Gianforte, and Mr. Malinskii.

H. Res. 246: Mr. Cline, Mr. Stewart, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Young, and Mr. Rooney of Florida.

H. Res. 259: Mrs. Roy, Mrs. Lawrence, Ms. Lofgren, and Mr. Welch.

H. Res. 276: Mr. Stanton.

H. Res. 277: Mr. Cash and Ms. Lofgren.

H. Res. 336: Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Sherrano, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Aguilar, and Mr. Payne.

H. Res. 354: Ms. Slotkin, Ms. McEachin, Ms. Waters, Ms. Barragan, Ms. Jayapal, Ms. DelBene, Ms. Underwood, Ms. Houlahan, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. Sanchez, Ms. Scanlon, Mrs. Axne, Ms. Schrier, Mrs. Fletcher, Mrs. Torres of California, Ms. Velazquez, Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Walorski, Ms. Granger, Mrs. Miller, Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Ms. Foxx of North Carolina, Ms. Brooks of Indiana, Mrs. Roby, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Espoo, Ms. Plaskett, Ms. Hill of California, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Craig, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Pingree, and Ms. Davids of Kansas.

H. Res. 368: Mr. Bryan and Mr. Raskin.

H. Res. 372: Mr. Cummings.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS
Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative Pallone or a designee to H.R. 987 the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Cost Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
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.
Eternal Spirit, our shelter in the time of storm, when our hearts grow faint and weary, renew our strength and enable us to soar above our challenges.

Today, fill our lawmakers with the spirit of wisdom. May their different approaches to problem-solving for our Nation and world contribute to more effective solutions for freedom in the years to come. Lord, deliver our Senators from the spirit of pessimism, and bless them as they seek to honor You.

In their thoughts, words, and deeds, may they passionately strive to glorify You, ever seeking Your divine approval.

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 (Mr. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PENTAGON OVERSIGHT
Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to shed light on yet another really dark cloud that is hanging over our Department of Defense. In fact, for decades, a dark cloud of fiscal mismanagement has loomed large over the Pentagon. During my very first term here in the Senate, I began my quest to bring fiscal accountability to the Pentagon. Four decades later, I am still keeping tabs on the money trail. That money trail is sometimes difficult to follow. Back then, it was a bit like David taking on Goliath. We all know that the United States of America has the strongest and mightiest military in the world. I am thankful for that because a strong military is not meant to fight a war; it is meant to maintain the peace. We haven’t had a world war III since we have had a strong military.

Our brave men and women who serve in the U.S. Armed Forces protect our shores at home and abroad to keep us safe and to protect the blessings of liberty for our children and grandchildren. That is exactly why it is so very important to keep check on the Pentagon’s ledgers, to help make sure that every tax dollar assigned to the Nation’s defense is actually spent effectively and not squandered on waste, fraud, and abuse.

With the help of brave whistleblowers who stuck their necks out to “commit truth,” I stuck my neck out during the Reagan administration. That is when I learned about the Pentagon’s little shop of price horrors.

Of course, ripping off the taxpayers started during the Revolutionary War, when contractors sold rotten meat to the Continental Army, and it continued during the Civil War, when contractors sold ammunition filled with sawdust and shoddy shoes and horses to the Union Army. It looks like it continues to this day.

Back in 1985, Americans will recall, the Defense Department was shelling out vast amounts of taxpayer dollars for spare parts. Remember back then the $450 hammers and the $640 toilet seats? That sounds like a real bargain compared to the more recent wasteful spending at the Pentagon, such as the $1,280 coffee mug and the $14,000 toilet seat lid. Obviously, the cost of waste is getting a whole lot more expensive for our taxpayers.

Back in the 1980s, I fought to win a spending freeze on unchecked spending sprees. Misspending and overspending were riddling the defense budget at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Military readiness drives the spending decisions that Members of Congress make when we cast our votes on the defense budget. Our constituents expect their elected representatives to make sure that the moms and dads, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters who are serving our country in uniform are well equipped with the best resources money can buy. But they also expect their elected representatives to make sure their hard-earned dollars that are withheld from every paycheck—their tax dollars—aren’t being ripped off by greedy corporations, like TransDigm Group, Inc., which I will speak about in a moment.

That is why I conduct robust oversight of defense spending. As a taxpayer watchdog—and all of us are supposed to be watchdogs, and all of us would claim to be watchdogs—it is our
responsibility and my responsibility to make sure every defense dollar is spent as effectively and as efficiently as possible. Every dollar lost to waste, fraud, and abuse harms military readiness, and it also lines the pockets of some self-interested contractors.

Trimming the fat in a bloated bureaucracy won't happen in the shadows. There is no magic wand to wave either. If there is one thing I have learned in my years of oversight, transparency matters. Transparency brings accountability.

Every time I come to the floor to talk about the fiscal mess at the Pentagon, I get a bit of deja vu. Earlier, I said my fraud-fighting efforts in the 1980s could be compared to David v. Goliath. Now let's fast-forward to this year, 2019. I am still here working as hard as ever to do away with wrongdoing and extract fiscal accountability at the Pentagon. Today, some might say that job is like the one performed by the mythological character who was destined to roll that heavy stone up the hill and to do it from then until eternity.

Congressional oversight can be extremely tedious, and it can be time-consuming. I like to remind each of the other 534 Members of Congress, it is essential to our country that we exercise this system of checks and balances. Without it, the dark fiscal cloud looming over the Pentagon would swell bigger and bigger and bigger.

Oversight work may feel like an uphill climb, but oversight is not futile in the end. That is why I keep my shoulder to the wheel—to hold people at the Pentagon accountable, to protect taxpayers, and most importantly, when it comes to a defense dollar, to make sure we have our military readiness.

Right now, I am here today to share some new details about the broken record of fiscal mismanagement at the Department of Defense. No matter how high I turn up the volume, the overdoses at the Pentagon remain tone deaf to fiscal integrity. Consider the recent report by the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General. It is called “Review of Parts Purchased From TransDigm Group Inc.”

First, I want to compliment Senator Warren and two Representatives, Ro Khanna of California and Tim Ryan of Ohio, for getting the ball rolling with their request asking the inspector general to look into the contract—this contractor’s pricing structure. We need all hands on deck in Congress to conduct oversight, so I thank these other Members of Congress just named.

After digging into the details, I can only conclude that the Pentagon is still, after all these years, stuck on autopilot. No one on board in the Pentagon’s mother ship seems to bother to steer its “fiscal ship” into shape. Fiscal integrity somehow got lost in the spare parts horror story I am about to tell. In fact, I was more than dismayed with the response from the internal watchdogs at the DOD IG office. Their team wrote the report, and yet the inspector general leadership team seemed to show no urgency whatsoever to fix the problem they described.

Trashing this text to keep a tight leash on the internal watchdogs leading the Department of Defense inspector general’s office. Their February report exposes a galactic price gouging, colossal ripoff, and out-of-this-world waste. It reads like a sequel to the investigative reports that have returned the Pentagon into a taxpayer money pit. Change out the name of the contractor, inflate the charges, submit the invoice and voila—the American taxpayer is on the hook for another fixed-price, sole source contract.

For this report, the inspector general examined one contractor, TransDigm Group. In total, the inspector general analyzed 113 contracts between January 2015 and January 2017. They re-examined 47 contracts at each of the 16 Defense agencies for which the company TransDigm purchased from this contractor. In just those 2 years, the inspector general found TransDigm overcharged the Pentagon by $16.1/10th million out of a total of $29.7/10th million in contracts reviewed.

The reasonable profit threshold is considered by the Department of Defense to be 15 percent or below. The IG found that TransDigm earned excess profits on 46 of the 47 parts sold to the Defense Department.

On 17 of those parts, TransDigm earned more than a 1,000-percent profit. Remarkably, the highest profit percentage was 4,436 percent.

It is obvious to our taxpayers that that is fleecing the American taxpayer. Pulling the wool over the eyes of Congress and the taxpayers will only stop with transparency—which transparency will bring accountability.

So that is why I am here today. Just think about the fiscal picture. This report is just one snapshot of a much larger problem. It is kind of a spit in the ocean when you consider the enormous $716 billion defense budget. Just imagine the boatloads of bloated elsewhere in the bureaucracy. The Department of Defense is obligated under Federal law and under regulations to uphold basic measures of fiscal integrity.

So where do we go from here? The inspector general made just a few paltry recommendations. For starters, it directed contracting officers to request voluntary refunds for excess profits. Guess the chances of getting voluntary refunds. Let me suggest that I would not advise taxpayers to hold their breath on a voluntary refund. The inspector general’s recommendations, then, have no teeth. Their recommendations are insufficient. What is worse, the inspector general leadership team claims no single Department of Defense official is responsible for this price gouging that goes on.

So let me repeat: The inspector general leadership, the internal watchdog for fiscal integrity and compliance at the Department of Defense, is effectively saying something like this: No one person at the Department of Defense can be held accountable for waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayers’ money. Obviously, no; that taxpayers’ dollars and it amounts to anybody else’s this illustrates a cavalier attitude toward taxpayer money that former Secretary of Defense James Mattis sought to extinguish. By the way, I wrote him a note, complimenting him on some state-of-the-art steps he made about taking care of some of these problems.

The decades-long odyssey of misspending at the Pentagon keeps going around and around and around. That is why—the way I see it—the Department of Defense has a fundamental responsibility to uphold fiscal integrity.

After reviewing the IG report and meeting with its auditing team and the Department of Defense pricing czar, I have reached three conclusions. No. 1, the Defense Department’s leadership team claims no single Department of Defense is AWOL. The Pentagon will never clean up its books if it cannot properly track the money trail and connect the dots.

Consider why the Department of Defense contracting officers were unable to even certify if a profit was “fair and reasonable.” Do you know why? It was because they could not obtain critical cost data at the company TransDigm. In the most egregious case—that case I mentioned where there was a 4,436-percent profit margin for just one spare part—the contracting officer—you will not believe this—certified that the price was fair and reasonable. There is something very, very wrong about that procedure. A whopping 4,000-percent profit margin for a spare part doesn’t square with our midwestern common-sense standard.

No. 2, the leadership team at the IG office has exhibited an alarming hands-off approach toward waste, fraud, and abuse. The lack of urgency and the failure to hold anyone accountable is very revealing. It sends a signal throughout the chain of command: Just keep on signing contracts; keep ordering spare parts; keep up business as usual. Lastly, it shows that no one will be held accountable for price gouging.

No. 3, the pattern of price gouging at TransDigm and its subsidiaries has grown. TransDigm and its subsidiaries has acquired and has amassed exclusive rights to sell these spare parts to the Pentagon. In fact, the Defense Department accounted for 34 percent of its sales in 2017. TransDigm exploited its business model and took advantage of its sole source position to leverage higher prices.

Now, as a former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee—and still a member of that committee—I have examined anticompetitive business practices over a long period of time, including those in agriculture and the pharmaceutical sectors of our economy. It is very concerning to me when...
contracting arrangements, like those between TransDigm and its 100 subsidiaries, are effectively a monopoly. It is like an octopus with 100 arms putting the squeeze on the Pentagon. Effectively, the Pentagon is at the mercy of TransDigm—which controls the intellectual property and can buy the spare parts it needs to build the Nation’s critical weapon systems. That leaves the American taxpayer on the hook for exorbitant price gouging.

The House General Oversight Committee’s report found that TransDigm’s choke hold has added up to tens of millions of dollars overcharging to the taxpayer. This is a good time to refresh people’s memories about the legislative and oversight work with anticompetitive business practices. It is pretty simple. Monopolies invite government regulation. If that is the road TransDigm wants to continue following, I am here to deliver a message. The jig is up on this cozy relationship. The buck stops here.

I had written a letter to Acting Secretary Shanahan about these flawed contracts and failures to identify price gouging. I have asked him to make measurable recommendations on how to restore accountability and end this price gouging. One thing is crystal clear. Transparency and competition are MIA—missing in action—when the Pentagon buys spare parts from TransDigm and its subsidiaries. Now, thank God the other body, the House of Representatives, its Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

Congress has a constitutional duty of oversight to keep check on taxpayers’ money and hold government accountable. As I said earlier, we need all hands on deck to root out wasteful spending.

Once again, we are back to square one. The Pentagon has flunked a fundamental benchmark of fiscal responsibility and stewardship. It is one of Washington’s worst kept secrets. Year after year, Congress shoves more money into the Pentagon coffers to ensure we maintain the best military in the world, and I express my support for the military. I express my support that a strong department of national defense is also a strong keeper of the peace because we might not be challenged, and we are going to be able to help keep the peace. However, one year after another, the Pentagon squanders hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some people at the Pentagon seem to think that paying $16 million in excess profits somehow seems to be small potatoes.

In my letter to the Acting Defense Secretary, I made it clear that I am not one of those people. I have asked him to answer a direct question. That question is this: What specific steps is he going to take to stop the profiteers from pilfering taxpayer money?

Contracts like I have described today between TransDigm and the Pentagon are shortchanging the troops, fleecing the taxpayers, and tarnishing its reputation.

As Justice Brandeis said, “sunshine is said to be the best of disinfectants.” So I am here today to pull back the curtain on this TransDigm audit. The American people need the sun to shine on price gouging at the Pentagon so we can root out the wasteful spending here and elsewhere.

Transparency is the best ammunition that we have to chase away that dark fiscal crowd looming along the shores of the Potomac.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa for always staying on top of things like this. Mr. President, first, I would like to talk about Police Week. Today we observe Peace Officers Memorial Day, the House of Representatives’ Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

I want to share a special thanks to all of our law enforcement members visiting from New York, who, in my view, are the gold standard in public work.

I grew up in a neighborhood where the Pentagon buys spare parts from TransDigm and its subsidiaries. Now, thank God the other body, the House of Representatives, its Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

Congress has a constitutional duty of oversight to keep check on taxpayers’ money and hold government accountable. As I said earlier, we need all hands on deck to root out wasteful spending.

Once again, we are back to square one. The Pentagon has flunked a fundamental benchmark of fiscal responsibility and stewardship. It is one of Washington’s worst kept secrets. Year after year, Congress shoves more money into the Pentagon coffers to ensure we maintain the best military in the world, and I express my support for the military. I express my support that a strong department of national defense is also a strong keeper of the peace because we might not be challenged, and we are going to be able to help keep the peace. However, one year after another, the Pentagon squanders hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some people at the Pentagon seem to think that paying $16 million in excess profits somehow seems to be small potatoes.

In my letter to the Acting Defense Secretary, I made it clear that I am not one of those people. I have asked him to answer a direct question. That question is this: What specific steps is he going to take to stop the profiteers from pilfering taxpayer money?

Contracts like I have described today between TransDigm and the Pentagon are shortchanging the troops, fleecing the taxpayers, and tarnishing its reputation.

As Justice Brandeis said, “sunshine is said to be the best of disinfectants.” So I am here today to pull back the curtain on this TransDigm audit. The American people need the sun to shine on price gouging at the Pentagon so we can root out the wasteful spending here and elsewhere.

Transparency is the best ammunition that we have to chase away that dark fiscal crowd looming along the shores of the Potomac.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa for always staying on top of things like this. Mr. President, first, I would like to talk about Police Week. Today we observe Peace Officers Memorial Day, the House of Representatives’ Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

I want to share a special thanks to all of our law enforcement members visiting from New York, who, in my view, are the gold standard in public work.

I grew up in a neighborhood where the Pentagon buys spare parts from TransDigm and its subsidiaries. Now, thank God the other body, the House of Representatives, its Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

Congress has a constitutional duty of oversight to keep check on taxpayers’ money and hold government accountable. As I said earlier, we need all hands on deck to root out wasteful spending.

Once again, we are back to square one. The Pentagon has flunked a fundamental benchmark of fiscal responsibility and stewardship. It is one of Washington’s worst kept secrets. Year after year, Congress shoves more money into the Pentagon coffers to ensure we maintain the best military in the world, and I express my support for the military. I express my support that a strong department of national defense is also a strong keeper of the peace because we might not be challenged, and we are going to be able to help keep the peace. However, one year after another, the Pentagon squanders hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some people at the Pentagon seem to think that paying $16 million in excess profits somehow seems to be small potatoes.

In my letter to the Acting Defense Secretary, I made it clear that I am not one of those people. I have asked him to answer a direct question. That question is this: What specific steps is he going to take to stop the profiteers from pilfering taxpayer money?

Contracts like I have described today between TransDigm and the Pentagon are shortchanging the troops, fleecing the taxpayers, and tarnishing its reputation.

As Justice Brandeis said, “sunshine is said to be the best of disinfectants.” So I am here today to pull back the curtain on this TransDigm audit. The American people need the sun to shine on price gouging at the Pentagon so we can root out the wasteful spending here and elsewhere.

Transparency is the best ammunition that we have to chase away that dark fiscal crowd looming along the shores of the Potomac.
Board was correctly decided, saying instead that the decision was correct with the benefit of hindsight—whatever that means. In the same district, where 6-year-old Ruby Bridges became the first African-American child to attend an all-White elementary school in the South, the Senate will consider confirming someone who claims that hindsight was needed to understand why the decision that allowed Ruby to go to the same school as a White child wasn’t correct. That is who we are putting on the bench.

These are not just conservatives. We understand that the President and Republicans will put in conservatives, but hard-right, narrow ideologues who show no understanding or sympathy for people who don’t look like them or pray like them or marry like them—what is wrong here?

It is not hard. If you need the benefit of hindsight to understand that Brown v. Board of Education, which brought an end to segregation and led to the end of American apartheid, was correctly decided, you shouldn’t be a Federal judge. I urge my colleagues, in the spirit of the Brown anniversary and what it means, to oppose Ms. Vitter’s nomination to the bench.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. President, now on Puerto Rico, briefly, as negotiations on a final package of disaster aid continue. I want to stress to everyone that we must remain focused on reaching an agreement as swiftly as possible. Disaster-stricken Americans in the West, the South, the Midwest, and 3 million citizens of Puerto Rico are waiting on Congress to deliver relief, in some cases for disasters that occurred over a year ago.

Why is this held up?

We know why. Republicans are not willing to give aid to Puerto Rico. There was a bill that would never pass the House and something they didn’t think of—one—when President Trump said: Don’t do it. And they just bowed down. They thought they could roll over the House and the Democratic minority in the Senate, who wouldn’t stand up for certain Americans.

Well, we did. Now, thankfully, we are making progress. Republicans are realizing that Puerto Ricans cannot be left out of the package, but now we must avoid poison pills at all costs. President Trump, if he sticks his thumb into this again and asks for something once reasonable, will delay disaster aid once again, just as he did before.

To my Republican colleagues, let’s do this together. Let’s do it in the right way. Let’s do it in the way that can pass the House.

President Trump will sign the bill. We have to make sure this legislation gets across the finish line. Every time the President intervenes and Republican colleagues go along, it gets held up even further.

ABORTION

Mr. President, on the Alabama abortion bill, last night the Republican Alabama Senate passed, perhaps, the most draconian abortion law in the country. It bans abortion in every stage of pregnancy, imposes criminal penalties—criminal penalties—on any doctor who performs one, and includes no exception in the case of rape or incest, even if the victim is a child. If a child is raped, they have to have the baby.

The Alabama bill is as extreme as it gets. It is a clear attack on women’s freedom. It contravenes a woman’s constitutional right to make private medical decisions. It would deeply harm women, turn doctors into criminals, and deny the right of rape victims, even if they are children, to make personal medical decisions.

The Alabama abortion bill is plainly inhumane. It should never have passed. The Governor should not sign it. If she does, it ought to be swiftly struck down by the courts.

Mr. President, on Iran, over the past few days, it has come to light in public reporting that the Trump administration’s national security team has reviewed a plan to deploy as many as 120,000—yes, you heard that right, 120,000—U.S. troops in the Middle East should the conflict in Afghanistan escalate. I was stunned to read this report in the New York Times yesterday.

The administration just started a maximum pressure campaign of sanctions against Iran, but is it simultaneously reviewing plans for war? That would make no sense.

Meanwhile, the President oddly denied the report while also saying he would “absolutely” send ground troops to the Middle East. But if he did, it would be a “heck”—and I am paraphrasing—“of a lot more troops [than 120,000].”

Did we learn the lessons of the last decade? Do we know that we have to spend our time focusing on building up this country here, not build roads and bridges in the Middle East but do them here?

There is an alarming lack of clarity here. There is a lack of strategy, and there is a lack of consultation. The President ought to come up with a strategy and make it clear to Congress. An adventure like this—120,000 troops or a large number of troops—should have to be approved by Congress. It certainly should be discussed with Congress before it is carried out. It is the role of the House to hold hearings and closed briefings with the committees of jurisdiction immediately.

Any potential increase in our military presence in the Middle East should require consultation with Congress, and anything beyond that would require this body to act.

President Trump, what is your strategy? Where are you headed? Why aren’t you talking to Congress about it?

Mr. President, finally, on public housing, it was reported last week that the Department of HUD has proposed a rule that would bar families with mixed immigration status from receiving public housing assistance, even if everyone but one member of the family is a legal resident. So if it is a family of six—a mother who is an American citizen, four children who are American citizens, but a husband who is not—it would not be legal—they kick them all out. It risks displacing tens of thousands of legal residents and of American citizens, including 55,000 children. The administration has created crisis after crisis with the immigration community. Are they going to create another one and take 55,000 young American children, almost all of whom are citizens, and just kick them out on the streets when we know there is very little affordable housing? What a cruel and callous policy. It is another example of the Trump administration’s desire to separate families and disrupt communities.

There is nothing to say about this proposed rule but that it is cruel, wrong-headed, and will lead to even more chaos than the administration has created already.

In an effort to appear even more punitive toward immigrants, the administration has conjured up a rule that would prevent those potentially eligible for tens of thousands of children into homelessness or away from their families.

My message to President Trump and Secretary Carson is simple: Scrap this idea now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, it is an honor to rise today to speak in this Chamber on behalf of the people of Missouri. When I think of those who have served my State here before me, I am humbled. When I think of the true and strong Missourians who have sent me here, I am sobered, because to represent them with integrity and potential to guide our country. Are they going to listen to the people—Mr. President, that is who we are put here to be?

We Missourians are known for our frankness, and today I will be frank because this is a moment of great need for my State and for our Nation. This Nation was born in a revolution by the people, and we are a people who are our own masters and have made a case for ourselves and their children. It is a place where people value honesty and gumption and life’s simple pleasures: a fine morning in a deer stand, reading...
to the kids before bed, and Sunday dinner at Mom's. Although it is humble, it is a place that reflects the dignity and quiet greatness of the working men and women.

These are the people who explored a continent and built the railroads and who opened the West. These are the workers whose labor launched the Industrial Revolution and whose ingenuity made the American economy the marvel of the world. These are the families who have rallied to this country's flag at every battle of our history and who bear the burden of defending our Nation even now. These are the patriots who man the fire department and coach the Little League. These are the generous who give $25 a month out of their gas money to assist people half-way around the globe whom they will never meet just because they believe in helping others. They don’t ask for much, and they live by a simple creed: Give the best of yourself to your family, your community, and your fellow man. America is a place of promise, because in these hearts, honor lives.

These working men and women are confronting crises today, and, as they do, so does our democracy. After years of sacrifice, this American middle, the group that has been pushed aside by a new arrogant aristocracy. The new aristocrats seek to remake society in their own image, to engineer an economy that works for the elite but few else, and to fashion a culture that is dominated by their own preferences. When they think of helping their fellow citizens, they think of making everyone else more like themselves.

And Washington has just gone along. This town has embraced the politics of elite values and elite ambition rather than building opportunities to thrive in the great and broad American middle. This has left middle America—the great American middle class—under siege, battling the losses of respect and work, the decline of home and family, and an epidemic of loneliness and despair. This is the crisis of our time.

I am afraid you wouldn’t know it to see or will not acknowledge is that the sum of it all is that too many Americans are left with a sense that the people who run this country view them with nothing but contempt and value them as nothing more than the cost of their behavior and our country's social fabric, and they undermine our common ethic of citizenship because being a free person and being an American isn’t just about what you can buy. It is about the pride that comes in supporting a family. It is about contributing something of worth to your community. It is about being able to look a neighbor in the eye and know that you are his equal. It is about respect, and too many Americans haven’t been getting it.

They are certainly not getting it from our cultural elite. The media, Hollywood, and academia relentlessly press their values and their priorities on the rest of us. They advocate liberation from the duties of family and tradition. They look down on the plain virtues of patriotism, self-giving, and faith. They idealize fame and preach self-realization through consuming more stuff, and as they do, they assault the foundations of the great American middle.

Perhaps we shouldn’t be surprised, then, at the epidemic of loneliness and despair that is spreading across working communities. Fewer young people are getting married and starting families. Drug addiction is surging. The opioid menace has ravaged every sector, every age group, and every geography of working people.

It is not only pills. It is heroin, cocaine, fentanyl, meth, and, of course, marijuana that have flooded our streets and our homes. Everywhere, deaths of despair are mounting among farmers and among the young. Most shockingly, the young are the hope of the working families. Fewer young people are getting married and starting families. Drug addiction is surging. The opioid menace has ravaged every sector, every age group, and every geography of working people.

A typical young person is bombarded by video games and violence and the relentless status-seeking imposed and modeled by our cultural elite. There is no more shocking illustration of our cultural poverty and no more damning indictment of our cultural leaders than these lost lives.

The sum of it all is that too many Americans are losing their standing as citizens. They are losing their voice in this country, and with that, they are losing their liberty. To be free is to have a voice. It is to have a say, and it is to have the power of self-governance.

The chattering class often tells us that all of this—the jobs, the despair, and the loss of standing—is a result of forces beyond anyone’s control, as if that is an excuse to do nothing, but in fact, it is not true. Today’s society benefits those who shaped it, and it has widened the gap between the wealthy and the well-educated. If you make the rules now, who run our large corporations, and who set the tone for our economy, but in reality, they are told that you are not a success, and you are told that you are on your own. This is no accident. The people who make the rules now, who run our large corporations, and who set the tone for our economy, but by the cold and judgmental world of social media.

The crisis reaches well beyond economics. The message that Washington has sent our whole society is loud and clear: Our elites are the people who matter and those who aspire to join them. Everyone else is unimportant or backward.

Millions of Americans are left with a sense that the people who run this country view them with nothing but contempt and value them as nothing more than the cost of their behavior and our country's social fabric, and they undermine our common ethic of citizenship because being a free person and being an American isn’t just about what you can buy. It is about the pride that comes in supporting a family. It is about contributing something of worth to your community. It is about being able to look a neighbor in the eye and know that you are his equal. It is about respect, and too many Americans haven’t been getting it.

They are certainly not getting it from our cultural elite. The media, Hollywood, and academia relentlessly press their values and their priorities...
society they have built works mainly for themselves. They have effectively run this country for decades, and their legacy is national division and national decline.

It is time to reclaim our revolution’s heritage and reassert the democracy “We the People.” To those who despair at the task ahead, I say the hour is not too late and the crisis is not too deep for the determined effort of a great people, and to those who feel beaten and unheard, I say this is your time. Now we must stand together to renew the promise of our enduring revolution. We must put aside the tired orthodoxies of years past and forge new politics of national renewal.

We must begin by acknowledging that GDP growth alone cannot be the measure of this Nation’s greatness, and so it cannot be the only aim of this Nation’s policy because our purpose is not to make a few people wealthy but to sustain a great democracy. We need one not just a bigger economy but a better society. We need a society that offers rewarding work for every worker who wants it, wherever she is from, whatever her background. We need a society whose ambition is to start a business or to start a family. We need a society that will allow towns and neighborhoods to flourish across the great heartland of this country and not just in the cities of the coast. We need a society that will nurture strong families, where children can know their parents and be nurtured a great democracy. We need strong schools and churches and co-ops because these are the things that make liberty possible, for liberty is more than selling or buying or the right to be left alone. Liberty is the ability to answer the day-to-day questions, force new debates, articulate the facts of this day. Now we must ask new questions, force new debates, articulate the facts of this day.

We will make it the work of this generation. It is the work of a generation. New priorities, and find new solutions to these are the things that make the heartland of this country and not only the heartland but the whole country come together. It is still the population center. Missouri is clearly thinks deeply about the issues that affect the country. He is focused on not only the present but the future. Those are all good things.

I would state to Senator Grassley that when crossing the border there, you certainly can’t tell when you cross from Missouri farmland into Iowa farmland and the small cities and small towns. The Bootheel, Delta South in character where Josh and I live in Springfield has that northwest Arkansas-Oklahoma vitality that is different from anywhere else in our State. As we travel actively around our State, as we both do, I think we have a great sense of so much of what happens in the country. It is still the population center. If not the exact geographic center. Missouri is where the country comes together.

Josh had an opportunity last year to talk to tens of thousands of Missourians about that and to communicate in other ways with millions of Missourians about that. I am glad he is here and glad to welcome him to the work we will be doing together. We won’t agree every single day because if we did, I guess we could have just one Senator and give him two votes. But it gives us a chance to talk about the issues we face and what that means for our State but also what it means to the country.

I am delighted he has committed himself to public service. Missourians have now elected him to two statewide offices in less than 3 years, and they have expressed that confidence in him. With great frequency, I run into students both Josiah and Erin had when they were studying law at the University of Missouri, and they always tell me Erin was the best teacher they ever had and often tell me Joshua was the best teacher they ever had. They must not have had a class with Erin yet. But I am delighted that they are both part of the discussion that will lead America forward. I look forward to engaging in that discussion with them and partnering in the things we can find to do together and getting a chance to represent our strong, unique State that I think is ready to merge into a greater future, whether that is with all the healthcare and ag research we see happening, the GEOINT focus that is coming into our State because of the new NGA, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency facility being built here.

This is a time of great opportunity. I am glad to have the chance to share part of that opportunity and look at that future with my colleague Josh Hawley and certainly want to join others in welcoming him officially to the Senate. As the new Senator today, as he makes his maiden speech to the Senate.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip, Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, and congratulate the junior Senator from Missouri on some wonderful remarks.

I came into the Congress with Senator Blunt from the House of Representatives over 20 years ago, which I guess makes us the old guys around here, but it warms my heart and gives me great hope for the future to see the clarity and the quality of people who are entering public life in the form of people like Senator Hawley.

He is somebody who not only brings great intellect, great passion, and great conviction, but he is a principled leader who is here for the right reasons and profoundly wants to make a difference for the future of this country. In his remarks, he touched upon the genius of our Founders, and that is that average Americans—working men and women in this country—have an opportunity to make a difference with their voices and with their votes by entering the public arena and being a part of our democracy. That is really what this is all about. That is what our work should be about every day, is empowering them to do a better job in raising their families and serving their communities.

I certainly look forward to continuing our work with the new Senator from Missouri and with the rest of our colleagues here as we embark upon that task. I hope we can be successful in restoring that vision our Founders had for what this country should be and that each day we can be thinking about the fact that it is not about us; it is about what we do to secure a better and brighter future consistent with that brilliant past we have been so blessed by because of those who have come before and have been willing to enter public life and make a difference. So thank you and congratulations to Senator Hawley. It is a great honor to
serve with you, and we look forward to working with you in the days and weeks and months ahead to serve the very people you talked about in your remarks.

**National Military Appreciation Month**

Mr. President, May is National Military Appreciation Month. I am also proud to be a part of the Senate Military Caucus, where we honor our military personnel, their families, and our veterans. The men and women of our armed forces are the backbone of our nation, and we owe them a debt of gratitude.

Over the past year, we have seen the United States Air Force play a crucial role in defending our nation and our allies. From the Long Range Strike Bomber (LRSB) program to the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program, our military personnel are at the forefront of our national defense.

I want to take a moment to recognize the contributions of the United States Air Force at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. Ellsworth has been a vital part of our national defense since its establishment in 1942, and it continues to play a critical role in our military operations.

During the Cold War, Ellsworth was a major player in the Strategic Air Command, and it has since transitioned to a role as a Global Strike Base. Ellsworth is home to the 28th Bomb Wing, which operates the B-1B Lancer, and the 9th Bomb Squadron, which operates the B-2 Spirit.

In addition to its military mission, Ellsworth is also a key contributor to the local economy of the Rapid City area. Ellsworth's operations support over 10,000 civilian jobs and contribute over $1 billion to the state of South Dakota annually.

The men and women of Ellsworth Air Force Base are the best of the best. They are the guardians of our nation's airpower, and their dedication to our country is a true inspiration.

As we celebrate National Military Appreciation Month, let us remember the service and sacrifice of those who serve our country. Thank you for your service, and God bless our military men and women.
...not talking about a small memory lapse. I am talking about nearly 200 additional pages that had to be added to her response once they were brought to light. I am not talking about insignificant statements, things that are hard to find or easy to forget. I am talking about panels, political rallies. I am not talking about innocent uncontroversial comments. I am talking about the fearmongering of an activist who is entirely unfit for the Federal bench.

Mrs. Vitter initially failed to disclose her remarks at a political rally opposing the construction of a Planned Parenthood clinic, remarks where she claimed Planned Parenthood—which, by the way, provides low-cost healthcare like cancer screenings and contraceptive care to millions of people. She claimed Planned Parenthood is responsible for killing 150,000 women a year. That is careless, it is reckless, and it is wrong. It is incredibly poor judgment for someone who is being considered for a lifetime judicial appointment.

She also failed to disclose the time she moderated a deeply dishonest panel called “Abortion Hurts Women’s Health.” Mrs. Vitter promptly asked the panelists to peddle misinformation about women’s health, encouraging a discussion that falsely suggested abortion is linked to cancer and infertility. One panel spoke at length about a deeply inaccurate brochure she had authored called “How the Pill Kills.” As you can tell from that title, the brochure was loaded with glaring falsehoods, like the false claim that birth control causes breast cancer or that women on birth control are more likely to die a violent death. In response to that speaker’s long string of very dangerous lies about women’s healthcare, Mrs. Vitter encouraged the attendees to download the brochure, bring it to their doctors, and ask them to put it in their waiting rooms.

It is incredibly alarming that a nominee for the Federal bench would be so willing to voice her support for one of the landmark civil rights cases in our country’s history, Brown v. Board of Education. During her confirmation hearing, Mrs. Vitter was asked whether Brown v. Board correctly decided the historic cases of segregation? The answer should be simple. Someone whose statements and record fail to support the Brown v. Board decision cannot be trusted with the responsibility of deciding the historic cases of tomorrow. Someone who has worked to spread misinformation about contraceptives and undermine the constitutional right to safe, legal abortion that is enshrined in Roe v. Wade cannot be trusted to fight for the truth or uphold the law. In other words, someone like Wendy Vitter cannot be trusted with a lifetime seat on a Federal bench.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this nomination. While President Trump and Vice President Pence may keep sending us these far-right nominees and Senate Republicans may keep jamming them through under the radar, Democrats are not going to stand by or stand down. They may try to push our courts to the right. We are going to keep pushing back. We are going to keep holding a spotlight on these nominees and making clear just how extreme they are, and we are going to keep fighting for women and men in industries in this country.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Theropic clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MENTAL HEALTH

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, I knew I wanted to make mental health one of my top priorities. As a Minnesotan, I am proud of the way our Senators have led the way on this important issue, from Paul Wellstone to Al Franken, to Amy Klobuchar. I am honored to have the chance to further our proud legacy when it comes to improving our mental health care system. That is not the only reason I have chosen to make mental health a focus.

I am glad it has become a more prominent issue here in Washington, but I have noticed it usually comes to the forefront in the context of some unthinkable tragedy. When a high-profile celebrity takes his or her own life, we immediately want to reach out to other people who are suffering in silence. Of course, we do. That is not a bad thing.

But we can’t repeat the number often enough. If you are having thoughts of suicide, please, please call the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline at 1-800-273-8255. Even if you aren’t suffering from acute mental illness, put that number in your cell phone so you can, someday, help someone who is.

On the other hand, when a profoundly disturbed person commits a horrible act of violence, we immediately want to intervene before the next time it happens.

When we bring up the need to improve our mental health system as the answer to the epidemic of mass shootings in America, though, we are making two huge mistakes. First, we are ignoring our responsibility to address a much more direct cause of these tragedies—guns. Second, we are unfairly and falsely stigmatizing mental illness. There is another thing we say often enough: It is exceedingly rare that one’s mental illness leads one to commit acts of violence. In fact, one is much more likely to be a victim of violence than to be a perpetrator, and we must not make it harder for people to seek help by falsely tagging them, as we do, as being potentially dangerous.

Yes, these tragedies are reminders that we need to spend more time talking about mental health, but let’s have the right conversation. For most people who struggle with mental illness in America, the struggle is not about life or death; it is about the quality of the lives we lead. Mental health is a continuum, and many of our fellow citizens fall somewhere along this continuum. These millions of Americans deserve our attention, and these millions of Americans deserve our help.

The other reason I want to focus on mental health care while I am here in the Senate is that I am one of them. When I was 27, I started feeling like I was just having a bad day or, really, a series of bad days. While growing up, I had always been a pretty cheerful kid, but at some point during my second year of college, I started to find it hard to handle one of the daily challenges of life. Actually, it had been my roommate who had noticed that I had not been myself and hadn’t been myself for a long time. She had suggested that I talk to someone at the Student Health Services. It had been a completely foreign idea to me, and I had responded in the way a lot of people would have—“I have this.” Eventually, I had realized that maybe I had been wrong about that. It was really hard to make a phone call, walk over to the counselor’s office, and sit in the waiting room. I didn’t know what to expect, and to be honest, I was embarrassed. The counselor’s name was Charlotte. She was nice, had common sense, and wasn’t patronizing or judgmental. She just asked me some simple questions about how I was feeling, and I remembered what a relief it was just to talk about it. Over the course of a few months, Charlotte gave me some ideas about how to cope with the challenges I was facing, and I would always walk out of her office feeling a little bit more courageous and a little bit more hopeful.

Did I live happily ever after? Well, not exactly. It isn’t about not how mental illness works. There isn’t a box for when you are healthy and a box for when you are not. Like I said, it is a continuum, and you try to get a little closer to the healthy end every day.

And on a personal note, if this has caused you to think, or if this has caused you to think of someone you love who’s had a mental illness, I want you to know how much your thoughts and your care matter. I want you to know how much your encouragement means to people who are suffering in silence.

...
I had a career, and Archie and I were raising our two sons. We were busy, and we were tired, but that is the way it is when you are a young parent. Still, something was wrong.

All who have suffered from depression know the indicators to describe it, but most can identify with the sensation of the color just sort of draining out of your world. The things that used to give you joy don’t give you joy anymore. The things that you used to love to do may just make you exhausted, and sometimes you are just struggling to slog through the day. Of course, when you feel this way, just making it through the day is tough. I found myself struggling to be a good mom, a good wife, a good friend, a good colleague. I just felt off all the time—clumsy and slow. I forgot things and got angry at the drop of a hat.

See, the thing is, depression messes with your memory. I will never forget when my young son asked me quietly and casually, “Mom, are you OK?” It was a spiral. The worse things got, the more frustrated I became, but I couldn’t get it together. Down and down I went until I could no longer see hope on the horizon. I was never suicidal, but I struggled to function. I definitely wasn't living my best life. I really wasn’t living at all.

That is the reality of mental illness for millions of Americans. I am one of the lucky ones. I was lucky that my college had excellent mental health resources, so I had enough about me to urge me to take advantage of those resources. I was lucky that when my depression came back with a vengeance, I had health insurance that covered treatment. There was a therapist named Susan with the skill and the expertise to help me. Susan asked me a few questions: Are you forgetting things? How are you sleeping? Terrible. Are you struggling to get things done? There is anything happening except that you used to love to do just really isn’t working? On the other hand, what if it did work? Would I really be better, or would it just be an illusion of feeling better?

Susan convinced me to give it a try, and I was lucky again when the first medication we tried worked. I didn’t feel better right away. There was no big milestone moment where I woke up and everything was great again. But I remember feeling like I was slowly coming out of a fog. The color started to return, and a little bit more every day. I began to reengage with my family and my friends and my work, and I could see hope on the horizon again. After a couple of years of medication, I slowly ramped down, and I haven’t had to get treatment since.

As I said, there is no happily ever after when it comes to mental illness, but happier is possible. If anyone needs proof, just talk to me.

So that is my story, but really it is the story of millions of Americans. I chose to share mine—first in an op-ed in the Rochester Post-Bulletin and now here on the floor of the Senate—because I want to urge anyone who struggles with depression or substance abuse or post-traumatic stress disorder or any other mental health issue to reach out and seek help.

Destigmatizing and demystifying mental illness is just the beginning. Everyone can be a friend to those in need by urging them to take advantage of the resources that are available to them, but the 100 of us here in the Senate have a responsibility to make sure those resources are available to everyone. We can’t afford to leave holes in the net we build to catch people when they fall, especially when one of the biggest holes is in our schools.

I have spent a lot of time over the last months having conversations with teachers and administrators in public schools across Minnesota. Time and again, when I ask them “What keeps you up at night?” they come back to the mental health of their students. They talk about everything from increased social pressure that comes from social media to the trauma of losing a parent to opioids—but they also talk about the students who are struggling and to connect them with help. If we here in the Senate are serious about addressing mental health in our schools, we should pass this bill without delay.

A comprehensive approach to mental health means improving the system all along the age continuum. Over in the HELP Committee, we will have an opportunity this year to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or CAPTA. And I have a bill, sponsored in the House by my friend Representative DEAN PHILLIPS, that would improve the delivery of mental health services within our child welfare system. For example, our bill would make sure that young, at-risk children get important developmental screenings when they need it.

We are learning that childhood trauma can be a major factor in future mental illness. The more we address the underlying trauma, whether it is poverty, the death or incarceration of a loved one or a parent, or sexual abuse, the better we address those issues, the better chance we will have of turning the tide on this epidemic.

The mental health crisis isn’t only affecting our kids; it is affecting our parents too. According to a study by the Centers for Disease Control, one in five adults age 55 or older experiences a mental health issue, and a third of them never receive treatment. Men over the age of 75 have a higher suicide rate than any other age group. The social isolation that too often comes with aging or caring for a loved one or a parent, or sexual abuse, the better we address those issues, the better chance we will have of turning the tide on this epidemic.

As for kids whose issues are very real but not so acute—like the ninth grader whose anxiety makes her sick to her stomach every day—they wind up stuck on waiting lists for treatment. And that is even before psychologists can do any active outreach to the students who haven’t reached out or told someone.

That is why last month I reintroduced my Mental Health Services for Students Act. This bill would create a grant program for school districts looking to expand the mental health services they are able to offer to students by partnering with community mental health system organizations.

If we are going to get our arms around this crisis, we need to train more teachers, administrators, and staff of the school to be aware of the signs, including parents, to recognize when kids are struggling and to connect them with help. If we here in the Senate are serious about addressing mental health in our schools, we should pass this bill without delay.

The mental health crisis isn’t only affecting our kids; it is affecting our parents too. According to a study by the Centers for Disease Control, one in five adults age 55 or older experiences a mental health issue, and a third of them never receive treatment. Men over the age of 75 have a higher suicide rate than any other age group. The social isolation that too often comes with aging or caring for a loved one isn’t just unfortunate; it is a public health risk.

Just as we have learned to reach out to the veterans in our lives and in our communities to let them know we are there for them if they are struggling, we should do the same for our elders. As the HELP Committee takes up the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act this year, I will be working to do my part.
Our mental health system should be there for people at every age, from nursery to nursing home. It should be there for people everywhere along the mental health continuum, offering everything from preventive care, to ongoing therapy for chronic conditions, to crisis care in the acute setting. It should also be there for people in every ZIP Code, and unfortunately, some of the biggest holes in our system can be found in rural areas.

As Senator, I am proud to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I frequently meet with farm groups, and today mental health is one of the first topics to come up. Farming is an inherently stressful profession, especially these days, when the numbers for suicide prevention hotlines regularly appear in farm publications. But we need to include the entire rural community, from bankers and pastors to grocers and fertilizer sellers. We need to include them in this conversation, and we need to make sure that when people do reach out for help, there is help there for them.

Unfortunately, rural communities in general are often underserved by mental health professionals compared to cities and suburbs. Many still lack consistent access to the internet, meaning that even online resources can be out of reach for someone who is struggling. That is why, in the last farm bill, we set up a rural health liaison in each state to work with someone who understands the specific needs of rural communities and is charged with paying attention to a crisis that has too often lurked beneath the surface.

Last year, Senator Murkowski and I worked together to pass a law that would provide mental health professionals in the National Health Service Corps with greater flexibility in where they practice and deliver care, increasing the resources available in underserved rural communities.

I hope my colleagues will join me in continuing to take action to address the mental health crisis, and I hope that sharing my own story will make it easier for more Americans to add their voices to this fight.

Still, there is no magic cure for depression. There is no magic bill to solve this problem. Mental health is a reality of life for millions of people in our country, and it can’t just go away. If we work to help more Americans bring their struggles out of the shadows into the sunshine, if we reach out to people in need and connect them with people who can help, and if we understand the factors that make people vulnerable to these problems and focus our energies on making sure the net is there to catch them if they fall—if we do these things, then we can take steps in the right direction, one right after the other and one day at a time.

I support what it felt like in those weeks and months after I began to treat my depression—the sense of empowerment that came with finally taking my mental health into my own hands, the renewed energy that came with finally feeling like today is better than yesterday and maybe tomorrow will be even better yet, and the joy that came with finally seeing hope on the horizon once again. So even in the face of exasperation with it all, I believe there is hope on the horizon for the millions of Americans who struggle with mental illness, but they are counting on us to make this hopeful vision a reality in all of our states. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEDY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you watched ’60 Minutes’ on Sunday, you would not have been surprised that there was a segment relating to prescription drug pricing. Everywhere we turn, somehow the question about why we are paying so much for prescription drugs and why the cost of these drugs has gone through the roof.

We want to encourage research. We want to encourage innovation. We understand that profit-making companies, so we understand we will pay for that. But what we are seeing in terms of the pricing of drugs across America now is inconsistent with any of the history that we have had. It seems as if pharma believes that if they put out a drug, they can charge whatever they ever they can charge, and no one will question them.

It makes a difference. Blue Cross Blue Shield, the largest health insurer in my State of Illinois, analyzed the cost of care in our State and nearby and asked: What is driving the increase in health insurance premiums? The cost of prescription drugs, even more than the cost of inpatient hospital care. Look at all of those big hospitals and all of the important work they are doing and expensive procedures they are involved in. All of that cost does not equal the rising cost of prescription drugs. That is why our health insurance premiums are going up, so it is understandable that more and more of us are talking about this and trying to find practical ways to approach it that might make things better.

Can you consider one policy that might have the support of Democrats and Republicans, the American Association of Retired Persons, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, 88 percent of Americans, and the Trump administration? What in the world could that be? Here it is: a measure I introduced in 2017 to require pharmaceutical companies to disclose the prices with new prescription drug advertising.

Last year, Senator Grassley, Republican of Iowa, and I teamed up to pass an amendment that requires price tags on the television ads. We were stopped in conference by a single House Republican.

Think about those television ads. What do they tell us in those ads? For 60 seconds, as fast as they can talk, they tell us everything under the sun. If you are allergic to Xarelto, do not take Xarelto. Certain negative things may happen if you take this drug or the other drug. On they go for 60 seconds without stopping. Yet they never disclose the price of the drug.

After Senator Grassley and I put our bill in last year, I got a call from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Alex Azar. He decided he wanted to pick up on our effort and join us. Think about that for a minute—a Republican Senator, a Democratic Senator, and the Trump administration agreeing on something. It turns out, he thinks it is a good idea, and I do too.

If we had price disclosure on these ads on television, it might open the eyes of a lot of people as to what it costs. What is the most heavily advertised drug today? Humira. Why was Humira invented or discovered? To treat arthritis, particularly psoriatic arthritis. Guess what they discovered. It also had a side benefit they didn’t anticipate. You see a little red patch on your elbow—or psoriasis? If you take Humira, all of a sudden, that little red patch goes away. So if you are watching the ads on television, some of them are about arthritis, but some of them show someone sitting by swimming pools with flawless skin because they are taking Humira. It is very interesting.

There is one thing they leave out. Do you know what Humira costs? It costs $5,500 a month. This red patch on my elbow may trouble me when it comes to the swimsuit competition, but I am not going to spend $5,500 to deal with it. I think they ought to have to disclose the price of the drug. We take their prices; we do not make up the price. We should sit down with the pharmaceutical manufacturers—we believe that is the one that should be advertised.

On Monday, Senator Grassley and I introduced the bill to codify this rule that the Trump administration is pushing for price disclosure and to ensure its long-term implementation. We are happy to have on board with us Senator Lamar Alexander, Republican of Tennessee, and Senator King, Independent from Maine. Discuss prices in drug ads is a simple step to give patients a break at the pharmacy. We have to do a lot more. I think this is a good starting point, though.

American patients and taxpayers pay the highest prices in the world for most medications. Eli Lilly, out of Indianapolis, IN—they make a drug called Humalog. It is for diabetes. It is an insulin drug that can cost up to $329 per dose here in the United States. Humalog, insulin, diabetes—the cost is $329.

What does the same vial of the same drug made by the same company cost...
in Canada? It costs $38. It is $329 here and $38 there.

In 2017, Canadians could purchase AbbVie’s HUMIRA, which I mentioned earlier, for $20,000; for Americans, $40,000. The worst part of this price disparity can happen when a generic drug manufacturer files to sell the ones paying to develop these drugs in the first place. Our tax dollars at the National Institutes of Health provide the clues and the direction for these companies to take our federally funded research and turn it into a valuable drug. Medical development, and then charge us more than any other place in the world.

All 210 drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration between the years 2010 and 2016 received funding from the National Institutes of Health, supported by nearly $40 billion by U.S. taxpayers each year. I am all for that, incidentally—funding the NIH and leading to this research. But make no mistake, these breakthrough drugs start at the National Institutes of Health at taxpayers’ expense. So American taxpayers get hit twice. We pay for the initial research, which leads to the drug, and then we, of course, pay for the drugs at the highest levels.

The problem is that our system does not function as a free market. There are too many forces at work when it comes to prescription drugs that limit competition. Often Big Pharma charges as much as they can get away with because they manipulate the patent system to avoid competition.

The theory used to be that if you discovered the drug, you could sell it exclusively for, say, 20 years, and then everybody could take your formula, make generic drugs, and there would be open competition so that the price would go down. That is not how it works.

The core issue is that roughly 10 percent of brand name, patent-protected drugs account for 80 percent of spending in America. The overwhelming prescriptions are for generic drugs, which are affordable drugs, but it turns out that even though 90 percent of the prescriptions are for generic drugs, they account for only 20 percent of all the spending. It is that 10 percent of brand name drugs that account for 80 percent of all prescription drug spending because they are so expensive.

In what other industry does the price of the consumer product increase year after year after being introduced on the market? Maybe a collector of artwork or baseball cards but certainly not when it comes to something that is a life-and-death commodity like a drug.

The point is, I don’t believe our Founding Fathers envisioned a scheme where Sanofi’s Lantus, insulin that was approved in the year 2000, would receive 45 additional patents after it was approved by the FDA, providing a massive 37-year monopoly by Sanofi on this insulin product. During that time, the price of insulin has increased from $35 to more than $270 because Sanofi has successfully bought lower-cost generic competitors, and it is not just Lantus or insulin.

Celgene’s cancer drug, REVOLUMID, has been awarded 96 patents, many of which have been given before the initial FDA approval. As a result, REVOLUMID, effectively, has gone 40 years without competition.

The same goes for Pfizer’s nerve pain drug, Lyrica. You have seen that one advertised on TV. I have. That entered the market in 2004. Lyrica has received 68 patents, including filing more than 2 dozen after initial FDA approval. They are gaming the system to avoid competition to keep their prices high.

In fact, the top 12 best-selling drugs in America each have an average of 71 patents. Why do they get a new patent? Because they have decided that instead of a 150-mg tablet, there will be a 75-mg tablet, and they get a new patent. Or they put a new coating on the outside of the pill, and they get a new manufacturing technique. They get the patent. They have exclusivity in the market for another extended period of time.

The top 12 best-selling drugs in America each have an average of 71 patents. A percentage of all new drug patents are for drugs that are already on the market. They are gaming the system.

We can and should reward innovative research so that companies can and do profit for good work and big ideas. But an abusive manufacturer should not be allowed to game the government patent system while being shielded from competition.

This month I am going to give what I call my Pharma Fleece Award to Celgene, Pfizer, and Sanofi for stacking excessive secondary patents to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy, Republican from Louisiana, and a medical doctor, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy. The act, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy. The act, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy. The act, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy. The act, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator Cassidy. The act, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to “evergreen,” which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patent rights to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.
have a debate, and pass a bill that may become a law that ends up helping Americans. For many of us, that is the reason we ran for office, and I hope we can return to that very soon.

NOMINATIONS

Once again, this week the Republican leadership has refused to act on any legislation for votes on the Senate floor. Instead, our Republican colleagues are spending another week rubber stamping President Trump’s nominees.

This week, the Republican majority scheduled three Trump judicial nominees. Each of these nominees has expressed views that are ideological and extreme.

First there was Michael Truncale, nominated to the District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Mr. Truncale gave a speech in 2011 where he outrageously called President Obama “an un-American imposter.”

He described the Supreme Court’s decision in Shelby County that gutted the Voting Rights Act as “a victory.” He has called for defunding Planned Parenthood and said that he opposes the bipartisan DREAM Act.

He has called the Environmental Protection Agency a “job killer” and called for eliminating the Departments of Education and Energy.

Mr. Truncale also gave a radio interview in 2012 thanking the Tea Party movement “for what it has meant to our country and to our Republican party.”

Despite all this, only one Republican Senator, Senator ROMNEY, voted against Mr. Truncale.

Then there’s Ninth Circuit nominee Kenneth Lee of California, who has been advanced by Republicans over the objection of both home State Senators. That never happened before until this year, but this is now the fifth time we have seen a nominee advance with no blue slip.

Mr. Lee initially failed to provide dozens of his controversial writings to the Senate Judiciary Committee. I remember when President Obama’s Ninth Circuit nominee Goodwin Liu initially failed to fully disclose articles he had written to the Judiciary Committee. Republican members of the Committee said it was “potentially disqualifying” and said it showed either incompetence or an attempt to hide his writings.

Senate Republicans ended up filibustering Goodwin Liu’s nomination. Yet every Republican member of the Judiciary Committee voted for Mr. Lee’s nomination. The double standard is obvious.

When we were finally able to review Mr. Lee’s writings, we saw he routinely expressed extreme views. Here are just a few examples:

He wrote: “Charges of sexism often amount to nothing but irrelevant pouting.”

He said: “homosexuals generally are more promiscuous than heterosexuals, and thus their risk factor [for AIDS] increases exponentially.”

He called affirmative action “liberals’ most sacred shibboleth.”

And he called multiculturalism a “malodorous sickness.”

Then there is Wendy Vitter, nominated to the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Mr. Lee, Ms. Vitter also initially failed to disclose more than 100 speeches and documents to the Judiciary Committee.

The matter was disclosed in a panel she moderated in 2013 at a Louisiana Right to Life conference. At this panel, she told the audience to urge their doctors to put in their waiting rooms a brochure entitled “The Pill Kills.” This is a brochure about how birth control pills supposedly kill women.

Ms. Vitter also claimed in a 2009 speech that we are “throwing out our Constitution” by counting the full population in the national census.

All three of these judicial nominees have expressed extreme ideological views that raise serious questions about their judgment. Yet Republicans are rubber stamping all three of them to lifetime appointments on the federal bench.

Then there is President Trump’s nominee for Deputy Attorney General, Jeffrey Rosen. Mr. Rosen simply does not have the right qualifications for this important job.

The Deputy Attorney General runs the day-to-day operations of the Justice Department and oversees its law enforcement components.

At this confirmation hearing, we need a Deputy Attorney General who is familiar with the Justice Department, who has experience in overseeing criminal investigations and prosecutions, and who is committed to the Department’s role of enforcing the law independently without fear or favor.

Mr. Rosen has no experience working in the Justice Department or handling criminal cases. When I questioned him about core DOJ functions and agencies he will oversee, he wasn’t familiar with them and said he would have to get up to speed.

For example, when I met with him and asked him about the landmark First Step Act, he said he had “begun getting informed about it.”

When I asked him about the Deputy Attorney General’s role in overseeing the Federal Bureau of Prisons and addressing their critical staffing shortages, he said he wasn’t familiar and couldn’t comment.

When I asked him about voting rights and voter suppression, he said he hadn’t had occasion to study the issue.

When I asked him about the DEA’s role in setting opioid production quotas, which he will oversee, he didn’t know about it.

When I asked him about DOJ’s role in immigration matters, including his priorities for the immigration courts he will oversee, he said he looked forward to learning more about it.

Mr. Rosen was a longtime colleague of Attorney General Barr at a law firm, and he has held positions in other government agencies like the Department of Transportation. But that does not make him qualified to be the Deputy Attorney General.

Because my Republican colleagues continue to rubber stamp every Trump nominee, there is now less time for the Senate to debate controversial nominees like Mr. Truncale, Ms. Vitter, and Mr. Rosen.

But the American people see what is going on. They see the rush by President Trump and Senate Republicans to confirm nominees who are ideological or who lack the right qualifications for the job.

I oppose these nominees. And I regret that the Senate’s advice and consent process has become an exercise in Republican rubber stamping. This institution can, and should, do better.

I see that my colleague from Texas is here on the floor, and I don’t want to take any more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Texas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the notwithstanding rule XXII, at 5:30 p.m., all postcloture time on the Lee nomination be considered expired; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

I ask that following disposition of the Lee nomination, the Senate vote on the cloture motions for the Vitter, Bulatao, and Rosen nominations; finally, that if cloture is invoked on those nominations, the confirmation votes on the Vitter and Bulatao nominations occur at noon on Thursday and the Rosen confirmation vote occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, May 16, and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

The remarks of Mr. CORNYN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1480 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. 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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cassidy). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. President, I am going to be on the floor with some of my colleagues in the next hour.

I think from Iowa, Senator Ernst—Lieutenant Colonel Ernst, by the way, of the Iowa National Guard—for organizing the series of discussions we are going to have in the next couple of minutes on the Senate floor on Military Appreciation Month. I think we are all going to talk about how wonderful our military is, and we will probably do a little bit of bragging about our different States and how we support and appreciate our military so much.

I like to come down on the floor and talk in superlatives about my State, the great State of Alaska. It is true that most Senators love to talk about their States in all of their superlatives, which I enjoy doing. We each think we live in the best State in the country. We all believe that. I happen to think my State is the best State in the country.

In talking about our military and its support, during Military Appreciation Month, we certainly have a large military presence in Alaska. We have about 32 military facilities and 5 major installations. Roughly, 10 percent of the population is either in the military or is a direct member of someone who is in the military.

I like to say that Alaska actually constitutes three pillars of our Nation’s military might. Whether the attacks be from Kim Jong Un or the Iranians, we are the cornerstone of missile defense, which are the missiles and the radar that protect the entire country from attacks. This all resides in Alaska. We are the hub air combat power for the Asia-Pacific and the Arctic, and we will be over 100 fifth-generation fighters—F-22s, F-35s—by the end of next year. We are also a vital platform for some of America’s best trained troops to be deployed anywhere around the world because of our strategic location. Alaska also boasts the largest number of veterans per capita of any State in the country. These are the facts, and they are all good.

What is so unique about Alaska—and, I would say, as in most States—is how proud we are of our military and how much the communities of Alaska—big communities, small communities—support the men and women who serve in the military. It is almost a part of our DNA in Alaska. Let me just give you one example.

I was in a group of community leaders in Delta Junction, which is in Alaska’s interior. It is actually near Fort Greely, where we have our missile defense fields. It is right on the outskirts of what is called the JPARC, which is the biggest air training range in the entire United States. The airspace is actually the size of Florida. There is great training, and we have Red Flag exercises. Our men and women in the Air Force, in particular, do some wonderful training there.

We were in this community meeting, and some Air Force pilot was flying low and fast. He probably broke the sound barrier because there was a giant sonic boom. It shook the whole building. It shook the whole meeting room. Now, I would say, in most States, that would probably result in having people complain and call their Congressmen and Senators in their being mad about what was being done. I think they were beaming shaking the buildings with sonic booms because they would be breaking the speed of sound as they would be training. Yet the mayor of Delta just looked at me and said, “The sound of freedom.” There were no complaints, just support.

Let me give another example. In so many of our smaller Native communities—Native villages—across Alaska, one sees what I refer to as special cultural patriotism. Alaska Natives and the lower 48 American Indians serve in the military at higher rates than any ethnic group in the country. That is a special patriotism because—let’s face it—these great American patriots weren’t always the first to volunteer for government service when they came home after fighting in World War II or in Vietnam.

As a matter of fact, there was a documentary that was produced about the community of Hoomah, AK, which is in the southwest of Alaska. That was called “Hunting and Wartime.” It was about the fact that almost every single male high school senior in the late 1960s in these small communities went off to fight in Vietnam—all almost every one of them.

That is special patriotism. This support for the military isn’t a recent phenomenon in Alaska. In 1942, during World War II, Alaskans oversubscribed their war bond quota by 300 percent, which surpassed that of every State in the Union.

So many Senators—Democratic and Republican—are going to come down to the floor and talk about our Military Appreciation Month, as they should. There is some talk in the country about the 1 percent and the less than 1 percent. Well, the 1 percent I really care about is the less than 1 percent of young men and women who still, today, raise their right hands to support and defend the Constitution and to put their lives at risk. I think it could even cost them their lives by their joining the U.S. military.

We all have wonderful veterans and wonderful men and women in the military whom we support in the U.S. Senate. I tell my constituents that the one thing we are focused on doing is making sure, when you send your son or daughter to join the military, that it is the top military in the world, the most ready military in the world, and the most capable military in the world.

One thing we are doing is reversing a dangerous trend. From 2010 to 2015, defense spending for the U.S. military was cut by almost 25 percent during the second term of the Obama administration—25 percent—and readiness plummeted. We are changing that because no man or woman in this country who volunteers to support and defend the Constitution should join the military that is not at the highest level of readiness and lethal in terms of its getting the job done. So I am going to pass this on to some of my colleagues here. As the Senator from a State where communities support our military so much, I just want to thank all the members, regardless of where you live, for the great work you do and to let you know that the Senate supports you with all its heart and soul.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina, Mr. TILLIS.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, while my friend and colleague from Alaska is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his many years of service as a marine.

I am here to talk about North Carolina and Military Appreciation Month. We have a special relationship with members of the military and their families in North Carolina. We have a million veterans in the State. Literally hundreds of thousands of people serve in the military.

You may have heard of the Global Response Force. The Global Response Force is out of Fort Bragg. When there is a crisis anywhere in the world, whether it is a military conflict or a relief effort, it is the 82nd Airborne that goes out to the green ramp down in Fort Bragg, NC, and goes wherever they need to go, sometimes with 48 hours’ notice.

Just down the street from there, we have the marines at Camp Lejeune. The marines who are based in Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point and New River constitute about 45 percent of all the marines serving in the Marine Corps.

We can go up to Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and we have a proud number of men and women in the Air Force who are part of a base that will be the home to the new KC-46, a next-generation tanker.

To say we have a close bond with the military is an understatement. We love them, and we love their families.

I chair the Personnel Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, so I have a direct role in showing appreciation to not only the men and women who are serving in the military but also their spouses. It is a tough job. They are serving too.

I want to thank all of my colleagues here. As the Senator from North Carolina, let’s make sure we are, first and foremost, thinking about not only those brave men and women who have sworn the oath to defend and protect our Nation but also their families, who are an integral part of their being capable and ready to do the job.

I also want to make sure we don’t lose sight of the veteran population—a
million of them in my State alone. One-tenth of our population are veterans.

We should also talk about the National Guard and the reservists. If you take a look at a State like North Carolina, a number of persons in the National Guard who have been deployed multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan—some of the most dangerous places you could be. They do it with courage, and they do it with honor. During Military Appreciation Month, I think we should pay special attention to this special group of people. I hope that every day of the year, each and every one of you shows them the appreciation and the respect they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, like my colleagues and like people from around the country, North Dakotans are very proud of our military heritage. In fact, North Dakotans sign up at a rate four times the national average. I think you will hear that theme throughout the Midwest especially.

I am grateful to Senator E RNST for her leadership today as we stand and do something we ought to do every day. It is something we ought to do in church when we are sitting next to them in the pews and when we are talking to our neighbors who are serving or their spouses or family members. We are saying: Thank you. Forgive us for not saying it more often. Frankly, part of why we don’t say “thank you” more often is because we go about our business in complete comfort, unaware of the dangers around the world because you all do your jobs so very well. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. President, North Dakota is home to two Air Force bases. I recently finished a tour of the military bases in North Dakota, and I want to speak briefly about the airmen at those two bases.

Grand Forks, ND, houses the 391st Air Base Wing, known as the Warriors of the North. Just last Saturday, Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson visited Grand Forks and redesignated this base as the 391st Reconnaissance Wing. This is one of only three of its kind. I am continually impressed with the mission of the 391st. The Global Hawk is a capability that is headquartered out of Grand Forks. I believe that Grand Forks is a place that is well-positioned for the future of warfighting.

To the west of Grand Forks a couple hundred miles is the community of Minot. Minot, ND, is home to the 5th Bomb Wing and the 91st Missile Wing at the Minot Air Force Base. This is interesting because, of course, the bomb wing operates the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the B-52 bombers at the same base. That is two of the three legs of the nuclear triad we hear so much about. You are not going to find a stronger proponent of the nuclear triad than you will in me because it is the only base of its kind.

As the base’s motto goes, “Only the best come North.” Our greatest defense is in detouring our adversaries, and certainly the B-52 is important to that. Every day, the airmen in Minot wake up with literally the weight of the world, in many cases, on their shoulders. So for their service and their willingness to fill that gap in the defense of the world, I am immensely grateful and always impressed.

Of course, I would be remiss to not also mention the airspace station in Cavalier. I think it is the Air Force’s smallest base, but it is a very important installation. As we debate in this Chamber the need for a modernized space force, understanding the work this base does has further compelled me to support a United States space force, capable military unit able to defend the emerging domain that space has become. A special thank-you to those 40 or so airmen in Cavalier who do an incredible job far from home and in many cases far from a lot of other people around them.

On a personal note, I want to say “thank you” to the military families and spouses of those stationed in North Dakota, as my colleagues have done. As we know, in a family, everybody serves. In a small community, everybody serves together. They come from all over the country, and they bless our local communities and our State with their work in North Dakota. They deserve a very special thanks for that service.

Our military community is not, of course, defined solely by our Air Force bases; it also is defined by our incredible Army and Air National Guard. North Dakota exemplifies that than the Happy Hooligans. They are frequent recipients of the 119th Wing of North Dakota’s Air National Guard, I want to say a special thanks to the units that distinguish themselves and their willingness to stand in the way of radical protesters even while their own families were targets of the radical protests, the harassment of radical protesters from everywhere other than North Dakota. They put themselves at risk, often without provocation, without escalation, and with a calming presence. They didn’t run from their orders. They didn’t balk at their commands. They answered the call to peacefully and professionally defend our State from the chaos that descended upon us.

Again, “thank you” is inadequate. It is all we can do today. I would just compel people to say “thank you” more often. As you see that neighbor, as you see that person sitting next to you, make it a point to say “thank you” out loud, in front of friends.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thanks to the Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. E RNST. Mr. President, during Military Appreciation Month, we honor the men and women who wear our Nation’s uniform, those who have worn it in the past, and those who have sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

As a Senator and a combat veteran with over 23 years of service between the Army Reserves and the Iowa Army National Guard, I am grateful to have the opportunity to get to know so many patriotic and selfless Americans, and Iowans are well represented in those ranks. Nearly 9 percent of our State’s adult population are veterans. The national average is just above 6½ percent. From World War II to the global war on terrorism, Iowans have served with honor and distinction.

Military Appreciation Month is also a time to recognize our military families who sacrifice so much and faithfully support our men and women in uniform. They keep things running when called into action beyond our borders.

The mission of the National Guard is to provide ready units, individuals, and equipment supporting our communities, our States, our Nation.

If I might elaborate a little bit on homeland issues, just a few short years ago, our State called on our National Guard to meet that mission. We were called on to protect the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the North Dakota National Guard was deployed to help keep the peace. It is appropriate today, on this Peace Officers Memorial Day, that we recognize this relationship. The National Guard was deployed to keep the peace as out-of-state activity added interest, really, in North Dakota—they flooded our State to violently protest the legally permitted Dakota Access Pipeline. Absent Federal help, our Governor called on our National Guard as a last resort.

You would think that would have some serious ramifications. Well, the reality is, because of the quality of our guardsmen, they did what the previous administration would not—they stood up to the rule of law. This is a last in the way of radical protesters even while their own families were targets of the radical protests, the harassment of radical protesters from everywhere other than North Dakota. They put themselves at risk, often without provocation, without escalation, and with a calming presence. They didn’t run from their orders. They didn’t balk at their commands. They answered the call to peacefully and professionally defend our State from the chaos that descended upon us.

Again, “thank you” is inadequate. It is all we can do today. I would just compel people to say “thank you” more often. As you see that neighbor, as you see that person sitting next to you, make it a point to say “thank you” out loud, in front of friends.

I yield the floor.
all of our military families in Iowa and, of course, across the Nation, thank you for choosing to serve.

This month is also a good opportunity for those of us in the Senate to highlight some of the work we are doing to support our military families, and, of course, our veterans. Next week, the Senate Armed Services Committee will be starting our yearly national defense authorization bill process. In anticipation of my remarks, I will be joining my Democratic colleague from Arizona, Senator Sinema, to introduce two new bills to address military sexual assault—one to improve prevention and the other to streamline prosecution.

I will also be introducing a bill with Senator Warren that will explore ways to better track traumatic brain injuries sustained by our warfighters. Helping our servicemembers with injuries sustained in battle is a top priority of mine. So, I am working with our wounded warriors to seek out game-changing treatments and to help them heal and recover.

As the chair of the subcommittee on emerging threats and capabilities, I will also use the NDAA process to ensure that the bill fosters technological advancements to better equip our warfighters for success.

Military Appreciation Month is an important reminder of the daily sacrifice made by our servicemembers, our military families, and our veterans. It is also a solemn time to remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice to keep America free, safe, and prosperous. We should be mindful of our own members who have served in the military, and I want to thank them all very much. So for those of us who have worn boots, we take a look at this legislation and find ways that we can better support those who serve.

In the Senate, members of our military, families, and veterans have our support and our gratitude, not only today but every day. I know the folks back home in Iowa feel the same.

So from all of us to all of you who have worn the uniform and those who have supported those who have worn the uniform, thank you for your service, and God bless you.

God bless our great State of Iowa. God bless the great United States of America and those men and women who make it possible to be free.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Perdue). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

It is so important for all of us, particularly those of us who have had occasion to serve, to really pay attention to what is going on. This is Military Appreciation Month, and it is very significant, what is going on. Every month should be Military Appreciation.

As the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a veteran, it is my great honor and responsibility to support our warfighters during and after their service.

Whenever they were needed, they were there, and so we have to do a better job in supporting them. We went through 8 years of not adequate support. It is military, and it is something that many of them are suffering from now.

Now, next week, as it was pointed out, we are going to do the Defense authorization bill. It is that very often you can stand here and say we are going to introduce a bill, and we know it is going to pass. The reason we know it is going to pass is because it has passed for the last 58 years. So this one is going to pass.

I can remember a few years ago that we actually had to go into September to get the Defense authorization bill passed. In the event it got to the end of December, and the same thing would be true this coming year; then we would have had to harden the flight pay, and we would have flight pay that wouldn't be paid. There would not be adequate funding to take care of any of that.

So we can't let that happen, and we are not going to let it happen.

I am a little confused now because a month from today we will actually mark up that bill in the U.S. Senate. Yet the House isn't going to do it, it is my understanding, until the middle of June.

Then I also heard that they may, over in the House, actually do the appropriations bill first.

Well, if you do the appropriations bill before you do the bill we will be marking up, the NDAA, then there is no reason to even do the NDAA from the House perspective.

So we do know that good things are going to happen. We are going to implement the national defense strategy.

We have talked about the national defense strategy several times on the floor and on how we have done, I think, a very good job in putting this together. Most importantly, we are supporting our All-Volunteer Force.

I may be the last person on the Senate Armed Services Committee who still believes in compulsory service.

I often wonder what would have happened in my life if I hadn't been drafted. I always remember coming back at Christmas time. Eisenhower was President, and I was enrolled at the University of Mexico, and I looked in the mailbox and there was a card. It was from the President, and I thought how nice of the President to remember me at Christmas time. It was my draft notice.

So that changed my plans, and I often wonder where I would be today if I hadn't had that experience.

We are going to provide the Armed Forces with adequate funding, and I hope we will find a budget solution. We can't do it with a continuing resolution. We have asked all of our leaders in the hearings what would happen to us if we did a continuing resolution, and it just wouldn't work. I think we all realize that.

It puts people who are budget hawks, like me, and military hawks in a very awkward situation because we have a situation where, as a result of the 8 years of the Obama administration, we have a disparity so that for every dollar you put in the military, there has to be a dollar that goes to the nondefense programs. This is something that doesn't work. So the continuing resolution, we all know, is something that should not be an option.

The responsibility carries a great weight now. We ask our men and women in uniform to do more in the face of danger and more in a dangerous and unpredictable world than at any time.

I think the Trump administration is right. They try to categorize the two threats that are out there, one being the threat of the rogue nations that are out there that we are talking about, North Korea and some of these other nations. At the same time, we also have the major threat of the great power threat, and this is one we face, and we know that. Yes, we are used to dealing with the threats of the rogue nations, but after the 8 years of the Obama administration, we watched Russia and China forge ahead of us in many areas. Hypersonic weapons are a good example, and that is something that is taking place now.

During that period of time, during the last 5 years of the Obama administration, the amount of money that we had to run our military was reduced by almost 25 percent. Now, we have made up a lot of this in fiscal year 2018 and in fiscal year 2019, thanks to the Trump administration. We have increased that funding back up to $700 billion, then again $716 billion, and this time I think we are going to be at $750 billion.

There is some dispute as to what the exact figure will be, but nonetheless we have started to rebuild. So we will be modernizing our forces, including our nuclear arsenal now, in order to maintain our military superiority—or to regain is a better word than maintain because we have actually lost some of our superiority—well into the future. Our Armed Forces have long been the best in the world, but we have problems now in trying to rebuild, and that is what this is all about.

So we will support our troops and their families who sacrifice a great deal to protect our Nation. This includes making meaningful reforms to privatize on-base housing. We went through this housing trauma just the other day. We found out a lot of people are not being treated properly. A lot of the spouses of our members and our members are living in housing that is totally unacceptable, but we came to that realization and we are correcting that situation. We want to correct it even further in the Defense Authorization bill that we will mark up a week from today.
So we want to thank every man and woman who ever put on a uniform and those who are doing this in defense of the country, congratulate them and pay particular attention to them and support them in every way we can. The fabric of our Nation is stronger because of the guys in uniform and those who have been in uniform, and we will endure for the years to come because of their service. God bless all of the men and women in uniform. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor as part of Military Appreciation Month. It is a time, clearly, to remember our brave service men and women, to reflect on their faithful service to this country and to recall the many sacrifices our troops and their families have made and continue to make in defense of this great Nation.

Many of us will be heading overseas for the 75th anniversary of D-Day to commemorate the efforts of an incredible group of allies on the fateful day and the weeks and the months that followed.

As I stand here today, I think of those soldiers, and I think of my wife Bobbi’s dad, Bob Brown—currently 92 years old, living in Thermopolis, WY, longtime postmaster. He still drives Meals on Wheels, as he says, “for the old folks.”

He was called to Europe in World War II, and he is one of those few who was in World War II in the European theater as well as in Japan as part of that first occupation and then called back to Korea as part of the 2-300 who continued in the fight for our freedoms.

He continues today to serve our United States. His wife, Jerry, who went through all of this in Thermopolis, WY, knows the sacrifices he and so many have made.

My dad, World War II, Battle of the Bulge, I still carry his dog tags from the Bulge with me. I have them with me today on the floor of the Senate, and I carry them with me when I go to see our troops overseas.

He is the guy who had to quit school in ninth grade because of the Depression. In World War II—and I have gone through some of his old papers—I found pictures of him and a number of members of the artillery who were part of the liberation of France.

From the time I was a little boy, he would say: John, you should thank God every day because you live in America. You don’t know how fortunate you are.

We are so blessed to live in this great country, and it is to the men and women who have come to protect this land, who fought for our freedoms—my dad, his wife, Louise, the sacrifices they have made on behalf of all of us.

Today we honor all of our Armed Forces, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Marines, the National Guard.

In particular, today I want to salute the members of the Wyoming Army National Guard because they are now deploying to the Middle East. Some 300 Wyoming soldiers from six units will be sent to the Middle East between January and September—the largest Wyoming deployment in nearly a decade.

The deployments began in January with the G Company of the 2nd Battalion, 211th Aviation, a medical evacuation company—the most deployed unit in the Wyoming Guard.

The medevac unit that was sent to Afghanistan and Pakistan, Wyoming soldiers from Bear River, from Casper, from Carpenter, from Guernsey, from Cheyenne, Laramie, and Wheatland.

This past week, Wyoming Governor Mark Gordon participated in a sendoff ceremony in Casper for 130 Wyoming National Guard troops headed to Texas ahead of a 9-month deployment to the Middle East.

The Wyoming troops from the 2nd Battalion of the 300 Field Artillery, the “Cowboy Cannoneers,” the group my father-in-law, Bob Brown, was part of—they are from more than two dozen communities from Casper to Lovell, to Cheyenne, to Moorcroft. This Guard unit will serve under the U.S. Central Command in Afghanistan, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates.

Wyoming and the entire Nation owe an incredible debt of gratitude to these fearless fighters for our freedom.

God bless the U.S. Armed Forces. God bless our troops, our veterans, and God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I am proud to speak today in honor of Military Appreciation Month.

Our men and women in uniform are true heroes. They risk their lives every day to protect our freedoms and our way of life.

I had the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Navy during the Vietnam war, and my adopted father was one of the few who made all four combat jumps in the 82nd Airborne during World War II.

As Governor, I made it my mission to turn Florida into the most military- and veteran-friendly State in the Nation, and we succeeded. We championed important legislation and funding to support priorities that matter most to Florida’s military families, and we took every opportunity to recognize veterans for their service.

Florida has 20 military bases and 3 unified commands—more than almost any other State. As Governor, I met regularly with Florida’s base commanders to see how I could help support their missions and their troops. As a Senator, I continue to host base commander meetings to make sure our military has every resource they need.

America is blessed with the protection of the strongest military in the world. Our military provides not only for the safety of our country but also for the safety of our country but also to export our freedoms and democracy across the globe.

For decades, we have invested in building our military into the most lethal fighting force in the history of the world, but we live in a dangerous world, and we must avoid complacency. Our military readiness was diminished by budget cuts and the sequester under President Obama, which reduced defense spending across the board. The dysfunction in Washington has many consequences, but a significantly weakened military is perhaps the most dangerous.

Our military superiority is never guaranteed. Russia and China continue to build up their militaries with a single goal in mind: to dominate the world stage.

To avoid a national security emergency, we must act now. That is why, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am fighting to match the President’s request of $750 million in defense spending, and I am fighting to secure passage for our men and women in uniform—our heroes.

I have also sponsored the Pay Our Coast Guard Act to make sure military pay is never affected by a government shutdown.

We must also work together to pass disaster relief funding immediately, which will help rebuild Tyndall Air Force Base following the devastation of Hurricane Michael.

I will never lose sight of one of the most important roles I have as a U.S. Senator: to protect and serve the families of our Nation. None of us should lose sight of that.

I look forward to working closely with each of you to invest in America’s greatest asset—the men and women of our Armed Forces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I would like to echo the sentiments my colleagues have expressed in appreciation of the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces.

While it may seem like the Members of this Chamber, much like America itself, are strongly divided on issues of national policy, I can say, without a doubt, that we are all united in support of our troops and their efforts to protect and defend our Nation and its ideals. That is why I am appreciative of the opportunity to join with my colleagues today to thank the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen working tirelessly to protect the American people from the multitude of threats that face our Nation.

The men and women who wear our Nation’s uniform selflessly serve. They are fully aware of the risks they face. Despite that, they bravely put themselves in harm’s way to defend our country, ideals, and allies around the world.

They didn’t choose this life to seek recognition, awards or honors. Like those who wore the uniform before
them, they chose the path of a higher calling. They chose it as a way to use their talents for the greater good. The men and women who serve in our military embody what it means to be a giver.

I know my fellow Arkansans share my gratitude and appreciation for all of our military personnel and their families who sacrifice at home while their loved ones are abroad.

Arkansas has a storied military heritage that is long and proud—the story of supporting our Nation’s defense. Troops stationed in the State served our country honorably even before it was admitted to the Union. Today, Arkansans are stationed around the globe, and our personnel at the Little Rock Air Force Base, Camp Robinson, Ebbing Air National Guard Base, Pine Bluff Arsenal, and Fort Chaffee continue to make the Natural State proud.

We highlight their service during the month of May, which includes six military—national observances, as a way to express our gratitude. That gratitude endures in perpetuity.

We simply cannot thank our service-members enough for the tremendous sacrifice they made to ensure that we continue to live in the greatest, freest country that the world has ever known.

As the son of an Air Force master sergeant, I learned at a young age about the sacrifices our men and women in uniform make. I also learned very early on that military families face unique challenges. It truly is a family affair.

My father joined the National Guard while he was in high school, and while still in high school, his unit was shipped out to prepare for World War II. He remained in the Air Force long after the war was over, serving over 20 years in uniform. The example set by my father’s military career—and the lessons we learned growing up in a military family—all helped my siblings and me to prepare for a productive service-centered life. The experience taught us one of the most valuable lessons which I continue to carry with me today. Through their service to our country, the men and women of our military are part of something much bigger than themselves.

My father was not only my hero, but as a World War II veteran, he and his fellow servicemembers in my hometown of Cape Girardeau were embraced in the same manner by the community as a whole. The respect and admiration our community displayed for military members was not faked or forced. It was genuine.

It remains just as strong today in communities across our great Nation. While those displays may be more publicly visible during National Military Appreciation Month, the feelings of respect, admiration, and gratitude will carry on long after the end of this month. Our Nation is eternally grateful for the sacrifice of every service-member working to keep America safe, strong, and free.

It is a real honor to be down here with my colleague from Arkansas, and we greatly appreciate your service. Congratulations on your book, which tells the story of Arlington and what a very special place it is—truly hallowed ground.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are here in recognition of our Nation’s efforts to honor and appreciate those who serve in our Armed Forces during National Military Appreciation Month. So I am pleased to join my colleagues in showing our Nation’s gratitude for every single soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coast-guardian who is serving or has served our Nation with honor.

This month is especially dedicated to our Armed Forces, but, of course, we have ample reason to celebrate and appreciate them year-round, because our troops serve year-round and around the clock and willingly accepting limitations on their own freedom and comforts so their fellow Americans can live in freedom and security.

Right now, thousands of American troops are fighting in dangerous conditions overseas far from home. Even now, at this moment, our troops are engaged in combat, surrounded by the enemy, fighting courageously.

We are all thankful and proud of their service and indebted for their sacrifice. But it is not only them. Two weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a medal ceremony in Arkansas where seven veterans of the Korean war were honored for their service and for actions they took in defense of our freedom nearly seven decades ago, so that these long-ago actions were not forgotten.

One week ago, I had the opportunity to thank our military spouses—the unsung heroes of our Armed Forces—for their work raising families despite the hardships of military life.

Those are just a couple of events from the last couple of weeks. Yet there are multiple days of remembrance every holiday across our country and around the world wherever our troops and their families are present. At airports, troops returning from overseas are greeted with hugs and cheers. The remains of our fallen heroes are greeted with odd silence.

At dinners and restaurants, a uniform or even a veteran’s hat will sometimes still earn a veteran or soldier a free meal from a grateful neighbor and fellow citizen.

Here in Washington, honor flights for our veterans still get police escorts with flashing sirens, and children salute those veterans, sometimes asking innocently about their memories at battle.

Across the river at Arlington National Cemetery, sentinels of the Old Guard stand at attention and walk the mat around the clock and in all weathers—just as they have for the past 92 years—to remember our fallen soldiers and every person whose headstone graces those beautiful rolling fields rest in eternal peace.

I am proud to live in a country that honors its military in such a fashion, but, more importantly, I am proud to live in a country whose military is worthy of such honor. So to every soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coast-guardian, I extend my gratitude, my respect, and my thanks and your family for your honorable service, not just today, not just this month but every day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, in the United States we are known as the land of the free. There is a reason for that. It is because we are the home of the brave. Our military men and women represent the very best of America. In fact, the good Word tells us that “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”

When a young man or a young woman volunteers to serve, he or she is writing a blank check made payable to the United States of America for an unknown amount up to and including their life. In Montana, we are fortunate to have so many heroes hail from our great State, including many who now work on my staff and on behalf of the people of Montana. Great Montanans like Larry Helms, Don LeMoir, Robin Baker, and Jim Korth. We are all so very fortunate to have Dillon Vaden and Doug Pack on staff here in DC currently serving in the Marine Corps.

I ask you to thank you for your service to our country. Thank you for your service to the people of Montana.

In fact, just last fall, I had the honor of visiting the men and women of Kalispell’s 495th CSSB while they were deployed in Afghanistan. They flew over to Kabul and to Bagram Air Base. I had a chance to spend time with these great Montanans.

Just a few months ago, I had the privilege of welcoming these same soldiers home after they had been deployed for 9 long months. These men and women had been far away from their families and from their friends across the holidays. Many of them were with us that night on the tarmac as they were risking their lives to protect our freedom. Seeing them reunited with their loved ones was a powerful experience for both Cindy, my wife, and me. It is one that I will never, ever forget.

But the sad reality is that some of our Montana heroes do not make it back. SSG Travis Atkin is a Bozeman native. In fact, Travis and I both went to the same high school. He was recently awarded the highest military decoration in this country by President Trump, and that is the Medal of Honor.

You see, Sergeant Atkin willingly laid down his life when he tackled a suicide bomber to shield the blast from fellow soldiers. He very bravely saved their lives—a true hero. The sacrifice he made for his country and his fellow soldiers will never be forgotten.
Over in Fort Harrison, MT, MSG Jesse Edinger of the Army National Guard has been welcoming home the fallen since 2006. He knows what sacrifice looks like. He is no stranger to combat, having served three deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. He earned his national instructor certification and has taught over the years hundreds of soldiers within his region to be honor guard trained. He has also performed more than 1,100 military funerals for Montana veterans, which included the service for SSG Travis Atkins.

While we all appreciate our brave men or brave women who serve in the military every day, this month is Military Appreciation Month. This month is about giving these men and women the added appreciation they richly deserve.

I will continue to advocate for policies that strengthen our military and give our men and our women who serve the strategic advantages they need to win.

Thank you to all who serve and to all who have served. On behalf of a very grateful Nation, we honor you, and we appreciate you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the month of May is Military Appreciation Month. It is a time when we as a country come together to recognize the sacrifices of those who have raised their right hands, worn the cloth of our country, and continue to serve the world’s greatest military day in and day out.

They have exceptionally long days and difficult tasks. Sometimes they fight the fight of boredom while hanging out and guarding a spot. Sometimes they are in exceptionally stressful full-on combat mode. They are prepared for both.

Throughout the month of May, there are actually six different days of observation to honor our Nation’s military and their families, who have sacrificed so much: Loyalty Day, Public Service Recognition Week, Victory in Europe Day, or V-E Day, Military Spouse Appreciation Day, Armed Forces Day, and, of course, at the end of the month of May, a pause for Memorial Day. All of these observances within 1 month, in May, remind us that our military is one of the most important cornerstones of our country and that their sacrifice is unmatched. So we should honor and celebrate it.

In addition to our service members and veterans, I hope all Americans also recognize the service of their family members while their husband, wife, son, daughter, mom, and dad are wearing the uniform. They could be gone for months at a time on multiple deployments.

I had the opportunity to meet with many family members in Oklahoma. Their spouse, mom, dad, son, or daughter has been deployed multiple times into several different theaters. While they are fully deployed, their family waits, and it is a long and difficult wait. It is tough for the family.

For those who serve in our National Guard, it is tough on employers. It is tough on the person you love. It is a stressful environment. For those folks who have done it and continue to serve—that 1 percent of our Nation that defends the other 99 percent of our Nation—we could not be more grateful for them and for their family members.

To all Gold Star families, those who are left behind to continue the legacy of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, we thank you for your service and for your love of country.

As a nation, it is our duty to continue to support our Gold Star families, to encourage them, to check on them, and to live life with them. Just last week, I introduced legislation with Senator CARPER to expand certain benefits to the survivors of guardsmen and reservists who have died as a result of their service. This is the least we could do as a nation to walk alongside those Gold Star families.

Over 33,000 Active-Duty Reserve, and Active-Duty personnel are currently assigned in Oklahoma. We have Oklahomans serving our country and protecting our interests, literally, all over the world right now. We have men and women at Altus Air Force Base, Tinker Air Force Base, Vance Air Force Base, Fort Sill Fires Center of Excellence in the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, as well as countless different National Guard locations all around the State. We train and equip our soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines, and I am proud of the Oklahomans who wear the uniform.

As we continue this Military Appreciation Month, I hope all Americans take the time to remember that 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, whether you are awake or asleep, someone is on guard watching our Nation right now, and someone is defending our freedoms right now. Whether you are hearing about Military Appreciation Month while you are at work, while you are at play, or while you are at rest, someone is not resting right now. They are defending your freedoms, and we are grateful.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

REMEMBERING KENDRICK CASTILLO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Kendrick Castillo was an 18-year-old senior set to graduate high school at the end of the week when his life was tragically cut short. On Tuesday, May 7, Kendrick Castillo sat in his British literature class, just like any other day in school, when two schoolmates burst into a classroom at the STEM school in Highlands Ranch and opened fire.

When I heard this unimaginable, Kendrick acted out of pure heroism as he put his classmates’ lives before his own and charged the shooters. A classmate of Kendrick’s described his heroism by telling NBC News about his actions, “giving all of us enough time to get underneath our desks, to get ourselves safe, and to run across the room to escape.”

John Castillo reflected on his son’s actions by saying:

I did what I had to do, and I knew that was my son’s nature. That was who he was.

Kendrick Castillo died a legend. He died a trooper. I know he will be with me for the rest of my life.

Kendrick Castillo lost his life saving his fellow classmates. The students of the STEM school in Highlands Ranch experienced an absolute tragedy and showed fearlessness well beyond their years as they took charge in the face of danger.

Now is the time to come together in tragedy to rise above it and remind everyone the student at that school that we love them, we are with them, and we will never forget them.

I also want to take a moment to honor the first responders who, once again, displayed true bravery in their response to this tragedy. The deputies of the Douglas County Police Department, South Metro Fire Rescue, and all of the neighboring first responders on the scene acted quickly to help stabilize the situation and lead the students and faculty to safety.

This week is National Police Week, a fitting time to reflect on those who protect our sons and daughters every day.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, in Washington, DC, this week, we are celebrating National Police Week, a time we take each year to thank law enforcement for protecting our communities and to remember the cost of providing this community service.

Today, thousands of officers and their families will gather on the west front lawn of the Capitol to participate in the 38th Annual Peace Officers’ Memorial Service, an event to honor all of those we have lost in the line of duty. They carry with them the stories and the lessons about the sacrifices they have experienced during the ceremony and throughout the week will bring a bit of comfort to law enforcement and our law enforcement community. I also hope it demonstrates the tremendous gratitude that we all have for these sacrifices.

Police Week also serves to show the law enforcement community that the
Chairman WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address the Democrats’ one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. It is a radical plan to take over all of healthcare in America and to take away health insurance from millions of Americans.

Still, nearly every Senate Democrat running for President and 109 Members of the House of Representatives, Democrats all, have backed one-size-fits-all healthcare. Last week, former Senator Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota had words of wisdom for her fellow Democrats. She wrote in the Washington Post: ‘Most Americans are satisfied with the healthcare they receive and do not want their coverage options taken away and replaced,’ as she said, ‘with a one-size-fits-all government program.’

I agree. The fact is, according to the Census Bureau, 90 percent of Americans have healthcare coverage. Of those, 200 million are covered by private insurance plans and 180 million have employer-provided healthcare coverage. Most say that their current plan works well for them.

The 180 million Americans covered through their jobs work hard. These are the people who provide their families, people serve this country. So why do Democrats who support one-size-fits-all healthcare want to outlaw proven, popular, and predictable health coverage for millions of these working families?

Democrats certainly seem to be putting politics above principle. What is more, they clearly believe that Washington knows best. But shouldn’t we be asking what these hard-working Americans who have good private health insurance want? Well, shouldn’t we ask them what is best for them and what is best for their families?

Let’s take the Teamsters Union, for example. In an article published in 2017, the Teamsters said: ‘The availability of high-quality health care has been a top selling point for those who belong to unions. It is a benefit these workers have bargained for, and oftentimes they have sacrificed higher pay for these excellent insurance benefits.’

Let me underscore this point: The Teamsters Union believes their health benefits are excellent, and maybe Democrats should ask the United Steelworkers about their insurance coverage. If you go to the steelworkers’ website, you will find their answer: ‘The Steelworkers Benefit Plan . . . provide[s] high-quality, affordable health and welfare benefits to USW [United Steelworkers] members and their families.’

Basically, if you are a union worker watching this debate right now, you need to know that Democrats in Washington are coming for your hard-earned healthcare benefits. Make no mistake.

The one-size-fits-all healthcare legislation offered by Senator Bernie Sanders and so many Democrats running for President, this high-quality health insurance program and their insurance will cease to exist.

It is no wonder that last year some high-paid union leaders started sounding the alarm about losing their health benefits. When New York State debated a Sanders-like proposal to take over healthcare, who raised the loudest objections? Well, it was the public sector unions, of course.

So, again, we have millions of union workers, Federal and State employees, and their families, all with excellent healthcare benefits that are on the chopping block. Democrats are looking to destroy what is actually working.

Remember, it is more than union workers and public sector employees who are threatened. Democrats’ one-size-fits-all healthcare want to outlaw health insurance as well. We are talking about the TRICARE health insurance program for military families. There are more than 9 million military families enrolled in TRICARE. Our servicemembers have earned their TRICARE coverage through years of faithful service defending this Nation. I believe one of our greatest responsibilities is to provide for those who protect this Nation, to serve those who currently serve and our retired servicemembers.

Back home in Wyoming I talk with servicemembers, with veterans, nearly every weekend. These proud Americans want me to make sure that TRICARE works for them and to protect and strengthen benefits that work and that they have earned through their service.

Still, far-left Democrats don’t want to listen to reason. They are hell-bent on a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare.

It is especially ironic that Democrats ever want to ban ObamaCare plans—the plans they voted for and put in place. It has been less than a decade since Democrats passed ObamaCare, and now they want to repeal it and replace it, basically saying that ObamaCare has failed.

For years I have come to the floor to discuss the shortcomings of ObamaCare. Every time Republicans have offered to improve healthcare, we have heard from the Democrats that ObamaCare is off-limits and they can’t possibly make any changes to that law. Now that the Democrats are running for President, suddenly they are singing a different tune. They are done defending ObamaCare. In fact, Democrats are happy to repeal ObamaCare so they can replace it with a one-size-fits-all healthcare plan for America.

Senator Heitkamp is actually warning them not to cast aside ObamaCare and start all over again with a one-size-fits-all plan.

Well, let me just say as a doctor, as a physician who has taken care of patients for decades, my focus continues to be on improving healthcare for American patients and their families. Americans want to focus on real healthcare reforms that make a difference for them and their families in terms of the cost and the quality of their care. These are the issues that Republicans are working on right now: protecting patients with
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Do not want their coverage options.
preexisting conditions, lowering prescription drug costs, and ending surprise medical bills.

Surprise medical bills are bills patients receive that come out of nowhere. These bills are an unfair financial burden on many families, completely unexpected medical costs that they can’t afford and aren’t expecting. Just last week I was at the White House with President Trump announcing a plan to help patients by ending these surprise bills.

Representatives still remain committed to protecting patients with preexisting conditions and to lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

Democrats have a choice to make. They can follow the far-left Democrats pushing their radical one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. Again, this extreme scheme will mean the loss of health insurance coverage for millions and millions and millions of hardworking people, union workers, and their families—veterans, people who helped protect and save this country, Federal and State employees and their families, and all of the Americans who are currently enrolled in ObamaCare plans.

The better option for Democrats is to work with Republicans on common-sense, bipartisan solutions, real reforms that improve healthcare for all Americans. Let’s reject one-size-fits-all healthcare that will make Americans pay more to wait longer for worse care.

That is the key. One-size-fits-all healthcare, I will tell people listening in today, means that you will pay more to wait longer for worse care. It is time to reject one-size-fits-all care for Americans. Let us work together to give all patients the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I came to the floor to speak about rising tensions and potential challenges with Iran, but after my distinguished colleague’s remarks and as a Member of the Senate Finance Committee who helped write the Affordable Care Act, I wouldn’t want to have my silence be an acceptance of his views.

For nearly a decade Republicans have sought to take down the Affordable Care Act, which some derisively call ObamaCare, with no substitute, with no plan. This administration is actually in a Federal court, arguing that the law is unconstitutional—the very law that gives protections to everyone in this country who has a preexisting condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband who had a heart attack, a woman simply because she is a woman and before was discriminated against because she was pregnant, a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband with some heart disease, a woman suffering from some condition.

It was the Affordable Care Act that ended discrimination and created the protections.

It was the Affordable Care Act that ended lifetime caps so that if you had a major illness such as cancer, before you hit the ceiling on your insurance and you were one illusory away from bankruptcy—the Affordable Care Act ended lifetime caps so that if you had a serious illness you were still covered. The Affordable Care Act created the possibility for our children to be able to stay on our insurance until the age of 26. That was not the law before.

The list goes on and on. So it is that which Democrats have been about and, expanding upon that, the opportunity to create a universal system for everyone—something we all desire.

Iran.

Mr. President, as important as that issue is, I have come to the floor in alarm to demand answers by this administration about Iran, about its policy, about what intelligence the administration has. For more than a week we have seen press reports and heard rumors about the “threats” to U.S. interests and possibly American citizens by Iran.

For more than a week I have been demanding, along with others, that the administration provide senior level officials to brief Members of the U.S. Senate.

For more than a week, the administration has ignored these requests. For all intents and purposes, it has refused to provide Members of Congress with information critical to our national security—information it says indicates that American citizens and American assets may be in harm’s way.

After specifically requesting information on security posture at our diplomatic facilities in Iraq on Monday, this morning, I read from press reports that the administration is ordering the departure of staff from our Embassy in Baghdad and our consulate in Erbil. As the ranking member—the senior Democrat—of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is outrageous to be learning about the evacuation of an Embassy from media reports. There are only two reasons to make such an order: We have credible intelligence that our people are at risk, or there is some type of preparation for military action against Iran.

This behavior is unacceptable. By refusing to provide Members of Congress with critical information, this administration is blatantly disregarding the fundamental governing structures of the United States as outlined in our Constitution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is charged with writing the laws that authorize the use of military force and of oversight of the State Department and the safety of those who work there. The administration must provide this committee with the information we need to judiciously and appropriately make policies.

While I hear there is a briefing for all Senators rumored for next week, that is not confirmed, nor is it an acceptable timeline. Next week may be too late. We do not need another Iraq weapons of mass destruction moment that led us to one of the worst, most catastrophic military engagements when there were no weapons of mass destruction to be found. We need clarity. We need answers, and we need them now.

We cannot make foreign policy and national security decisions while flying in the blind.

Make no mistake—I have no doubts that Iran continues to be a bad actor in the region and throughout the world. Iranian leaders continue to support dangerous proxy actors throughout the region. Iran continues to violate arms embargoes. Iran continues to oppress its own people. Indeed, I have spent the better part of two decades developing legislation and policies to stop Iran’s quest for a nuclear weapon and attacks against our allies, including Israel.

Working across the aisle, often cajoling and prodding the executive branch and our allies, Congress led the effort to build an extensive economic and political pressure campaign to force Iran to the negotiating table. Our allies in Europe, Asia, and across the world, most of whom share our concern about Iran’s ability to develop a nuclear weapon and its broader malign activities, have been critical to this effort.

When building a policy to effectively confront an adversary, you must have an end goal, you must have clear objectives, and you must take actions in pursuit of those objectives. With Iran, our objective was to ensure that Iran never develops a pathway toward a nuclear weapon. So I am all for putting on as much pressure as we can, but that requires also having a clear way of showing how it can be alleviated. There must be a viable, tenable, diplomatic table. If I were to walk into a room, lock the door, throw away the key, and tell you there is no way out and no way to survive, you would sure as hell start looking for ways to fight and break down that door.

For a campaign of maximum pressure, when the moment of maximum leverage is reached, it must be seized. That requires working with our allies to offer a real, diplomatic path to negotiations.

British Major General Chris Ghika, the deputy commander of the American-led coalition to fight the Islamic State, has called into question some of the credibility of the intelligence our officials say we have regarding Iranian-backed forces in Iraq.

Yesterday, Spain pulled a frigate from a U.S.-led naval group that had been scheduled for a joint training mission 2 years ago, saying the original mission had changed.

While Iran is a threat, tactical not just in confronting Iranian malign activity but in securing our interests across the world. Let me conclude with two points.
Now is the moment to invest in a diplomatic surge to meaningfully engage our allies and Iran in serious negotiations to end its pathway toward nuclear weapons and its malign activities.

Second, Congress has not authorized war with Iran. The administration, if it is contemplating military action with Iran, must come to Congress to seek approval.

I call on every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle to assert our institutional and constitutional prerogatives and demand information from this administration, demand classified briefings. When matters this serious are at stake, we have to demand more. We cannot and we will not be led into dangerous military adventures. The administration must provide this critical information to Congress, and it must do so immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I think many of our colleagues here in the Chamber know that Senator AXE
ANDER and I host a breakfast on Tues-
day mornings called Tennessee Tues-
day. This week at the breakfast, one of our Tennesseans said: I have seen so many men and women in law enforce-
ment uniforms in DC. What is going on? Is this normal?

It was the opportunity to say: Actually, this is National Police Week, and this is a week we set aside to honor those men and women who are in law enforce-
ment.

There are dozens of thousands of police officers and sheriffs and highway pa-
trolmen across our country. My hope is that each of us will stop this week when we see them and say “thank you” to them for the service they provide our communities, because when it comes down to it, as many of us know, the issues that affect our communities on a day-
to-day basis—the issues we face because of drugs and drug trafficking, human trafficking, gangs—it is our local law enforcement that is on those frontlines, and we say “thank you” to them.

This year in Tennessee, three officers have lost their lives. During this week, we remember them and express our gratitude to their families for their sacrifice. This week, we remember Trooper Matthew Elias Gatti from the Tennessee Highway Patrol, who died on Monday, May 6, 2019; Sergeant Steve Hinkle from the Sullivan County Sher-
iff’s Office, who died on Tuesday, Feb-
rue 26, 2019; and Police Officer Nich-
olas Scott Gallinger from the Chat-
tanooga Police Department, who died on Sunday, February 24, 2019. As I talk to our sheriffs and police chiefs and pa-
trol captains, I know there are many more who have been injured, and we re-
member them.

We also say “thank you so much” to the families of these men and women who have chosen—you know, they real-
ly are called. This is their calling to public service, and we thank them for answering that call and that they choose to serve in our communities to keep us safe so that we know our com-

munities are a place where we can rear our families, where we can enjoy camaraderie with family members, with friends, with our churches.

I will tell you, as I was thinking about this week, I thought, there are so many moms and grandmas who I think would say much like me. Many times I will say I am a “security mom.” I want to make certain that my children and my grandchildren are safe, that our children are safe when they go to sporting events and when they go to school. We say a prayer when they get behind the wheel of a car. We are so grateful that there are law enforcement officers who are there at public events to keep them safe, who watch out if they are going to be speed-
ing on the road and provide the secu-

rity that is so essential to our way of life.

I have the opportunity as one of these security moms, if you will, to serve on our Senate Judiciary Com-
nittee. Just last week, Chairman GRA-
HAM brought forward three bills that we approved. These are things that are going to help law enforcement officers and their families—providing mental health support for law enforcement and their families, which is vitally impor-
tant, having things like bullet-proof vests, which are now essential, and ensuring that our first responders get the benefits they have earned by standing for that duty. When they get ready to retire, those benefits are going to be there.

This week, I have joined Senator CORNYN on his Back the Blue Act, and I thank him for his leadership. I think many of us who stand in this Chamber know that we stand to back that “thin blue line.” It makes the difference between order and chaos in our communities. This bill is going to create new penalties for killing or assaulting law enforcement officers and will pro-

tect officers from lawsuits when they interfere to stop a violent crime. It is a commonsense provision, and I am pleased to be in support of this bill.

As we talk about law enforcement and security and having safe commun-
ities, we also need to remember our security mom, individuals who are on the southern bor-
der. When you talk about being a security mom, of course you are going to talk about economic security, healthcare security, job security, and national security, but border security is a part of that. It is a way that we work to keep our communities safe.

We all know there is a humanitarian crisis on the southern border. Much of it is fueled by cartels that are big busi-

ness. They deal in drug trafficking and human trafficking. It is our first re-
sponders who address this in our commu-
nities and on our city streets. The issues and the lack of security at that border have created an environment where now, at this point, every State is a border State and every town is a bor-
der town because those problems that come across the southern border with the human trafficking, with the drug trafficking, with the gangs—all of this up on the streets in your commu-

nity.

We are working on legislation that we hope is going to help with this situ-
al. It will target traffickers of unac-
panied minors in the care of Health and Human Services. One of the things that has not happened and needs to happen is that Health and Human Serv-
ices and Homeland Security need to be able to share all of the information they have on individuals who are bringing these unaccompanied children, indi-
viduals who say “I am a next of kin,” individuals who say “I am here, and this child is coming to me.” We want to make certain they are in the coun-

try legally. We want to make certain they are safe. Some of these children so that we are protecting and looking out for the security of these children and making certain they are not being trafficked.

As we talk about our children, some of them are children of our law enforce-
ment—of course, much of the trafficking takes place in the virtual space. It takes place online. It seems impossible, but that is what hap-
pens with the human trafficking and the sex trafficking. The adverse impact that this has on young girls and women is horrifying.

Because of my work to prohibit these traffickers from working online, we are push-
ing forward with privacy legisla-
tion. You and I do not want our chil-
dren to be followed online. That is what is happening, and it is why we need to make certain that moms have the tools they need—that parents have the tools they need—to guard the pri-

vacy of their families online.

I recently introduced the BROWS-
ER Act. This is legislation I introduced while I was in the House of Representa-
tives. It is one of the first bipartisan privacy bills we have had. The BROWS-
ER Act will require you to give your consent if you are going to opt in and allow someone to share your information, to have access to your sensitive information.

In this Nation, we have a history of respecting informed consent, and that is why I am working on legislation that I introduced while I was in the House of Representa-
tives before that company looks at their private information or, worse yet, data miners or, worse yet, shares that information about those individuals with third parties—people they do not know, people they have never seen, people they never will see. Then that tech company—guess what—sells ads. It is paid with your information.

The BROWSER Act also prohibits companies from denying their services to users who refuse to waive their pri-
vacy rights. You have a right to pri-

vacy, and these companies should not deny you their services because you
say: You cannot share my information. You cannot share my sensitive information. I am not going to opt-in to allow you to do that, big tech company. I am also going to opt-out on non-sensitive data. I am not going to allow you to do that. I do not want my children followed, and I do not want you to be following me. I do not want you to sell my information. I do not want my spam to run crazy with ads and information I do not want.

Indulge their privacy. Americans deserve to know they are protected and have that privacy in the online universe. They deserve to know they are not going to be followed and they are not going to be tracked.

While we are talking about technology, I’d like to bring attention to the global race for 5G, or fifth-generation wireless technology. You are hearing a good bit about this. It doesn’t matter whether you are in our information sector or in our military sector; we are at the forefront of this debate to make certain that we win this race on 5G—that China does not get a foothold, that Huawei does not penetrate our delivery system. We have to make certain that we win this race just like we did the race to 4G, which brought forward a lot of the technologies we all use and take for granted, like those devices we hold in our hands on which we receive our emails, make our phone calls, send text messages, pull up maps, get to a favorable site on which we want to make a purchase, and log on to social media accounts. This is all from a handheld device, and it is what 4G brought us. Well, 5G is going to be as revolutionary as going from analog to digital, and we are going to stay on top of this to make certain we win this race.

Because of this, we have a couple more pieces of legislation that sector or in our military sector is going to discuss on the floor at a later date. We have the SECURE 5G and BEYOND Act. Senator CORNYN has the lead on that. I have the SUPPLY CHAIN Act, which will be focused on securing our national space and make certain that we will be rooting out these threats that may come to our supply chain and affect our private sector or our governmental sector.

We know it is imperative that, yes, we win the race in 5G but that we protect our networks and that we secure them so the American public knows that its information is not being exploited.

As a mom who values and puts a priority on keeping children and grandparents, it is an honor for me to come to this floor to salute the men and women of law enforcement and to talk about what we need to do every single day in this Chamber to protect our Nation’s security and to protect our citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I honor the life and legacy of the late Senator Richard Lugar.

My colleagues and I in the Senate were deeply saddened to hear of the passing of our dear colleague and friend. His selfless service and tireless dedication to the State of Indiana and to this Nation inspired many to follow in his footsteps and govern using his principle of law and desire for constructive compromise.

From an early age, Senator Lugar understood the value of hard work and dedication. He became an Eagle Scout, was the valedictorian of his classes in both high school and college. He was later a Rhodes Scholar at the prestigious University of Oxford in England. Senator Lugar’s commitment to his education served him very well later in his career as a distinguished statesman.

As a fellow Eagle Scout, Senator Lugar knew that the knowledge and skills gained in Scouting always had a use and were a central part of the Boy Scout Creed. Senator Lugar understood early on the importance of core Scouting values, such as trust, loyalty, courtesy, reverence, and the rest. He displayed these values not only in his nearly four decades-long career in the Senate but also as living husband and father to Charlene, his wife, and their four sons.

These critical skills also served him well as the mayor of Indianapolis. As a mayor, he guided the city as it transformed from a coal-mining center to a modern metropolis. He led on that. I have the SUPPLY CHAIN Act, which was guaranteed to them as well. They deserve to know that their pension will be funded fully, and they deserve to have accessible healthcare, which was guaranteed to them as well.

Unlike many foreign assistance programs that do not impact those directly on the ground, PEPFAR taught people how to avoid contracting the HIV/AIDS disease and provided countries with the ability to care for their citizens who were already infected.

Senator Lugar was also a committed man of faith. As a member of the Jehovah’s Witnesses, his moral compass was guided strongly by his faith. He was always one to do what he thought was right rather than what was the easiest.

The United States is a better place because of Senator Lugar’s tireless service and commitment to what is right. I and Diana, my wife, send our deepest condolences to his loved ones and know he will find eternal peace and happiness in knowing he had a profound effect on all who knew him as a colleague, as a father, and as a friend. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMERICAN MINERS ACT

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to call for immediate action on the American Miners Act.

We have an obligation to the miners across America who served our Nation by providing us with the energy throughout our greatest advancements. They deserve to know that their pensions, which they rightfully worked for, will be funded fully, and they deserve to have accessible healthcare, which was guaranteed to them as well.

As the Senate fails to act, we continue to put our retired miners’ healthcare and pension benefits in jeopardy yet again.

I have been working with everyone and from every angle in order to prevent our miners from losing their healthcare and retirement benefits, but, once again, they are facing a deadline that puts their whole livelihood at risk.

This has been a long fight, and it is far from over. Everyone who has joined me on this journey understands that
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for necessary and long-overdue changes in how we address the cost and affordability of prescription drugs.

You are going to hear today from, in addition to myself, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator SMITH, and Senator KAINE, as well as Senator DURBIN, who spoke on these issues earlier, to highlight this egregious public health issue facing our country.

It is unacceptable that lifesaving treatments and cures are increasingly out of reach for the people who need them the most. That is why the Senate must act now to pass legislation that will lower the cost of prescription drugs. Healthcare represents one-sixth of our economy, and out-of-pocket costs account for over 10 percent of our Nation’s healthcare spending from consumers to hospitals and nursing homes.

One report found that between 2012 and 2016, the price of branded prescription drugs increased 110 percent. That is not 11 percent; that is 110 percent. Even drugs that have been available for decades, like insulin, are no longer affordable. It is outrageous, it is dangerous, and it has real consequences for real people.

For most Americans, this is deeply personal. I know it for me. I will never forget the frightening day when we learned my daughter had a nut allergy. She was a toddler, and we were actually in a cabin. We were out in the middle of nowhere, and she had a cashew for the first time. Her throat started to close up, although we didn’t really know that was what was happening. I still remember us driving as fast as we could through the woods for about 45 minutes to the closest emergency room, where finally they were able to help her. That was when we discovered that she had a nut allergy.

She now keeps an EpiPen with her at all times. So when the price of an EpiPen increased by three times the original amount, I knew just how dangerous that cost increase would be to the people who rely on the medication, and I spoke out.

It wasn’t just me. It was moms and dads across the country who spoke out. They spoke out by writing letters. They spoke out on Facebook. They spoke out on email. They spoke out on their social media. They spoke out on their Facebook pages. They spoke on these issues earlier, to highlight this egregious public health issue facing our country.

By the way, not every drug has a constituency like that of parents who have
kids that have nut allergies. There are a lot of rare drugs for which maybe only hundreds of families understand what a price increase means. There are drugs that have constituencies who are disabled or people who aren’t going to be able to mob the halls of Congress to make a change.

Besides that, I don’t think that is how we want to make change, anyway. Wouldn’t it be better if we responded in a policy way, in a bipartisan way, and simply made some changes to the policies of our government and of our country to bring down the price of prescription drugs—not just the drugs that are most famous but for all drugs.

The examples of prescription drug pricing is now out of control and why we have to take action. For instance, a Wall Street Journal article reported that the price for a multiple sclerosis drug went up 21 times over the course of a single year, and it now costs nearly $199,000 a year.

We know that the price of certain insulin products rose 700 percent, accounting for inflation, in two decades. When the State of the Union happened this year, I invited a guest, and that guest was a woman named Nicole Smith Holt, and it was her son, a young man named Alec, who was a 26-year-old restaurant manager, who worked in my State. He worked hard. He was a good guy, and he was on his parents’ health insurance until he was 26. When that health insurance ended, when he could not get that health insurance, he then had to pay for the insulin himself since he was a diabetic. It was $1,200 a month. He was unable to afford his insulin. So what did he do? Sadly, he did what too many people are doing in America right now. He started rationing insulin. He rationed that insulin, and he died waiting for his next paycheck. He was a restaurant manager in the suburbs of the Twin Cities.

His mother sat at the State of the Union, looking down at the President, looking down at the Congress, to make the point that she needed action, and in the memory of her son Alec, she was going to make sure that action happens.

Congress has a duty to act, and the President should support these efforts. Committees in the House of Representatives, for the first time, have already advanced proposals to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, and we should be moving similar legislation here in the Senate.

Yes, it is true that there are two pharmaceutical companies for every Member of Congress. That is a fact, and for years they have felt that they owned Congress. That has to change. They do not own me, and they do not own the people who are speaking up today.

STOP STALLING ACT AND CREATES ACT

Madam President, two of the bills the House Judiciary Committee have already advanced with bipartisan support are companions to bipartisan legislation that I am leading in the Senate with Senator Grassley: the Stop Stalling Act, which addresses the abuse of the FDA petition process by pharma companies, and my bill to crack down on anti-competitive pay-for-delay agreements.

In addition to these commonsense proposals, the House Judiciary Committee also passed a version of the bipartisan Creates Act, which Senator Leahy and Senator Lee and others have led and which I have been a co-sponsor of for years, to deter branded drug companies from withholding testing samples to develop new generics.

Recently, on “60 Minutes,” there was a story of the work that is being done in Connecticut in response to what is going on with generic companies and the pharmaceutical companies. That is what these bills get at—to get products out on the market, to stop the pay-for-delay, in which Big Pharma pays off generics to keep their products off the market. Yes, we should take up these bills. It is very important, but we must do more. We must also make sure that Medicare negotiates for prices. Right now there is literally a ban on negotiation, so 43 million seniors cannot get the best prices for their drugs. That doesn’t help just 43 million seniors if we lift that ban; it also helps everyone in America because they are such big purchasers of prescription drugs that it will bring down the cost for everyone.

The other bill I noted was the one about the petitioning process that was designed to allow interested parties to raise legitimate health and safety issues related to generic drug applications, and for years branded drugmakers have filed sham petitions to delay the FDA’s approval of the competing generic drugs.

Studies show that the FDA denies more than 90 percent of petitions relating to generics and that more than 10 percent of generics between 2011 and 2015 were filed by branded pharmaceutical companies. Our legislation would help to deter those who engage in sham petitioning. According to the CEO—the Congressional Budget Office—that would save U.S. taxpayers $117 million over the next 10 years.

These are ideas that have been out there for a long time. These are things that we believe would make a major difference.

SAFE AND AFFORDABLE DRUGS FROM CANADA ACT

Madam President, another one I would like to mention is a bill that I introduced with the late Senator John McCain, and we have introduced that bill.

LIFEBOAT ACT

Madam President, finally, we should act to hold drugmakers accountable for the opioid crisis they helped to create by passing the LifeBOAT Act, led by our colleague Senator Manchin, who was just in this Chamber, which would establish a permanent funding stream to help address and confront the treatment for addiction. It is only fair that the companies made wealthy from addiction be held responsible to fund a pathway for recovery. There are many options, and, alone, none of these will fix this problem. But, together, along with other legislation that has been proposed by my colleagues, we can make a difference. We can no longer pretend this is happening. It is time for us to make a dent, to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, and to stop coddling the pharmaceutical companies.

This is about Jessica, a mother whose specialty drug costs to treat her arthritis are $50,000 a year. This is about a woman from Crystal, MN, who told me “I am practically going without food” to pay for her prescriptions. This is happening in America.

Madam President, I note that my colleague Senator Blumenthal is here, and I know that he has remarks as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Madam President. I will be speaking in just a moment, but I understand the minority leader, Senator Schumer, is on his way to speak before me, so he should be here within moments.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. While we await for Senator Schumer, I want to mention just a few examples of what we are talking about here with drug prices—a woman named Paula. Paula has been prescribed a treatment for her multiple sclerosis. It costs over $5,000 a month. She has been getting copay assistance from a grant but does not know how she is going to afford it and whether she is going to be able to afford her lifesaving medication.

Julie, another example, is covered under her husband’s employer plan. She currently has to pay a $500 copay for a drug that she needs—the same drug that was once offered in a generic form for $50, a fraction of the new cost. The generic drug has been discontinued, creating an impossible choice between paying $500 or not filling her prescription. Because of the high cost, she goes without this drug.

Diane—Diane has an Epipen for bee stings and is unhappy with the high cost. She says:
Now that I am retired, it is horrific how I have to buy them in a pack of two, and they cost more than before. The prices have just skyrocketed. Every year I throw away something that is so expensive that I cannot use. It is way overpriced.

Angie, from Savage, MN, is a mother, a wife, and a teacher. In May of 2018, she was admitted to a hospital, where MRI scans showed brain lesions. She was eventually discharged from the hospital and was instructed to follow up with a neurologist. She received a multiple sclerosis diagnosis. She was prescribed a new medication that is also one of the most effective drugs available today for treating MS. Payment for the expensive drug was denied.

These are just examples of the people we see every day. I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota—the senior Senator—for all of the great work she has done in working to reduce the high cost of drugs for the American people.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Madam President, on a much different subject but one a very important one—Iran and the Middle East—I have returned to the floor this afternoon amid several concerned reports about the Trump administration’s position on Iran.

Earlier this week, it was reported that the administration’s national security team discussed a plan that would deploy at least 120,000 U.S. troops in the Middle East. Today we learned that personnel were removed from the U.S. Embassy in Iraq. The President himself initially denied there was a plan and then seemed to confirm the reports by saying that he would “absolutely” send troops, and, if he did, “it would be a hell of a lot more than 120,000.”

This comes as quite a surprise to the American people, who have grown quite tired of wars in the Middle East, of the loss of life and fortune when there is so much that has to be done in America.

The American people deserve to know what is going on here. We are talking about not only putting 120,000 troops in harm’s way in this possible deployment but also about the safety and the actions of the thousands of troops who have been stationed in the Middle East right now.

So I am calling on Acting Defense Secretary Shanahan and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dunford, to come testify before the Senate Armed Services Committee in an open setting before the end of the week. The hearings that are done in secret do not inform the American people of what is going on, and they are entitled to know because the lessons of history teach us that when things are done in secret, behind closed doors or put off on the table, mistakes can be made and momentum built for a course of action that the Nation ultimately regrets.

So I repeat: The American people deserve to know what is going on. If the President and Republicans in Congress are planning to take the United States into a conflict, even a war in the Middle East, the American people deserve to know that, and they deserve to know why.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I want to begin by thanking the minority leader for bringing this issue as straightforwardly and as clearly as he has. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I demand to know from the Acting Secretary of Defense and other relevant officials why we have deployed these American military assets, including an aircraft carrier group, a number of bombers and Patriot missile units to one of the most dangerous parts of the world, where they may unexpectedly provoke act of war.

We are on a dangerous path without a strategy. We are embarked on a course of potential war without informing the Congress or the American people. We have demanded repeatedly that we be briefed, and it must be in public.

This situation has reached a point of potential conflagration. The tinderbox of the Middle East is no place to operate on impulse or whim. That is the appearance this administration was created by lacking a clearly articulated strategy for the American people to know and assess. On the Armed Services Committee, we have asked repeatedly for this kind of information, and so far the administration has refused to provide it. So this kind of open hearing is necessary to be open information for the American people, and they deserve and need no less.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, I turn now to a topic that is of great consequence to the American people for their health and their economic well-being.

As we all know and as the senior Senator from Minnesota, my great friend Amy Klobuchar, has very eloquently and powerfully described, the high cost of essential medicines in this country is a national disgrace. It is immoral. For the greatest country in the world to compel ordinary Americans to choose between covering their rent or paying for their medical needs to stay alive is absolutely abhorrent and unacceptable.

The only people who benefit under the current system are the high-paid executives, whose pay is increased even more by this unjust and intolerable system. It yields them greater profit without any greater help to the American people.

It has to stop, and the good news is, we have bipartisan agreement that it must stop. After years of disagreement, we are starting to see Republicans and Democrats coming together and confronting the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. Drug companies’ price-gouging, their manipulation of their monopolistic power to raise those prices and make the industry’s practices noncompetitive and to exclude even new products from coming to market—all of these have become so extreme and so outrageous that there is now bipartisan consensus that we need to stop it.

I am proud today to support the Affordable Prescriptions Act. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation, and it will finally stop some of the most egregious monopolistic and predatory tactics within the drug industry. These tactics would make even the robber barons of the Gilded Age blush with guilt and embarrassment for the obvious anti-consumer effects that impact the average American.

These patent abuses go by colorful names like “patent thicketing” and “product hopping,” but these names obscure their very purpose. Patent thicketing and product hopping are only the tip of this monopolistic iceberg. While these terms may be unfamiliar to many Americans, almost everyone is familiar with the harmful effects of these predatory practices produce.

The fault here is with the people who take advantage of shortages and market power. They exploit them in the same way that anti-trust abuses have been uncovered over the years, and they are the reason we have anti-trust laws. Now, to confront this even more egregious example of abuses of market power, we need these new laws.

According to one study in 2017, across the top 12 grossing drugs in America, drugs companies filed an average of 127 patent applications per drug. By creating a thicket, a genuine thicket of patents around their drugs, drug companies are able to double the number of years of market exclusivity that they have before a competitor can enter the market.

During this time, these drug companies are able to charge consumers extraordinarily high prices for drugs they desperately need. If you use HUMIRA or have rheumatoid arthritis, you should be deeply concerned about patent thicketing. According to one study, the manufacturer of HUMIRA has filed 247 patents so far. It can exclude competitors from market—those competitive adversaries from producing drugs and can do so for a total of 39 years. During those 39 years, the cost of HUMIRA in the future—they will do it for 39 years—is just going to keep climbing. According to reports, between 2012 and 2015 alone, the average amount that Medicare and Medicaid spent on each patient using HUMIRA more than doubled—from $16,000 to $33,000. Things will only get worse in the years to come.

Rheumatoid arthritis patients are hardly the only ones who should be concerned about patent thicketing. A large number of patents have been filed
to protect the market exclusivity of drugs that treat conditions like cancer, stroke, blood clots, diabetes, multiple myeloma, and macular degeneration.

Patent thickets will keep competitors off the market. It will cost consumers hundreds of thousands of dollars, each year. It isn’t only the patients who use the drugs who suffer these effects; we all pay the cost of higher insurance when those insurers have to pay higher costs for drugs. It hurts all of us, not just the patients who suffer from these medical conditions.

Unfortunately, this obviously anti-competitive practice is not the only way drug companies abuse the patent system to keep drug prices high. Just before the protections for their first drug expire, brand-name drug companies pull a bait-and-switch, pushing consumers onto a new, slightly different drug. That means any generic competition coming to market will struggle to compete in the market, and consumers will be stuck with the brand-name drug for even longer, likely at a significantly higher cost. In this way, the brand-name company succeeds in gouging customers and keeping them paying.

That is the objective—not better product, not better health, not better patient experiences, only higher profits.

One of the most famous examples of product hopping—the practice I have just described—concerns Namenda, a drug to treat Alzheimer’s. This drug was produced by a company called Actavis. When Actavis originally released Namenda, it was usually taken by patients twice a day, but a number of years before Namenda’s market exclusivity was going to expire, Actavis went to the FDA to approve a new version of Namenda, this one taken just once a day. A new drug? No. A different way of taking it? Maybe. To improve patient health? No. To increase profits. Yes.

Although the FDA had approved this drug in 2010, Actavis strategically waited 3 years to introduce this, with the apparent goal of extending its exclusivity in the U.S. market. Once the new drug was introduced, Actavis pushed all of its customers onto it, while pulling the old drug from the market. As a result, Actavis was able to continue charging monopoly prices on essentially the same drug long after Namenda’s first patent was expected to expire.

We have reached the time to stop patent thicketing and product hopping once and for all. We have reached the time to bring sanity and fairness to the market. As a result, Actavis was able to transition off his mom’s insurance, Alec faced a $1,300-a-month cost for managing his diabetes. Most of that was driven by the high price of the insulin. Alec had a good job, but his diabetes treatment was eating up nearly 45 percent of his monthly salary, and that is on top of regular expenses for food and rent and other basic necessities. So Alec did what he had to do. He rationed his insulin to make ends meet. Unfortunately, less than a month after his 26th birthday and less than 1 month after he transitioned off his mom’s insurance, Alec passed away. He was the victim of insulin rationing.

Colleagues, we are at a crisis point. Thousands of people like Alec are rationing their prescriptions so they can afford them, and sometimes they are literally paying with their lives. Patients with health insurance, like Nikki and Rachael, are facing higher and higher out-of-pocket costs, and seniors are being forced to choose between paying for groceries and paying for their medicine.

In the wealthiest country in the world, this is unacceptable. It is morally wrong that the pharmaceutical companies are raking profits off of skyrocketing prices while Americans struggle to pay for their prescription drugs. That is simple to understand, but the industry would have you believe otherwise.

Their first argument. Well, drug pricing is so complex; it is impossible to understand; and Congress should study the problem. I would argue this complexity serves a function. Complexity obscures all the ways the drug companies are gaming the system to drive up profits. Colleagues, we can’t be paralyzed by complexity. We need to create more transparency in drug pricing.
So then the pharmaceutical companies come back with their second argument. They say high prices are the result of altruistic purposes, like investing in research, development, and innovation, but, colleagues, remember, it is taxpayers who are subsidizing the basic research that leads to innovation and new cures through the National Institutes of Health. Innovation can’t help people if it is too expensive to afford.

So then their closing argument. We aren’t the problem, say the drug companies. It is the PBMs. It is the insurers. It is everybody else but us. I would argue that everyone has a role to play. Lots of companies profit from high drug prices all along the supply chain. That needs to be fixed, and all of these players need to be held accountable. Pointing fingers and shifting blame will not bring down high drug prices. Comprehensive solutions will.

In the coming weeks, I will be re-introducing the Affordable Medications Act, which is a comprehensive solution that targets the multiple causes of the skyrocketing price of prescription drugs, and a number of my Democratic colleagues are working with me on this bill. It would increase transparency and hold pharmaceutical companies accountable for their role in setting high prices. It would make prescription drugs more affordable by allowing Medicare to use its buying power to negotiate lower prices, just like we already do with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

My bill goes further by penalizing drug companies that spike prices and allowing for the safe importation of lower-cost drugs from other countries like Canada. My bill would spur innovation by creating a fund for new antibiotics and funding for clinical drug trials, and it would protect competition by blocking unfair, anticompetitive drug monopoly practices. This bill would eliminate the blame game and put patients at the center of the solution.

Now, I recently introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator Cassidy to help bring low-cost biosimilars, like insulin, to the market. I am working to reintroduce legislation that would limit the ability of the big brand name drug companies to keep lower cost generic drugs off the market.

Many of these proposals have bipartisan support. Many more should, but we haven’t brought any of these bills up for a vote in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to take up these proposals and the drug pricing bills making their way through the House right now as we speak. Alec, Nikki, Rachel, and all of our colleagues don’t have the luxury of waiting for Congress to break through legislative gridlock until they can afford what they need to live.

Thank you, Senator Klobuchar, for drawing attention to this issue and for inviting me to join with you today.

I yield to my colleague from Virginia, Senator Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise with my colleagues to just tell stories I am hearing from Virginians. Having completed a campaign last November, I have continued to do a lot of listening and have continued to do a lot of listening since then. In your own mind, you kind of categorize the stories, and, first, above all else, are stories about healthcare. I hear stories about a lot of things, but I hear stories about healthcare, probably, as much as all other areas combined. In the area of healthcare, the issue of the price of prescription drugs is No. 1.

Hundreds of Virginians have reached out to me to let me know about the high cost of prescription drugs and how that affects not only their health but even their ability to put food on their table or a roof over their heads. Today I want to share some stories from Virginians and then talk about some comprehensive legislation and a present opportunity to bring drug prices down.

Andrew from Great Falls shared this story with me. His father was being treated for CML, which is a leukemia that is effectively curable, and he was prescribed the drug Gleevec. Now, this story goes back a little bit, and here is what Andrew said:

In the United States, Gleevec costs approximately $159 to manufacture for a year’s dose.

That is the manufactured cost.

In India, a generic version of this drug costs about $8.80 a year for the branded drug. In the United States, there is no available generic, and the brand name drug’s marketing cost is $146,000 a year. This is not a drug that consumers can simply choose to take or not take—to be blunt, they will, literally die of cancer if they don’t take it.

Now, since Andrew wrote me the letter, a generic has been approved in the United States that has provided him and other families relief, but for a long period of time, the United States for a drug that costs $159 to manufacture, and the price to patients in other countries is dramatically less. Daniel from Martinsville in Southern Virginia wrote to me about the high price of insulin, which is a common theme, I know, for all of us here with constituents.

He writes:

I paid $505.00 for 3 bottles of Humalog Insulin . . . at Walgreens. This is a three month supply. This annual cost is required by my wife in order for her to avoid death [and that is hundreds of dollars more].

Laurie from Norfolk wrote to me to share her story. Laurie has rheumatoid arthritis, and she lives on Social Security. She wrote:

The drug company wants $65,000 for the drug. With my Medicare part D, they only want $8,000—that is good, but that is over 1/3 of my annual income [as a senior on Social Security or drug]. I have applied for the drug companies patient assistance program [because] the pain is too great. I can’t use my hand without the drug. The drug companies are getting away with robbery. We need Medicare to have the authority to negotiate drug prices.

Ron from Arlington, just across the Potomac, wrote me a story. He went to renew a prescription he had been taking for more than a year.

That is an outrageous increase of 100 percent or $100 more out of my pocket for exactly the same thing [every time I buy it]. I am a retired federal employee on a limited income and I am locked into this insurance plan for the rest of the year. So I have to pay $100 more out of my pocket to obtain the exact same thing.

Every time he buys it, 100 percent increase in the price.

Marie from Virginia Beach wrote me about a drug that costs $375,000 a year. She wrote:

I can’t afford the exorbitant price.

I recognize the recovery cost of research is the main expense, since manufacturing is extremely cheap, but when the sufferers cannot afford your drug, then what have you gained?

Medicare is prohibited from negotiating the price of prescription drugs. Medicare Part D enrollers over 43 million seniors nationwide, who have incredible bargaining power if it could only be used for their benefit.

Many seniors are on fixed incomes. The average senior gets Social Security. Their median income is $23,000, so an annual drug cost is one-third to a quarter of their income. In the wealthiest nation in the world, seniors should not have to choose between paying for their medication and putting food on the table or heating their home. So many of these seniors tell me about getting medication and then thinking: If I cut the pill in half and just take half a dose, maybe I can save some money—but that then comes at an incredible reduction in the efficacy of the prescription you are taking to control your healthcare condition.

This is why I joined with Senator Klobuchar, and I appreciate her organizing this group of us on the floor today, to introduce the Empowering Medicare Seniors to Negotiate Drug Prices Act, which allows Medicare to negotiate drug prices. This is simple, basic, best business practice. Everybody will negotiate prices. Why should we bar the Medicare Part D Program that provides a prescription drug benefit to 43 million people—why should we bar them from negotiating for drug prices?

According to a recent analysis, Medicare would have saved $14.4 billion. That is billion with a ‘‘b,’’ Medicare would have saved $14.4 billion. In just 50 drugs in 2016 if the program had paid the same prices as the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is allowed to negotiate. That is a whole separate level of absurdity. Why would we, as Congress, allow the Department of Veterans Affairs, who negotiate the same drugs from the same manufacturers, to negotiate and get a volume discount but tell the Medicare Program they
can? We actually know how much money we would save because of allowing the Veterans Affairs Department to negotiate, which they should be able to, but why would we then handcuff Medicare Part D and not allow them?

If Medicare would have saved $14.4 billion just in those 50 drugs in 1 year, that is $14.4 billion that could be used for better healthcare, the deficit reduction, tax relief, Pell grants, education expenses. There is also a savings not just to Medicare but to patients that would also be in the billions.

Every corner pharmacy negotiates the price of prescription drugs. Every Walmart does. When they are buying prescription drugs to sell in their pharmacy, they negotiate based on volume. It makes no sense that the Federal Government is not allowed to do the same thing.

Another area is biologic medicines. They represent a new and very promising segment. I do want to stop here and say I am not one of these people who use a big broad brush and say pharmaceutical companies are bad. Why are we living longer? Why is the average age going up and up and up? It is going up and up and up because of better medical care, and much of what medical care and improvement is innovation in the pharmaceutical industry, so I am not on a campaign to say pharmaceutical companies are bad. They are producing lifesaving prescriptions that are giving those who need them the opportunity to prolong life. It is just that the price Americans pay for those drugs is so far out of whack with what other nations do, and one of the things that is innovative, that is great is biologic medicines.

When competing products—they are called biosimilars—attempt to enter the market, they often find it impossible to negotiate the thicket of patent laws that protect the branded product because they lack access to readily accessible information. So when bio-similar manufacturers are able to uncover the web of patents, expensive litigation too often results in patents being found to be invalid or unenforceable.

That is why I joined with Senator COLLINS from Maine on a second bill to introduce the Biologic Patent Transparency Act. Our bill promotes patent transparency by requiring manufacturers of competing products to provide and list patents covering their products with the FDA in what we call the FDA Purple Book. The legislation encourages manufacturers to apply for patents sooner, allow prospective biosimilar manufacturers to challenge weak or invalid patents earlier in the product development process to eliminate waste, and the legislation will help us bring needed biosimilar treatments to patients faster and ultimately help lower drug prices.

Finally, a word about insulin. Over 30 million people—that is like the combined population of about 19 or 20 States—live with diabetes in the United States, and insulin is a critical and life-sustaining daily treatment for 7½ million of those people. Yet, between 2012 and 2016, spending on insulin nearly doubled, even while there was little change in the actual use of insulin. So what happened?

The price hikes we have experienced have caused Virginians who need these drugs, whose stories I have indicated, to endure severe financial hardship, ration their supplies, or even skip the needed medication.

In February, I joined all my Democratic colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, our Chair, Senator Alexander, and our ranking member, Senator Murray, have indicated that we don't want to see the work on this year is a bill of single-shot strategies to reduce medical costs. It is not going to be the rewrite of the healthcare system. Senator Alexander and Senator Murray were heard to describe our bill with a series of singles, that would be a very good thing. So we will work together as colleagues to come up with a series of strategies that could bring healthcare costs down, and we have an opportunity in this bill to have some of those provisions deal with provisions just like those I have described that can reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

I am proud to join my colleagues to share that I think it is probably the single-most frequent complaint I hear, and it is a complaint we can do something about.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Cramer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota, Ms. Klobuchar. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his thoughtful remarks and the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Blumenthal, as well as Senator Smith, my colleague. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

We have all cited numerous examples of people who, literally, are taking drugs that, in the case of insulin, was $27 a vial and is now $1,213 a month. That is simply outrageous. We have people who can't afford drugs that they used to just take as commonplace, and there were no changes made.

So for me, a lot of this is what happens when you have monopolies, what happens when you don't have competition. So the answer is to look at all of these strategies we could take to ensure that there is better price negotiation and more competition. One of them, as Senator Kaine mentioned, is Medicare negotiation, unleashing the power of 43 million Americans. That is a lot of people. Seniors are good at getting deals. That is 43 million people. Yet they are banned from negotiating with Medicare to get better deals for themselves. That should change.

We need less expensive drugs from other countries—safe drugs. That would certainly create more competition. We had bipartisan support for a proposal like that. Senator Grassley and I have the bill that would take one out of Canada and in the Presiding Officer's State of North Dakota we can see Canada from our porch. The point is that we see those less expensive drugs right across the border. We should be able to have that competition.

Then, look at the CREATES Act and some of the other ways of stopping pay-for-delay and stopping, as Senator Blumenthal was describing, these patent abuses to try to make sure we have more competition. There is a start to be general agreement on this issue that we have to take on these pharmaceutical prices. The time for describing the problem is still here because it seems like some of our colleagues don't want to get into it. But the time for action is certainly now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. Moran. Mr. President, this week, as we know, our Nation observes National Police Week, a time when we pay tribute to our law enforcement officers, especially those who died in the line of duty. Today I rise to honor their dedication and their significant and tremendous sacrifice.

On Monday evening, thousands of people gathered on the National Mall to pay tribute to the 371 officers who gave their lives in the line of duty. Four officers from Kansas were among those memorialized on Monday.

Last June, Wyandotte County sheriff's deputies Theresa King and Patrick Rohrer were shot and killed while preparing to transport a prisoner. Theresa King joined the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office in 2005. A working mother of three children, Theresa, or "TK," was known for coming to work every day with a smile and a willingness to help out in any way that she could. She is a founding member of the Kansas City-based Lancaster-Melton Peacekeepers Civitan Club, a group of law enforcement officers and their families dedicated to honoring slain officers.

Patrick Rohrer, a husband and father of two children, joined the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office in 2011. Patrick was known as a dedicated deputy that never lost his sense of humor and often peppered his colleagues with his favorite "Star Wars" quotes. He was also known for his competitive spirit.

Patrick had been a varsity letterman on the swim team at Shawnee Mission Kansas National Police Week.
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Northwest High School. His family’s motto became “Keep on Swimming.”
I will echo Wyandotte County’s Sheriff Don Ash’s words in memorializing the deputies: “Theresa and Patrick were heroes in every sense of the word when they lived between a cold-blooded killer and the citizens they swore an oath to protect.”

In September, Deputy Sheriff Robert Kunze of the Sedgwick County Sheriff’s Office was fatally shot during an encounter with a suspect in a stolen vehicle. He, too, was a husband and father who had served with the Sedgwick County Sheriff’s Office for 12 years and had previously served with the Shawnee County Sheriff’s Office for 6 years.

Robert Kunze’s impact on the department was made apparent when Sedgwick County’s Sheriff Jeff Easter referred to his death as the loss of a “family member.” Robert was known as an exceptional law enforcement officer and has been remembered by his colleagues as having a contagious laugh that always made others feel welcome.

This year we also memorialized Jef- ferson County undersheriff George Burnau, who died in the line of duty on April 29, 1920. His dedication set an example for generations of law enforcement officers in Kansas and around the country, those that followed him.

I would like to honor one additional law enforcement officer who is serving on my staff as a Department of Justice fellow. ATF Special Agent Matt Beccio has become an integral part of our team over the past year, giving sound advice on issues relating to Justice and a core member of my staff over the past year, giving sound advice on issues relating to Justice and a core member of my staff.

Mr. President, I rise to speak about the devastation I have seen as I toured flooded areas of Kansas, as well as parts of Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa, and the need for Congress to pass a disaster bill to provide assistance to impacted agricultural producers.

Kansas farmers and ranchers have endured several challenging years. Since 2013, net farm income has been cut in half due to low commodity prices. Kansas is known for its wheat and corn, and the Midwest has been one more setback in the long list of challenges facing our farmers and ranchers.

In the days following the worst flood- ing, I visited areas of Kansas that were completely underwater. I saw flooded fields that cannot be planted or put into use until significant time, effort, and resources are invested in restoring that land.

Continued rainfall across the State and region has threatened to cause additional flooding in addition to the floods. Kansas farmers and ranchers are invested in restoring that land.

Disaster programs such as the Emergency Conservation Program are an essential part of our agricultural economy. This legislation is needed now more than ever to provide assistance to those impacted.

The Emergency Conservation Program was authorized to help producers restore land damaged from natural disasters, including floods. Kansasans are, unfortunately, familiar with ECP as a result of assistance our State received to help rebuild fences following the devastating wildfires of 2017 and 2018. However, this program does not currently have sufficient funds to cover the cost of lost stored grain.

I asked Secretary Perdue about the ECP budget shortfall at a recent Ag Appropriations Subcommittee hearing, and as expected, he gave his full endorsement and support for Congress to provide funds for ECP in this disaster bill. Fortunately, the Secretary’s position is that funds must be provided to ECP and other disaster programs to help producers restore damaged land and remove flood debris. Congress must also provide assistance to producers who lost stored grain due to flooding.

Oftentimes, the farmer’s income or revenue is not money in the bank but instead grain stored in a bin waiting to...
be sold. With market uncertainty due to trade disputes, farmers have more grain in storage than usual, waiting for prices to increase. When that grain is wiped out by floods, it is similar to the family's savings account being drained of its value.

Currently, disaster programs are not equipped to help these producers who lost a year’s worth of work and income when their stored grain was damaged or destroyed. Congress has the opportunity in the disaster bill to give USDA the authority to cover these costs to help ensure the safety of the stored grain and to help these producers get back on their feet.

While faced with these great challenges, farmers and ranchers continue to provide the food, fuel, and fiber to our Nation and the world. Agriculture is one of the most demanding ways of life. It is full of uncertainty, but it is also a very noble calling.

It is imperative that Congress pass a disaster bill to help producers who lost goods and other disasters and to make certain farmers and ranchers across the Nation know that we appreciate what they do to provide for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that Senator PORTMAN and I be recognized for up to 25 minutes.

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

RETIREMENT SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly, I am going to be joined by Senator PORTMAN. The two of us have been working for well over a decade on retirement savings issues. When both of us were Members of the House of Representatives, we worked on pension legislation together. It was unusual at that time to have a Democrat and a Republican working together.

There was a great deal of discussion about tax reform at that time, and it seemed like neither the Democratic nor Republican leadership was interested in dealing with retirement savings at that point. Yet Congressman Portman and I joined forces, recognizing the need to strengthen retirement savings in this country. We authored a bill known as the Portman-Cardin bill. It was more of a process than it was a legislation. We brought all stakeholders together, and we sat around, listened to each other, and came to a consensus bill that was enacted into law and made permanent. It provides greater portability among the different pension plans in this country, recognizing that employees were shifting jobs, and therefore it was necessary for them to be able to protect their retirement savings.

We looked at increasing the amount of money that individuals could put away for retirement. One of the provisions provided for catchup for people over 50 years of age because we recognized that people—particularly women—who entered the workforce at a later time didn’t have as many years to put money away for retirement savings.

We simplified the retirement plans so that small companies could establish a pension plan and have safe harbor, so it was not too complicated to set up pension plans.

We established a saver’s credit. We did that because we recognized that the Tax Code itself wasn’t necessarily a great enough incentive for young and lower wage workers interested in participating in a retirement plan. We found that if an employer put money on the table, most employees would opt to join that pension plan. Witness the Thrift Savings we have here as Federal employees.

We recognized that a lot of the smaller companies didn’t offer those types of plans. So we developed the saver’s credit, which allowed lower wage workers to be able to get government help with saving money away for their retirement.

Quite frankly, the law that was passed back then did dramatically help the number of people who participated in retirement savings. We also included an automatic enrollment provision, and that also helped dramatically increase the number of people participating in retirement savings.

I give that as background because Senator PORTMAN and I have joined up again in the Senate in an effort to build on the success we had over a decade ago.

We had a hearing this past week, and in that hearing, we brought up the fact that several provisions that Senator PORTMAN and I had been working on are included in the recent legislation, which is legislation that had passed the House of Representatives and passed the Senate Finance Committee in the last Congress and the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee have filed in this Congress. That includes many important provisions to improve retirement savings.

We hope that bill will be considered on the floor very shortly. We want to get that done. Yet we recognize that we need to go further than that. For that reason, Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced the Retirement Security and Savings Act this year, and it includes many important provisions. It deals with the fact that we have yet to fully accomplish what we need to for retirement savings.

According to a 2019 GAO estimate, 48 percent of those who are near retirement age—those over 55 years of age—have no retirement nest egg, and 29 percent have no savings or pensions. Since the great recession, personal savings rates in this country have been flat.

Access to employer-sponsored plans and participation are still at way too low of a rate. For private sector workers, 68 percent have access to plans, but barely over 50 percent actually participate in plans. For part-time workers, the numbers are much lower—only 39 percent have an opportunity and only 22 percent actually participate in plans. For small businesses, only about 50 percent provide retirement access to their employees, and 34 percent participate. In the lowest quintile—those at the lowest income—25 percent have access to retirement savings through their employment; yet only half that number actually participate.

The urgency of this is really underscored by the fact that we have now heard a landscape that has mostly defined-benefit plans where the employer had a plan for you, that employer took the risks, and you had a guaranteed benefit when you retired—you didn’t have to think about how much money you put away because your company was protecting you on retirement with a defined benefit. We have gone from a defined-benefit world to a defined-contribution world.

I am going to yield at this point to Senator PORTMAN for his longstanding commitment to dealing with this national need. America’s economy is strong, but it is not strong on personal savings and retirement savings, and we need to do better. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator PORTMAN in regard to these issues.

Mr. PORTMAN. Thanks to my colleague from Maryland for yielding to me. It is great to be back on the floor with him talking about retirement savings.

Back in 1996 and again in 2001 and 2006, we passed legislation while we were in the House of Representatives together to encourage people to save more for their retirement by providing tax incentives, such as the Cardin bill. As an example, the amount you could put aside in a 401(k) or an IRA and catchup contributions and simplifying the rules for small businesses, and we made some progress.

Those legislative initiatives resulted in about a doubling of 401(k) assets and about a tripling of IRA assets but still way too little in savings. Senator CARDIN talked a little about that. Our national savings rate is a problem. Our personal savings rate is a problem. Our economy would be stronger if we had more savings.

The real problem is that people just aren’t saving enough for their retirement. Social Security is an absolutely essential safety net. Everybody wants to be sure it will be there into the future. But it is tough to live on your Social Security benefit alone. People need that private retirement savings.

We want to encourage people to save more for their own retirement. What is more important than peace of mind in retirement, knowing that you have the ability to take care of your needs—maybe long-term care needs, maybe...
First, it allows those who saved too little to set aside more for their retirement.

For seniors—people who are over 60 years old—we have a special catchup contribution. If you are over 60 years old, you have the opportunity to put more aside in your retirement plan. That is important. Contribution limits go from $6,000 to $10,000 for workers over age 60 with a 401(k).

Senator Cardin talked a little about this, but among these baby boomers, based on a 2019 GAO report this year, nearly half—48 percent of all retirees over the age of 55 have no retirement nest egg saved. Some may have a public pension, for instance, but still, when you add that in, 30 percent have neither private retirement savings nor any kind of pension benefits that they are going to get in the future. You have a lot of people out there with nothing. This will help with regard to those kinds of challenges.

We also say that with regard to this first issue, it is not just being able to make a catchup contribution, but we tell employers: If you set up a plan that allows you to match 6 percent of the retirement plan, we will give you a break from some of the onerous retirement rules in a safe harbor.

That will encourage more of those employers to do that. That provides a little bit of incentive for those employers who offer these safe harbor plans. So it gives more generous benefits to employees. We think that is appropriate to help save for retirement. It also helps employers who are struggling to save for retirement and pay off student loan debt, people who are saying: I would love to save for retirement, but how can I do that when I have this student loan debt to pay off?

In Ohio, by the way, the average debt for someone coming out of a college or university is $27,000. A lot of people don’t have enough disposable income to say: I am going to save for retirement and pay off college debt.

What we do here is we say that employers will now be able to make a matching contribution to the employee’s retirement account in the amount of his or her student loan payment. So employers can do this. It is a good way to help people pay off their debt, to help the individual pay off their debt. The employer putting a match in for the same amount is also a good way to attract employees. If you are a business owner out there, you will like this because it will give you an advantage in the marketplace by saying: Hey, come work for me. We will help you on your student debt.

The second issue we talked about today is with regard to small businesses. This is important because we know that this is where most people work, who don’t have access to retirement plans. They work for smaller businesses. Bigger businesses tend to offer retirement plans, very generous ones. The smaller businesses tend not to.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey that Senator Cardin talked about earlier shows that 68 percent of private sector workers have access to employer-sponsored plans to help the individual pay off their debt. That is only 49 percent for small businesses. So, if you work for a small business, it is less than half. By the way, it is only 39 percent if you are a part-time worker, which we also address.

This bill takes a number of important steps to help small businesses offer 401(k)s and other retirement plans for the workers. It increases the current law tax credit that is already out there, but it improves it and increases it from $500 to as much as $5,000 for small businesses that are starting new retirement plans. It simplifies top-heavy rules for small business plans to reduce the cost of enrolling new employees. It also establishes a new 3-year, $500-per-year tax credit for small businesses that auto-enroll all of the participants in the plans at least once every 3 years. This is one of the issues out there. If you don’t do auto enrollment—in other words, opt in—and you opt out, you are not going to get the participation. The participation.

By the way, this is legislation that Senator Cardin and I promoted back in the 2006 legislation that said to employers: Hey, you can do an auto enrollment. The participation then went from 20 percent to about 55 percent because there was auto enrollment. It is good for younger people. If you are just told ‘Hey, unless you do something, you are going to automatically be enrolled in this 401(k),’ that really encourages them to get into retirement savings.

All of that is to help these small businesses, and we think it is going to make a big difference.

Third, one of the big problems we face is that plan participation rates for low-income workers are well below what they are for others. So this bill expands access to retirement savings plans for hard-working, lower income Americans. The way we do that—and Senator Cardin is the expert on this—is to ensure that those people who are of low income have the ability to get into retirement plans with matches. That will incentivize them to get in. Only 22 percent of low-income workers participate in retirement plans today. And the people that are people who need savings the most.

The bill expands what is called the saver’s credit. It expands the income thresholds to give more Americans access to increased credit amounts. It increases the government match for low-income savers with a saver’s credit. By the way, the saver’s credit goes directly into the retirement accounts. I think it is important because you don’t want this money wasted, and you don’t want it used for other purposes—so we had to put in a provision that what we want the money to do is to go into retirement accounts. This goes right into retirement account.

We mentioned that only 39 percent have plans but, again, that only 22
percent participate. So this is important.

It also expands the eligibility of 401(k)s to include part-time workers. This is very important to the AARP and others out there who are looking at the numbers and say: Oh my gosh. There are only 22 percent who participate. That is it. So we have to do more there. It allows part-time workers who complete between 500 and 1,000 hours of service for 2 consecutive years to be able to join in with a 401(k).

These provisions are all designed to help particularly low-income Americans start to build nest eggs for retirement. A significant challenge we face—again, as I said earlier—is this lack of lifetime savings. Our bill provides more certainty and flexibility during Americans’ retirement years.

Last year, a study by Northwestern Mutual found that 66 percent of Americans believe they will outlive their retirement savings. So two-thirds of Americans are saying: I am going to live 20 years past my retirement savings. By the way, they are probably right. People are living longer and healthier lives and are running out of their retirement savings. It is a major concern.

We have a number of initiatives to try to provide more certainty and flexibility to seniors in their retirement years. Specifically, the bill increases the age for the required minimum distribution from 70½ years to 72. So that is now, to 72 and to 75. So it takes it up to 75 years old. Why is that important? For those of you who are not in retirement, you may not know there is a rule that says you have to start taking your money out of retirement at 70½. Now, if you are like my father, who was working full time at 70½, it was a head scratcher. Why should I take my money out of my 401(k) when I am still working? I ran into a guy like that last week. He said the same thing—that this makes no sense.

What we have said is, OK, we are going to kick it up to 75 years old but that if you have less than $100,000 in your retirement account, you will not be subject to the minimum required distribution rules at all. This is a great relief to a lot of seniors who are trying to save that money for retirement and don’t want to pull it out because, although they may work until 75, they still know they are going to have another, maybe, 20 years to live, and they want to be sure they have that retirement savings in there.

I am really excited about all of these provisions.

I am hearing a lot about this last one. Here is Tom Kermode, from Geauga County, OH, who wrote: Relief from required minimum distributions would be very helpful in that it affords me and other senior taxpayers the freedom to save to help fund my retirement years. Why should I be forced to deplete my retirement savings at age 70½ instead of remaining financially independent?

You are darned right, Tom. Thanks for your letter.

The bill also provides help in other ways. It reduces the current penalty for one’s failing to take the required distribution from 50 percent of the shortfall amount to 25 percent in most cases and to as low as 10 percent in some cases if one self-corrects the error.

Finally, in order to help those who are in retirement, the legislation encourages the use of qualifying longevity annuity contracts. What are the Treasury plans that provide annual payments to individuals who outlive their life expectancies. Basically, think of an annuity or a periodic payment. When you retire, instead of taking a lump sum, you can have a plan that provides you with an income during retirement that you can be used as a match by an employer for a savings account.

It also deals with lifetime income. How many people have we run into, as Senator PORTMAN has pointed out, who have outlived their retirements? They didn’t expect to live to be 95 and still have active lifestyles. So we significantly increase the opportunities for lifetime income options, as well as what Senator PORTMAN said in dealing with required minimum distributions.

There are a lot of other issues. I think there are 50 issues in the bill. These are a lot of important things that are important. There are issues that we want to work on, including relating to the recoupment of benefit payments.

The bottom line is that we want to improve the retirement security for Americans. As Senator PORTMAN pointed out, Social Security is very important. It is a three-legged stool. Let’s work together to increase private savings in retirement, which is exactly what this bill does.

I think we have 1 minute left, so I yield to Senator PORTMAN.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland for his partnership on this over the years. Let me just make the obvious point for those who are watching today. I am a Republican, and he is a Democrat. We are actually talking about doing legislation together. It is bipartisan. I would say, in the retirement space, we have to be ready to kick it nonpartisan because this is so important to the people we represent.

The committee also happens to be represented by a Republican and a Democrat who believe in this. Senator GRASSLEY was the chairman of the committee back in 2001 when we first passed this major legislation to increase what people could save for their retirement. He is the chairman again, and he believes in retirement security. Senator WYDEN is the ranking Democrat, the top Democrat. He also was a former Gray Panthers executive director and also has a provision in our bill that is very important, as Senator CARDIN talked about, with regard to student loan debt. So the constellation is well of properly aligned. I think the ability for us to get this done might be counter to a lot of the partisanship and the gridlock we see here in this town. This is bipartisan stuff. It always has been. We have used it at times, have done it right, and have used input from all sorts of outside stakeholders. We have the opportunity here to improve our national
savings, which everyone says is important, including the Congressional Budget Office, and to help people have peace of mind in retirement. What could be more important?

Again, I thank my colleague from Maryland for allowing me to join him on the floor to talk about the importance of this legislation. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a look at this. I hope they will sign it and be cosponsors on this legislation. Let’s get this passed. Let’s do it this year.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF KENNETH KIYUL LEE

Mr. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I arise today in opposition to the nomination of Kenneth Lee to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. Lee has been nominated to a California seat on the Ninth Circuit over the objections of Senator HARRIS and myself. Neither Senator Harris nor I returned blue slips for Mr. Lee; yet the majority moved forward with his nomination, disregarding our concerns.

In doing so, the majority is violating Senate norms and traditions by—for the first time—ignoring the lack of a blue slip from the Judiciary Committee’s ranking member. Let me restate: This has never been done before.

There was no need to proceed with Mr. Lee’s nomination over our objections.

As has been true of many of my Democratic colleagues, Senator Harris and I made it clear to the Trump administration that we were ready to work with the White House to find a consensus pick for this and two other Ninth Circuit California seats.

Sadly, our willingness to work with the administration has not been reciprocated. Once again, the majority is insisting on moving ahead with a nomination despite the strong objections of both home-State Senators.

Senator Harris and I refused to return blue slips for Mr. Lee for two key reasons.

First, Mr. Lee has a long record of controversial writings and statements on race and diversity, immigration, affirmative action, women’s rights, and other issues.

Second, Mr. Lee failed to disclose dozens of problematic writings to our in-state commissions and to the Judiciary Committee itself.

That failure raises significant doubts about Mr. Lee’s candor and judgment, and it should be concerning to all Members of this body. In fact, when another nominee for the Ninth Circuit, Ryan Bounds, also failed to turn over his writings, his nomination was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. Bounds had failed to identify Oregon’s in-state judicial screening commission at least five articles that took controversial positions on issues including campus sexual assault and diversity at institutions of higher education, whereas Mr. Lee failed to disclose either to my and Senator Harris’s screening commissions or to the Judiciary Committee itself more than 75 articles.

Importantly, several of Mr. Lee’s articles demonstrate a continuity between what he wrote and the positions he has continued to advocate well into his legal career.

For example, Mr. Lee was a vocal critic of affirmative action, writing: "Our strong position has always been that it ultimately hurts the recipients instead of helping them. . . . Black students will unfortunately be treated as inferiors because people will always assume that they were accepted solely because of their race." In a 2003 piece, written while he was a practicing attorney, Mr. Lee criticized the Supreme Court’s opinion in the Bakke case, which upheld the use of race as one of several criteria to be considered in college admissions.

Mr. Lee wrote that "[t]he Supreme Court can no longer hide behind the wishful thinking of Bakke," which he said "was based on the naive assumption that universities would consider race merely as a tie-breaker.'’

Mr. Lee has not backed away from his opposition to affirmative action and so the Congressional Black Caucus wrote a letter stating: "While many of [Mr. Lee’s] most disturbing writings have come from when he was in college and law school, there is every indication that these views were well-settled and carried through his career."

In a 2005 article, written years after he graduated from law school, Mr. Lee criticized President George W. Bush’s plan to allow undocumented immigrants to work legally within the United States.

Mr. Lee wrote: “By describing illegal immigrants as ‘hard-working men and women’ who are pursuing ‘better lives,’ [President Bush] blurs the distinction between illegals and those who came to America following the rules.”

Mr. Lee’s portrayal of undocumented immigrants is both inaccurate and troubling.

Mr. Lee has also taken extreme positions on women’s rights. He argued that feminism “is not about extending equal rights and opportunities to women . . . [but] is about adhering to a stifling orthodoxy.” He attacked feminists for “support[ing] unfettered abortion-on-demand.”

As NARAL put it in a letter submitted to the committee, Lee’s writings “suggest a disdain for women that is concerning in any context, but especially so for someone up for a lifetime seat on the federal bench.”

In conclusion, I believe Mr. Lee’s record shows that he is far outside the mainstream.

Given the positions he has taken in dozens of articles and given his failure to disclose writings to my commission and to the Judiciary Committee I cannot support Mr. Lee’s nomination to the Ninth Circuit.

I will vote against Mr. Lee and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATION SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 986 and H.R. 2157

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 986) to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect.

A bill (H.R. 2157) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. PORTMAN. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PORTMAN. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was agreed to.
The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the Record of April 30, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session.

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lee nomination?

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 110 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander  Gardner  Portman
Barrosao  Graham  Risch
Blackburn  Grassley  Roberts
Blunt  Hawley  Romney
Boozman  Hoeven  Rounds
Braun  Risch  Rubio
Burr  Inhofe  Sessions
Capito  Isakson  Scott (FL)
Casidy  Johnson  Scott (SC)
Collins  Kennedy  Shelby
Cornyn  Malinowski  Sullivan
Cotton  Lee  Sullivan
Cramer  McConnell  Thune
Craco  McSally  Tillis
Daines  Moran  Toomey
Enzi  Markowski  Wicker
Ernst  Paul  Young
Fischer  Perdue

NAYS—45

Baldwin  Hassan  Rosen
Bennet  Heinrich  Sanders
Blumenthal  Jones  Schatz
Brown  Kaine  Schumer
Cantwell  King  Shaheen
Cardin  Klobuchar  Sinema
Carper  Leahy  Smith
Casey  Manchin  Stabenow
Cochrane  Markley  Tester
Cortez Masto  Menendez  Udall
Duckworth  Merkley  Van Hollen
Durbin  Murphy  Warner
Feinstein  Murray  Warren
Gilibrand  Peters  Whitehouse
Harris  Reed  Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Booker  Cruz  Hirono

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.


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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander  Gardner  Portman
Barrosao  Graham  Risch
Blackburn  Grassley  Roberts
Blunt  Hawley  Romney
Boozman  Hoeven  Rounds
Braun  Risch  Rubio
Burr  Inhofe  Sessions
Capito  Isakson  Scott (FL)
Casidy  Johnson  Scott (SC)
Collins  Kennedy  Shelby
Cornyn  Malinowski  Sullivan
Cotton  Lee  Sullivan
Cramer  McConnell  Thune
Craco  McSally  Tillis
Daines  Moran  Toomey
Enzi  Markowski  Wicker
Ernst  Paul  Young
Fischer  Perdue

NAYS—45

Baldwin  Hassan  Rosen
Bennet  Heinrich  Sanders
Blumenthal  Jones  Schatz
Brown  Kaine  Schumer
Cantwell  King  Shaheen
Cardin  Klobuchar  Sinema
Carper  Leahy  Smith
Casey  Manchin  Stabenow
Cochrane  Markley  Tester
Cortez Masto  Menendez  Udall
Duckworth  Merkley  Van Hollen
Durbin  Murphy  Warner
Feinstein  Murray  Warren
Gilibrand  Peters  Whitehouse
Harris  Reed  Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Booker  Cruz  Hirono

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).


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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander  Brown  Coons
Baldwin  Coons  Cortez Masto
Barrasao  Cantwell  Cotton
Bennet  Capito  Cotton
Blackburn  Cardin  Cramer
Blumenthal  Cardin  Crapo
Brown  Casey  Daines
Braun  Collins  Durbin

NAYS—45

Baldwin  Blumenthal  Cantwell
Bennet  Brown  Cardin
Carper  Casey  Collins
Cortez Masto  Duckworth  Menendez
Feinstein  Gillibrand  Mendez
Feinstein  Hassan  Merkley
Harris  Heinrich  Jones
Kaine  King  Schatz
Klobuchar  Leahy  Shaheen
Leahy  Sinema  Smith
Nunes  Tester  Udall
Van Hollen  Warner  Whitehouse
Young  Rosen  Wyden
The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The 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?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—52

Burr    Hoeffen    Roberts
Burke    Hyde-Smith    Romney
Capito    Inhofe    Rounds
Collins    Isakson    Rubio
Cornyn    Johnson    Sasse
Cotchin    Kennedy    Scott (FL)
Cramer    Lansford    Scott (SC)
Crapo    Lee    Shelby
Daines    McConnell    Sullivan
Diniz    McSally    Tillis
Ernst    Moran    Thune
Fincher    Murkowski    Tills
Gardner    Paul    Toomey
Graham    Perdue    Wicker
Grassley    Porter    Young
Hawley    Risch

NAYS—44

Baldwin    Hassan    Rosen
Bennet    Heintz    Sanders
Blumenthal    Jones    Schatz
Brown    Kaine    Schumer
Cantwell    King    Shaheen
Cardin    Klobuchar    Sinema
Carder    Leahy    Smith
Casey    Manchin    Stabenow
Coons    Markley    Tester
Cortez Masto    Menendez    Udall
Duckworth    Merkley    Warner
Durbin    Murphy    Whitehouse
Feinstein    Murray    Wyden
Gillibrand    Peters    Wyden
Harris    Reed

NOT VOTING—4

Booker    Hirono
Cruz    Klobuchar
Booker    Hirono
Cruz    Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and shall 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.

GHOST ARMY CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MARKY. Mr. President, due to a regrettable clerical error, the senior Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, was not added as an original cosponsor and co-lead of S. 1421, the Ghost Army Congressional Gold Medal Act, when we introduced the bill together on May 9, 2019. I wish to clarify that Senator COLLINS is in fact the lead cosponsor of this important legislation and has been an indispensable partner in this endeavor. I thank her for her leadership in ensuring that the heroic Americans of the 234 Headquarters Special Troops and the 313rd Signal Service Company are appropriately honored for their service as a “Ghost Army” during World War II with a Congressional Gold Medal.

54TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the 54th anniversary of Head Start and the 25th birthday of Early Head Start.

Head Start and Early Head Start provide essential early childhood education services to almost 6,000 low-income children and families in Connecticut. In addition, across the 38 Connecticut centers, over 7,000 children have been able to access healthcare services, 2,000 families have gotten help through crisis intervention programs, and over 800 parents advanced their own education. For these families and
thousands of others across the country. Head Start is a lifeline for struggling families and a stepping stone out of poverty.

Fifty-four years since its founding, the work of Head Start and Early Head Start remains paramount. Children in poverty are more than twice as likely to suffer traumatic childhood experiences such as abuse, neglect, homelessness, and parental substance abuse. Exposure to these kinds of trauma results in greater likelihood of chronic disease, mental illness, and substance use disorders, as well as decreased likelihood of high school graduation and increased likelihood of involvement with the juvenile justice system. We know that children having access to safe and stable environments mitigates these effects and that Head Start is on the forefront of providing children with nurturing relationships.

This Saturday, not only do we celebrate the Head Start program reaching another milestone, but we celebrate the Head Start program reaching another milestone, but we celebrate the Head Start program reaching another milestone.
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to the Senate the following message
the United States and its people. Although maintaining an open investment climate in information and communications technology, and in the United States economy more generally, is important for the overall growth and prosperity of the United States, our openness must be balanced by the need to protect our country against critical national security threats. To deal with this threat, additional steps are required to protect the security, integrity, availability, confidentiality, and resilience of United States critical information and communications technology and services provided and used in the United States.

The Executive Order prohibits certain transactions involving information and communications technology or services where the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the United States Trade Representative, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator of General Services, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and, as appropriate, the heads of other executive departments and agencies (agencies), has determined that:

(i) the transaction involves information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied, by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary; and
(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage to or subversion of the design, integrity, manufacturing, production, distribution, installation, operation, or maintenance of information and communications technology or services in the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of catastrophic effects on the security or resiliency of United States critical infrastructure or the digital economy of the United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or the security and safety of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the authority to, in consultation with, or upon referral of a particular transaction from, the heads of other agencies as appropriate, take such actions, including directing the timing and manner of transactions prohibited pursuant to the Executive Order, adopting appropriate rules and regulations, and employing all other powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to implement the Executive Order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP
transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President’s budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services, Lieutenant General.

EC-1286. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to request relative to vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Nuclear, Chemical & Biological Defense Program), Department of Defense, received by the President of the Senate on May 14, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1287. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Expatriate Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the ongoing bilateral security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services; and Appropriations.

EC-1288. A communication from the Chairman of the Joint Select Committee on Killed in Action and Prisoner of War Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Committee’s fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities report of the Department of Defense to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment.

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 347. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Franklin Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”.

H.R. 540. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office Building”.

H.R. 829. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”.

The following executive reports of the Committees of the Whole and the Senate appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019:

EC–1289. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense (Nuclear, Chemical & Biological Defense Program), Department of Defense, pursuant to law, a report relative to a variance in the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Tammie A. Canada and ending with Douglas N. Schneeckloth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Leo B. Bajak and ending with Hakim M. Saah, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Douglas P. Wickert, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard T. Cooney, Jr., to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Robert W. Hughes, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph D. Kiley, Jr., to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Marcus L. Jordan, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Robert M. Hudson and ending with James D. Sizemore, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with John E. Callihan II and ending with Christopher R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Michael B. Cabral and ending with Ray A. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

The following reports of committees were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019:

Army nominations beginning with Col. Michael K. Pyle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Bradley J. Cox and ending with Col. Adam C. Volant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Andrew C. Diefenthaler and ending with Col. James M. Jones, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Andrew S. Buck, to be Vice Admiral.


Marine Corps nominations of Lt. Gen. George W. Smith, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations beginning with Col. Wanda N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Maj. General David S. Nahom, to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations beginning with Col. Jack M. Davis and ending with Col. Mark W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 2, 2019.


Mr. TILLIS for Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDs on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, that same be dispensed with.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Daniel Q. Greenwood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. William J. Duane A. Gambles, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Maj. General Marc H. Sasseville, to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations of Lt. Gen. Laura J. Richardson, to be Lieutenant General.


Navy nominations of Vice Adm. William R. Merz, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. Ross A. Myers, to be Vice Admiral.


Air Force nominations of Lt. Gen. Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., to be General.

Air Force nominations of Col. David A. Harris, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Navy nominations of Adm. William F. Moran, to be Admiral.

Navy nominations of Vice Adm. Robert P. Burke, to be Admiral.

Air Force nominations of Col. Frank W. Roy, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations of Maj. Gen. Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michale H. Frith, to be Brigade General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Bradley J. Cox and ending with Col. Adam C. Volant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Andrew S. Buck, to be Vice Admiral.


Marine Corps nominations of Lt. Gen. George W. Smith, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations beginning with Col. Wanda N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Maj. General David S. Nahom, to be Lieutenant General.


Army nominations beginning with Col. Jack M. Davis and ending with Col. Mark W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 2, 2019.


Mr. TILLIS for Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDs on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, that same be dispensed with.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Daniel Q. Greenwood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2019.
Army nomination of Boguslaw A. Augustyn, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with James R. Achenbach and ending with Keith B. Weber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Keith A. Anderson and ending with Frank L. Witsberger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy B. Alexander and ending with Wing Y. Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nomination of Christopher L. Metzger, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jonathan W. Anderson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brian J. Reed, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas J. Wargo, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David M. Rozelle, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tony L. Dedmond, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Ray G. McCulloch II, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Cory J. Cousins, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Damon L. Augustine, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Paul J. Stambaugh, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Brenton D. Griffith, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Andrew E. Radbill, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Richard Elias and ending with William A. Watts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Marlon G. Burns and ending with Michael F. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Paul R. Barbosa and ending with Michael N. Warks, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Frederick W. Allf III and ending with Michael D. Lewis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy S. Adams and ending with Dennis R. Turner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Carol A. Anderson and ending with Abdul R. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Thomas A. Bryant and ending with Arthur F. Yeager, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy J. Bearsar and ending with Michelle Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nomination of Rebecca A. Brawner, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Leslie S. Albers and ending with Sean E. Zukowsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Navy nomination of Steven J. Debich, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Neil Partain, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Robert G. Graham, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Laura C. Gilstrap, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael K. Wagner, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jason T. Stepp, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Stephen C. Plew, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael D. Kirsman, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Cirivello, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Zachary J. Conley, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Brentone E. Helbig, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Patrick H. O’Mahoney, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Guy W. Jensen and ending with Venita M. Simpson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Navy nomination of Marissa A. Mayor, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Adam C. Hancock, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John J. Eastman, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Terence B. McAdoo, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Donald A. Sinitiere, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert H. Battle and ending with Keith E. Wilber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Navy nomination of Riley A. Walls, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Benjamin D. Adams, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jessica M. Miller, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Frank R. Bittner, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of David M. Groves, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:


*Ronald L. Martin IV, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2024.

*James A. Crowell IV, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Jason Park, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

*Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)
By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. Tester, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CORTEZ-MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JACOBSEN) (for himself, Ms. SMITH): S. 1481. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWNFACOM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN): S. 1482. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KAINES (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO): S. 1483. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate, equal to the Title IX coordinator, to consider a qualified training program of an offeror as part of the past performance rating of such offeror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER): S. 1484. A bill to provide disaster relief assistance to individuals for the purpose of clearing fallen debris, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER): S. 1485. A bill to improve the collection and aggregation of fixed and mobile broadband Internet access coverage data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN: S. 1486. A bill to amend title II, United States Merchant Marine; to provide certain pension, administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHATZ): S. 1487. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN): S. 1488. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CASEY): S. 1489. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO): S. 1490. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of education records to facilitate the award of a recognition postsecondary credential by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ-MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAYS, and Ms. WARREN): S. 1491. A bill to improve arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKET, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SHAYES, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN): S. 1492. A bill to empower the grant at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: S. 1493. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a workforce development initiative to consider a qualified training program of an offeror as part of the past performance rating of such offeror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAHAM: S. 1494. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Re-authorization Act of 2008 to protect alien minor victims and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end abuse of the asylum system by alien traffickers and to establish a victim identification and processing centers outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCALPSE (for herself, Mr. TULLIS, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. ROUNDS): S. 1495. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance the prevention of sexual assault and related offenses in the Armed Forces, to enhance protections of victims of such offenses, to improve the inves- tigation and prosecution of such offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KAINES, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina): S. 1496. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN: S. 1497. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve cost and quality transparency under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE): S. 1498. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department of Defense to challenges relating to climate change and to improve the energy and resource efficiency of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON): S. Res. 211. A resolution recognizing the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as “America’s National Aviation Cadet Museum”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. VAN HOLLN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN): S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to make an invaluable contribution to United States and international security, and commending Richard G. Lugar’s indispensable contributions to international security and reducing nuclear weapons-related risks; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 136
At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to address maternal mortality and morbidity.

S. 139
At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 151
At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 271(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 178
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 286
At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 362
At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.
At the request of Mrs. Fischer, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis) was added as a cosponsor of S. 371, a bill to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

At the request of Mr. Barrasso, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to authorize a special resource study on the spread vectors of chronic wasting disease in Cervidae, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Scott) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to require that all coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

At the request of Mr. Warner, the names of the Senators from Delaware (Ms. Klobuchar) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

At the request of Mr. Warner, the names of the Senators from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow), the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) and the Senators from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. Gillibrand) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Sinema, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) 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.

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

At the request of Mr. Young, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Paul) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Lankford, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and establish procedures and consequences in the event of a failure to complete regular appropriations.

At the request of Mr. Jones, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans’ dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) were added as cosponsors of S. 636, a bill to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section.

At the request of Mr. Casey, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) were added as cosponsors of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) was added 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 Mr. Crapo, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested parties to promote fish conservation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Burr) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Daines, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) 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.

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Thune) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Stabenow, the names of the Senators from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. Sinema) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer’s disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to amend the
Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer’s disease.

At the request of Mr. Schatz, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 998

At the request of Mr. Hawley, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. Manchin, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. Udall, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) were added as cosponsors of S. 1039, a bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. Hoeven, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Ms. Capito) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans who hiring air traffic control specialists.

S. 1162

At the request of Mr. Cruz, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhofe) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax provisions of the tax reform law, and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. Blunt, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Hyde-Smith), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhofe) were added as cosponsors of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1196

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Young), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo) and the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) were added as cosponsors of S. 1195, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumption relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1212

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1321

At the request of Mr. Van Hollen, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Lankford) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) were added as cosponsors of S. 1218, a bill to require the review of the service of certain members of the Armed Forces during World War II to determine if such members should be awarded the Medal of Honor, to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor based on the results of the review, and for other purposes.

S. 1325

At the request of Mrs. Blackburn, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Jones), the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women in the United States the right to vote.

S. 1383

At the request of Ms. Cortez Masto, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Ms. Capito) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation.

S. 1379

At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Gardner), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Kennedy) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. Fischer) were added as cosponsors of S. 1370, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain military survivor benefits and earned income for purposes of the kidde tax.

S. 1380

At the request of Ms. McSally, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) were added as cosponsors of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1388

At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1388, a bill to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. Baldwin, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to amend the Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service.
as a “Ghost Army” that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1422
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1422, a bill to transfer revenues from the net investment income tax fund to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

S. 1438
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 1448
At the request of Mr. MARKY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education.

S. 1459
At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUDDO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to control the export to the People’s Republic of China of certain technologies important to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1462
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime, or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in the commission, from obtaining a firearm.

S. J. Res. 11
At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 11, a joint resolution to prohibit the unauthorized use of United States Armed Forces in hostilities with respect to Venezuela.

S. CON. Res. 10
At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUDDO) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. Res. 188
At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 188, a resolution encouraging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):
S. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain changes in tax provisions; to the Committee on Finance.
Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.
There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1475
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Charities Helping Americans Regularly Throughout the Year Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.
(a) DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.—Subsection (i) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(i) STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR USE OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE.—For purposes of computing the deduction under this section for use of a passenger automobile, the standard mileage rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary, which rate shall not be lower than the standard mileage rate used for purposes of section 213.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to miles traveled after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY E-FILING BY EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o)

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (7) of section 327(a) of such Code is amended by striking “if the Secretary determines that such returns are adequate” and all that follows through “such calendar year”.

(c) INSPECTION OF ELECTRONICALLY FILED ANNUAL RETURNS.—Subsection (b) of section 6204 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) set forth—

“(A) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING.—Any organization required to file a return under this section shall include information under section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is subject to the tax imposed by section 511(a)(1) of such Code on unrelated business taxable income, or any organization required to file a return under section 6033 of such Code and include information under subsection (e) thereof, the Secretary may delay the application of the amendments made by this section, but such delay shall not apply to any taxable year beginning on or after the date 2 years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO DONOR ADVISED FUNDS.
(a) ALLOWANCE OF TAX-FREE CHARITABLE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.—

(b) DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.—

(c) MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO DONOR ADVISED FUNDS.

(d) E-FILING OF EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

(e) MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO DONOR ADVISED FUNDS.
By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WARD, Mrs. CAPTAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1480. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about Police Week and some legislation we have introduced to honor and support our men and women in blue called, not surprisingly, the Back the Blue Act. With regard to the comments of my friend from Illinois, who was bemoaning the fact that there didn't seem to be bipartisan legislation that could come to the floor of the Senate, be debated, voted on, and passed with concurrence of the House of Representatives and the President's signature, I note that, actually, there is a lot we could be doing together.

I have been on the floor a number of times describing the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border. That is something we could work together on. I have introduced bi-partisan and bicameral legislation with my friend and colleague, Henry Cuellar, at the House of Representatives that would address that humanitarian crisis and, I believe, take big steps toward stopping it. That is something we could do together.

I know the Democratic whip from Illinois doesn't particularly like the idea that President Trump is nominating highly qualified people for the judiciary and for executive branch nominations—the types of people we are voting on today and will vote on tomorrow. Obviously, that is not high on his agenda, but I submit that there are a lot of other things we could do besides fixing this humanitarian crisis.

We could work on roads and bridges together. I know that Chairman BARRASSO of the Environment and Public Works Committee is soliciting the views of a number of Senators and is going to come to the floor, hopefully, in the next couple of months with some ideas on what that infrastructure package should look like. I actually think that is the best way to handle that.

Again, these are nonpartisan issues. Infrastructure is not a partisan issue, but figuring out how to pay for it is the biggest challenge.

I note that Ms. PELOSI, Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, and the President met and talked about a $2 trillion pricetag. Well, it seems to me that is backward. We ought to be talking about what sort of plan makes sense and whether we can get the votes to build consensus on that plan rather than saying that we want to spend this much money on a plan to come.

That is why I think the committee work that is being done in the Senate, in the Environment and Public Works Committee, and, hopefully, in the House is so important. Once the Environment and Public Works Committee makes a proposal and votes that out of the committee, then, the Senate Finance Committee will be asked to come up with a way to pay for it. That is always the part that people want to talk about the least, but it is important.

It is important we not continue to spend money we don't have and increase our deficits and debt. Rather, we need to come up with a user-fee model, which is what the gas tax is designed to do, and find a way not to pay for that infrastructure and deal with the congestion and traffic by just borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, literally just increasing the money we borrow and giving that tab to our children and grandchildren to pay back. That is not a way to proceed or do it.

There are a lot of ideas out there and ones on which I think we ought to work together.

I don't share the dystopian view of the Senator from Illinois in terms of the Senate. The Senate is not broken. It is broken when we try to work together to get beyond the petty disagreements that seem to come up every day and to just do our work. Sometimes you don't necessarily appear on TV or have your name appear in the newspapers when that sort of hard work, but it is essential to get the Senate's work done and, indeed, to get the work of the American people done. Those are some things we could work on together if there is a political will to do so.

Mr. President, this week, tens of thousands of Americans will make their way to Washington for National Police Week, our annual opportunity to honor the brave men and women in blue who really solve our problems while protecting our communities.

Of course, this includes many officers from Texas. I am particularly proud of the Fort Worth Police Pipes and Drums Band and the Texas Department of Public Safety Pipes and Drums Corps that performed on the National Mall yesterday.

Law enforcement is a calling answered by a select few. These brave men and women have chosen a difficult and dangerous profession dedicated to upholding the law, defending or civil liberties, and protecting our cities and our neighborhoods. They wake up each morning and put on a uniform, never knowing what the day may hold. It requires a lot of courage and sacrifice—both from the officers and their families—and I am grateful for those who selflessly serve our communities each day.

Each year for Police Week, we honor the law enforcement community to remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice. One of the most emblematic reminders of that sacrifice is the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, which is here in Washington, DC. It is a beautiful tribute to the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who have died in the line of duty and features marble walls filled with more than 21,000 names. Each of those names represents an American sacrifice. Mr. President, today, we add the names of 13 Texans to that memorial. These officers gave their lives in service to their communities and to our country, and we thank them and their families for their sacrifices, and we remember and honor those.

Each year for Police Week, we pay tribute to those who go to work and never come home. We honor the lives of those we have lost. We share in the grief of their families, and we promise never to forget the story of heroism they left behind.

While we remember the fallen this week, I hope we will also take time to consider how we can do more to support and serve those who have taken the oath to defend the Constitution.

Throughout my career in public office, I have had the pleasure of interacting with law enforcement officials from across my State and, certainly, here at the Federal level, including our Capital Hill Police officers. I am continually impressed and inspired by their professionalism, their conviction, and their unwavering commitment to enforcing the law, and I want to ensure that they have what they need when they answer the call with confidence every morning.

Last Congress we made a lot of progress, and two bills that I introduced then are now law. The first is the Justice Served Act, which I introduced with my colleague Senator KLOUCHAN, another example of bipartisan legislation. This bill provides grants to State and local governments to prosecute cold cases by making sure the newly tested DNA evidence is used to investigate and prosecute unsolved cases.

The Justice Served Act helps to ensure that violent criminals are taken off the streets and brought to justice.

We also passed legislation I introduced with Senator PETERS from Michigan to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods program at the Department of Justice. This is a nationwide partnership among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutors who use data-driven, evidence-based, and proactive strategies to reduce violent crime. It is inspired by a successful program that was initiated at the State level in Texas, when I was attorney general, but the truth is it started in the Eastern District. I believe it was in Virginia. Of course, it was designed to focus on reducing gun crime and gun violence by targeting those who repetitively used firearms in the commission of violent crimes.

We were glad to use the examples in Virginia and in Texas to bring the model to the Nation and to promote this proactive and collaborative approach to prevent violence in our neighborhoods.
I am appreciative of the fact that our colleagues have seen fit to work together to pass both of these bills and of President Trump for signing those, but I know there is a lot more that we can and should do.

Today I am introducing another piece of legislation called the Back the Blue Act, which I am introducing along with our colleagues Senator CRUZ from Texas and Senator TILLIS from North Carolina. This legislation sends a strong message to the more than 900,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving in our country that we support them and that we will not tolerate any act of violence against them, period.

In recent years, we have seen brutal and inexcusable attacks on law enforcement officers across the United States, including one in Texas that rocked our entire State. In 2016, a man killed five police officers and injured nine others in Dallas. It was a sobering reminder of the danger that law enforcement officers face every day and a call for us to take action to do more to support them.

This bill makes clear our support for these public servants who dedicate their lives to protecting and serving us. The Back the Blue Act would add stiff mandatory penalties and make it a Federal crime to kill or attempt to kill a law enforcement officer, a Federal judge, or a federally funded public safety officer. It would also make it a Federal crime to assault a law enforcement officer.

There is zero justification for attacking a police officer—none. We need to show that we value their lives, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out these crimes against them accountable. The Back the Blue Act sends that message loud and clear.

I think it is important to point out that this legislation would also help make our communities stronger by allowing us to be used for efforts that help foster more trust between the police and the communities they protect. This bill would better serve the men and women who work tirelessly in our communities each day. There is no doubt in my mind that our Nation is better and safer because of the hard work and dedication of our law enforcement officials. Here in the Senate we should do all we can to help them do their job as effectively and as safely as possible. The Back the Blue Act would be a great start.

I hope my colleagues will consider this legislation and decide to support it and, more importantly, show our law enforcement across the country that we stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

By Mr. KAINES.

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINES. Mr. President. Sexual assault is a major issue on our Nation’s college campuses. In 2016, the Department of Justice found that one in four college women had been sexually assaulted while in school. Alarmingly, the majority of these crimes will go unreported. The consequences of these crimes are often damaging to a student’s mental, physical, and emotional well-being and to the afterward for many survivors to drop out of school.

Sexual assault survivors deserve access to a safe and supportive educational environment. I have met with students in Virginia, most recently at the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, who have expressed the need for someone on campus to turn to for unbiased advice, guidance, and support following an assault. Given the prevalence of this issue, it is clear that our schools and our federal education policy must do more to prevent sexual assaults and ensure that survivors have access to and can navigate through a plethora of resources.

This is why I am pleased to reintroduce today the Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act of 2019 or SOS Campus Act. The SOS Campus Act requires every institution of higher education that receives federal funding to designate an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response. The advocate will help students access all of the resources available to them, both on and off campus, in the wake of a sexual assault and will guide them through the process of reporting their assault if they choose to do so, acting always in the interests of the victim, not the university.

The SOS Campus Act requires that the confidential advocate is responsible for ensuring that survivors, regardless of whether they decide to report the crime, are given access to emergency and follow-up medical care, guidance on reporting assaults to law enforcement, medical forensic or evidentiary exams, crisis intervention, and information on their legal rights. The advocate will also conduct a public information campaign on campus to inform students of their services, and train other university staff to provide information to students about the advocate.

I am proud to reintroduce this legislation with Senators BALDWIN, HIRONO, and FEINSTEIN, which would ensure all college students across our country have access to a supportive advocate for sexual assault survivors. It is our responsibility as public servants to advocate relentlessly for reform to prevent sexual violence and protections for survivors. I strongly encourage my colleagues in the Senate to consider this legislation when we consider reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

By Mr. MANCHINS.

S. 1486. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MANCHINS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Prioritizing Our Workers Act, which will make changes to the current bankruptcy code, requiring companies going through bankruptcy proceedings to pay unpaid vested benefits, like workers’ pensions, before they pay out other claims against them.

I firmly believe that no one should be denied their pension because their employer goes bankrupt. Hard-working men and women across the country go to work every day for years, paying into these pension plans each paycheck with the expectation that on day they can retire and provide for their families.

Companies offering pension plans made promises to their workers and need to live up to those promises, no matter what happens to that company financially.

In West Virginia, we are far too familiar with coal and steel companies leaving their workers out to dry in this way. This is absolutely unacceptable.

That is why I am introducing this bill, and I look forward to my fellow Senators joining me to support and protect pensions across this country.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1488. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1488

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Racehorse Doping Ban Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(a) I N GENERAL.—There shall be an independent anti-doping organization for interstate horseracing.

(b) B EQUEST OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Attorney General may employ personnel of the United States Government to perform the functions of the independent anti-doping organization under this Act, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose.

(c) DUTIES.—The independent anti-doping organization shall:

(1) DESIGNATE AN INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATION FOR INTERSTATE HORSE-RACING.—The independent anti-doping organization shall:

(A) DESIGNATE AN INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATION FOR INTERSTATE HORSE-RACING.—The independent anti-doping organization shall:

(B) PERFORM SUCH FUNCTIONS AS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL MAY REQUIRE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT.—The independent anti-doping organization shall perform such functions as the Attorney General may require for the administration of the Act.

(C) FACILITATE PERIODIC PERMANENT INDEPENDENT MONITORING.—The independent anti-doping organization shall facilitate periodic permanent independent monitoring of the activities of the independent anti-doping organization for interstate horseracing as provided under subsection (a) of this section.

(D) COORDINATE WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES.—The independent anti-doping organization shall coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Attorney General for the District of Columbia on matters relating to the enforcement of the Act.


(F) COORDINATE WITH THE INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES.—The independent anti-doping organization shall coordinate with the independent anti-doping federal and state agencies on matters relating to the enforcement of the Act.

(G) PERFORM SUCH OTHER FUNCTIONS AS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL MAY REQUIRE.—The independent anti-doping organization shall perform such other functions as the Attorney General may require.

(2) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Racehorse Doping Ban Act of 2019”.

SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATION FOR INTERSTATE HORSE-RACING.

(a) I N GENERAL.—There shall be an independent anti-doping organization for interstate horse racing.
(b) Duties.—The duties of the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) with respect to horse races described in that subsection are the following:

(1) Developing, publishing, and maintaining rules with respect to—

(A) substances, methods, and treatments that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horse race;

(B) substances, methods, and treatments that may be administered to a horse participating in such a horse race in the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship; and

(C) the use of substances, methods, and treatments permitted under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1);

(2) publishing under subparagraph (B), in a policy with respect to the period before a horse race (which may not be less than 24 hours before a horse race) during which a horse may no longer receive such substances, methods, and treatments.

(2) Implementing programs relating to anti-doping education, research, testing, and adjudication to prevent any horse participating in a horse race described in subsection (a) from racing under the effect of any substance, method, or treatment that could affect the performance of the horse (other than a substance, method, or treatment described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) administered during a time period that is permitted under subparagraph (C) of that paragraph).

(3) Furosemide.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, a host racing organization or a State racing commission described in subsection (a) may—the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) any person that the independent anti-doping organization or a State racing commission determines—

(A) has violated a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horse race described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1);

(B) has violated 3 or more times a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horse race described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1); or

(C) is subject to a suspension from horse racing activities by any State racing commission.

(c) Deadlines.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall publish the rules required by subsection (b) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) Fly Exclusion Period.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may suspend a period of exclusion from participating in a horse race described in subsection (b)(3) if the person provides substantial assistance to the organization or other persons that results in the discovery of—

(A) a violation of a rule published under subsection (b) by another person; or

(B) a violation of Federal or State law by another person.

(e) Consultations.—In developing, publishing, and maintaining rules under subsection (b), the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may consult with State racing commissions, host racing associations, horsemen’s groups, and other interested persons.

(f) Transition Rule With Respect to Furosemide.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall permit the use of furosemide in a horse participating in a horse race described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the horse is 3 years old or older; and

(2) the use of furosemide is authorized by the Association of Racing Commissioners International or a State racing commission.

(g) Designation of Organization.—The independent anti-doping organization designated pursuant to section 701 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (21 U.S.C. 201) shall serve as the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a).

(h) SEC. 4. Consent Required for Acceptance of Interstate Off-Track Wagers.—

(1) In General.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, a host racing association may conduct a horse race that is the subject of an interstate off-track wager, and an interstate off-track wager may be accepted by an off-track betting system, only if consent is obtained from the independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a).

(2) Requirement for Agreement.—

(A) In General.—A host racing association shall obtain the consent required by subsection (a)(1) pursuant to an agreement entered into between the association and the independent anti-doping organization that specifies the terms and conditions relating to such consent, including—

(iii) A compliance with the rules published under section 3(a).

(B) Defrayal of Costs.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a) shall ensure that all of the costs incurred by the organization in carrying out the duties of the organization under this Act are defrayed pursuant to agreements entered into under paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION CADET MUSEUM IN EUREKA SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, AS “AMERICA’S NATIONAL AVIATION CADET MU- SEM”

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 211

WHEREAS, in 1994, former Aviation Cadet and United States Air Force First Lieutenant Errol Sevore founded the Aviation Cadet Museum;

WHEREAS, the flying cadet and succeeding aviation cadet programs served as the primary production source of nearly 500,000 United States Air Force pilots, navigators, and bombardiers from 1917 to 1961;

WHEREAS, the bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of United States aviators from across the Air Corps and Army Air Forces were critical factors in defeating the enemies of the United States during World War II and the Korean War;

WHEREAS, the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, exists to exclusively preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation cadets in the 20th century; and

WHEREAS the Aviation Cadet Museum is dedicated to celebrating the spirit of the United States and recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the individuals who trained and fought among various armed forces who mobilized and supported the national aviation effort; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate recognizes the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as “America’s National Aviation Cadet Museum”;

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (NPT) CONTINUES TO MAKE AN INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND NOTING FORMER SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR’S INDISPENSABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND REDUCING NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED RISKS

WHEREAS the Treaty of Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) opened for signature 50 years ago on July 1, 1968; WHEREAS the United States and the former Soviet Union averted a catastrophic nuclear exchange during the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to lessen the chances of nuclear war, including the NPT; WHEREAS President John F. Kennedy predicted in 1963 that as many as 25 countries would acquire nuclear weapons by 1970 absent a treaty to control nuclear weapons; WHEREAS the United States Senate provided its advice and consent to the NPT on March 13, 1969, with a vote on ratification of 83 to 15; WHEREAS the NPT has grown to include 191 States Parties, making an irreplaceable contribution to international security by preventing the spread of nuclear weapons; WHEREAS former Senator Richard G. Lugar made indispensable contributions to reducing nuclear weapon risks, most notably through his leadership in standing up the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (commonly referred to as the “Nunn-Lugar Program”), which eliminated 7,600 nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union; WHEREAS Senator Lugar successfully secured the advice and consent of the Senate to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Prague April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011 (commonly known as the “New START Treaty”); WHEREAS Article III of the NPT obligates each non-nuclear weapon state to the NPT to conclude a Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify treaty compliance, 174 of which are;
Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements crafted to detect the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to non-peaceful uses;

Whereas the 2018 Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review affirms, “The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is a cornerstone of the nuclear nonproliferation regime, which plays a positive role in building consensus for non-proliferation and enhances international efforts to impose costs on those that would pursue nuclear weapons outside the Treaty;

Whereas the success of the NPT has and will continue to depend upon the full implementation by all State Parties of the Treaty’s terms, enforcing proliferation, access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and disarmament;

Whereas, over the past half century, the United States has exhibited leadership in strengthening each of the NPT’s three pillars for the global good, including—

(1) reducing its nuclear weapons stockpile by more than 85 percent from its Cold War heights of 31,225 in parallel with equally massive reductions of the Russian Federation’s stockpile through bilateral coordination;

(2) cooperating with Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus to facilitate the surrender of nuclear weapons on their soil after the fall of the Soviet Union to each of those countries’ accession to the NPT as nonnuclear weapons states;

(3) providing voluntary contributions to the IOA to promote peaceful nuclear activities exceeding $378,000,000 since 2010, including activities that help in the treatment of cancer and other life-saving applications; and

(4) extending deterrence to United States allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Japan, and the Republic of Korea through the unmistakable demonstration of the United States commitment to collective security;

Whereas heightened geopolitical tensions in recent years have made cooperation on nonproliferation and arms control issues with the Russian Federation more challenging;

Whereas a range of actions by the Government of the Russian Federation has led to a deterioration in bilateral relations with the United States, including Russia’s brazen interference in United States elections, its violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”), signed at Washington, D.C., December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988, its use of a chemical nerve agent in an assassination attempt against Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia in the United Kingdom in March 2018, its invasion of Crimea and its invasion of Eastern Ukraine, and its destabilizing actions in Syria;

Whereas, within a difficult environment, preserving agreements that continue to contribute to United States and global security, particularly the New START Treaty, is important, and that to that end, the Department of State confirmed in February 2018 that Russia had met New START’s Central Treaty Limits and stated that “implementation of the New START Treaty enhances the safety and security of the United States”;

Whereas United States efforts to reduce dangers associated with nuclear arsenals through ambitious arms control agreements with the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China would advance United States and global security, adding to the benefits of stability and transparency provided by existing agreements.

Whereas, in a March 2018 speech, President Vladimir Putin of the Russian Federation revealed a concept of strategic nuclear weapons under development, including hypersonic nuclear weapons, nuclear-powered cruise missiles, and multi-megaton nuclear clear torpedoes shot from drone submarines that may be accountable under the New START Treaty;

Whereas the Russian Federation erroneously claimed that the United States may have not reached New START Treaty central limits by February 5, 2018, as is mandated by the Treaty;

Whereas the Bilateral Consultative Commission (BCC) is the appropriate forum for the Parties to engage constructively on any New START Treaty implementation issues that arise; and

Whereas the collapse of the INF Treaty and expiration of the New START Treaty would be a double, bilateral treaty or agreement governing United States and Russian nuclear forces, which account for 90 percent of those currently in existence globally, for the first time since 1972: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representations concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to encourage all States Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to comply fully with the Treaty;

(2) the United States should maintain support for the IAEA through its assessed and voluntary contributions and promote the universal adoption of the IAEA Additional Protocol;

(3) the United States should—

(A) consider extending the New START Treaty, within the context of wider enhancement of strategic stability between the United States and the Russian Federation and provided the Treaty continues to advance United States national security;

(B) assess whether Russia’s recently announced nuclear capabilities should be accountable under the New START Treaty, and raise the issue directly with the Russian Federation;

(4) begin negotiations with the Russian Federation on an agreement to address the massive disparity between the nonstrategic nuclear weapons stockpiles of the Russian Federation and of the United States and to secure and reduce nonstrategic nuclear weapons in both countries;

(5) consider the consequences of the New START Treaty’s expiration in 2021 in relation to the insights it provides into the location, movement, and disposition of current and future Russian strategic systems;

(6) the United States should continue to encourage opportunities for cooperation with other nuclear weapon possessing states to reduce the salience, number, and role of nuclear weapons in their national military strategies.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of financial regulators.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of financial regulators.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of financial regulators.”

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during
the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Oversight of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission.”

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, OCEANS, FISHERIES, AND WEATHER

The Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is 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 Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 6 p.m., to conduct a hearing on pending military nominations.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Christian Braunlich, an Air Force defense fellow in Senator SULLIVAN’s office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my legislative fellow, Adam Bradlow, be granted floor privileges until the end of July of 2019.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the Chair makes the following announcement: The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2019

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, May 16; 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 proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Vitter nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. If there is no business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:30 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 15, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

KENNETH KIYUL LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.
HONORING JAMES BOGART
HON. JIMMY PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019
Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. James Bogart for his decades of service to the central coast of California with the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California. Through his decades of serving agricultural producers on the Central Coast, Mr. Bogart leaves an indelible legacy in our community.

Mr. Bogart joined the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association on November 3, 1980 as a Staff Attorney. In 1998, began his leadership role by serving as President and General Counsel for what would later be renamed the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California, where he has helped lead the Association and its members on many issues in the Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Santa Clara Counties. He is the longest serving president of the Grower-Shipper Association and is a highly respected advocate for agriculture.

Mr. Bogart has been a prominent leader in agriculture and his community all of his professional life. His community activities include service on several boards of directors, including but not limited to the Community Foundation of Monterey County, Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce (Chairman of the Board), California Bar Association (Ag-business Committee), Monterey County Bar Association (Labor Committee), Ag Against Hunger (Founding Director), Monterey County Agricultural Education (Founding Director), Grower-Shipper Association Foundation (Co-Founder and Incorporator), “AgKnowledge” Executive Leadership and Education Program (Past President and Founding Director), Hartnell College Ag Steering Committee (Founder and Past Chairman), Spreckels Union School District Board of Trustees, Monterey County Legal Services (Founding Director), Community Homeless Solutions (Past Chairman and Member of the Board of Directors), and the Salinas Valley Chapter of the American Cancer Society (Past President).

Mr. Bogart takes pride in the growth of the Grower-Shipper Association in both membership and in their leadership. Through the AgKnowledge program, he has focused efforts to educating community stakeholders in the importance of the produce industry. Mr. Bogart has been tenacious in working on issues that impact the produce industry, including labor relations, water, food safety, and crop protection topics. He has led by example and worked to build relationships with individuals on all sides of an issue by emphasizing work to identify common ground. He is well known for entertaining all with his good sense of humor.

Mr. James Bogart exemplifies what it means to be a conscientious and engaged citizen of the Central Coast. In retirement, Mr. Bogart will be cheering on his beloved alma mater, the University of Southern California, and enjoying life with his wife, Janis; two stepsons, David and Aaron; and his grandchildren. Madam Speaker, the agricultural community on the Central Coast will miss Mr. Bogart, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him a long and fulfilling retirement.

HONORING DAVID BARTLETT
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize David Bartlett. David is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 605, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. David has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years David has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, David has received the Paul Bunyon Award, and is a member of the Order of the Arrow. David has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. David built a wooden dumpster enclosure at his church to aid in aesthetics and security.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending David Bartlett for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING KYLER REESE
HON. BRYAN STEIL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019
Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our hardworking D.C. office interns, Kyler Reese. Kyler was born and raised in Virginia and is working towards a concentration in Sports Management from George Mason University.

Our office was fortunate to have Kyler as part of the Gregg and Livingston Harper Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities. Kyler lit up the office with his smile and energy, and enjoyed learning from staff and helping with our mail program.

We’ll miss having Kyler in the office and wish him all the best in the future. On behalf of Wisconsin’s First Congressional District, we thank Kyler for his help.

RECOGNIZING TANJA FRANSEN OF GLASGOW
HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019
Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Tanja Fransen of Glasgow, an...
award-winning meteorologist who is recognized nationally for his innovation and leadership.

Tanja is the Meteorologist in Charge at the Glasgow Weather Forecast Office in Montana. Starting as a meteorologist in Glasgow in 2001, she has been a supervisor since 2015. In fact, Tanja is one of only 8 percent of female supervisors for the National Weather Service (NWS) field offices.

Tanja’s research benefits Montana’s ag producers. Tanja and colleague Bill Martin helped develop an innovative cold weather advisory tool that helps livestock producers take precautions during calving season, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Their work earned them the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Administrator’s Award in 2011.

In 2014, the American Meteorological Society (AMS) presented Tanja with the Kenneth C. Spengler Award for her collaborative approach to ensure weather forecasts result in timely and appropriate public responses. The NWS recognized her with the Isaac Cline Award for Outreach in 2011 and the Isaac Cline Award for Leadership in 2002.

Throughout her 25-year career, Tanja has served in many public and professional advisory positions, and she has a passion for mentoring others. She mentors junior colleagues through the AMS and the NWS. She often encourages young people to embrace STEM courses and enhance their education with communication, business, and leadership training.

Madam Speaker, for her accomplishments in the sciences, dedication to the public, and 18 years of service to Montanans, I recognize Tanja Fransen for her spirit of Montana.

PURDUE MARCHING BAND’S 100TH PERFORMANCE AT THE INDY 500

HON. JAMES R. BAIRD
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th performance of Purdue University’s “All-American” Marching Band at the Indy 500, along with Director of Bands Jay Gephart becoming the prestigious American Bandmasters Association.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the band performing popular tunes, patriotic songs, and Indy 500 ceremonial music like “God Bless America” and “Back Home Again in Indiana.” The band builds the sound, color and emotion leading to the start of the race, thrilling fans for the past century.

The All-American band has become part of the fabric of the “Greatest Spectacle in Racing.” Nearly 300 members pay their own way each year to return to the Indy 500 from around the United States to perform on the track and under the Pagoda.

They also invite high school bands from across the Midwest to participate in the Parade of Bands that has marched around the race course before race since 1922 and have appeared in every nationally televised IPL 500 Festival Parade since its debut in 1957.

Thanks to Director of Bands Jay Gephart, Purdue’s participation in one of Indiana’s most storied traditions has held strong at the “Racing Capitol of the World.” I congratulate every band member—former and current—and Director Gephart on their remarkable achievements.

HONORING BOB DINGEMAN

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rick Johnson upon his retirement as Executive Director of the Idaho Conservation League. His leadership will be greatly missed by myself and many others.

For the past three decades, Rick has been the seminal leader in Idaho protecting Idaho’s outdoors and environment. Whenever I am asked who in the conservation community to speak to in Idaho, the answer is always Rick Johnson.

When I first met Rick in the 1990s, I would describe the environmental community as having a single mission of fighting and objecting to almost anything proposed by the resource industry.

Through the years, I am pleased to say that both Rick and I have evolved and recognize that there are other ways to accomplish conservation. Rick’s willingness to recognize the needs and concerns of others and his willingness to look for options where all parties can win, have made him a leader in the nation in finding ways to reach consensus on difficult conservation issues.

Rick and I have been through many battles together. We started with a not so harmonious discussion of nuclear power at my first wild Idaho and one day we ended up in the Oval Office with the President signing the Boulder-White Clouds and Jerry Peak Wilderness bills.

You learn a lot about an individual when you work for 15 years together on a wilderness bill and go camping in the mountains you are both trying to protect.

They also learn a lot about you. Rick was able to recognize my sincerity and concern for Idaho’s special areas and more importantly convey that to others.

Rick wasn’t a partner in crime, he was a partner in conservation. We were both able to maximize “wins” for our respective sides that they could take to the bank. He conserved hundreds of thousands of acres of wilderness and I was able to create security and certainty for counties, ranchers and motorized users.

Working together we were able to find the proverbial “win-win” that everybody is looking for but always seems elusive. We found it, and Idaho is better off for it.

As future generations of Idahoans gaze over the beautiful vistas of the Cecil Andrus-White...
Clouds, the Hemingway-Boulders, the McClure-Jerry Peaks, and the Owyhees, they should be thanking Rick Johnson for his work, his effort, and most importantly his ability to compromise with others.

I will miss Rick greatly as a leader and as my partner in conservation, but I know he is not leaving us far away. I will always have my friend I can call on.

I am wishing Rick and his wonderful wife Roberta, the best of luck in their future endeavors and retirement. I thank them for all that both of them have done for Idaho.

VERTAFORE, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Vertafore, Inc., for celebrating their 50th anniversary.

For more than fifty years, Vertafore has provided software services to the insurance industry worldwide. Founded in 1969, Vertafore was previously known as AMS Holding Group, Inc. In 2017, they relocated their headquarters to Denver, Colorado where they have created hundreds of jobs in the city and partnered with the thousands of agents across the state. The mission at Vertafore is to transform the way the industry operates by putting people at the heart of insurance technology. By focusing on their customers and delivering results you can see, they offer a level of trust and security that’s at the heart of the insurance industry. It is that service and level of trust that has allowed the company to be successful for over fifty years.

To all the employees of Vertafore, congratulations on this remarkable accomplishment, and I thank them for their continued commitment to the insurance community and contribution to the state of Colorado.

HONORING THE MONCOVICH FAMILY AND THE ORIGINAL SPRING LAMB BARBECUE

HON. JIMMY PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Moncovich family for their commitment to philanthropy by empowering their community and bettering the lives of others through the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue. Mr. John Moncovich founded the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue in Watsonville, California 60 years ago, and his son, Mr. Bill Moncovich, has chaired the event since his father’s passing in 1972. Since its inception, the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue has been a celebration of family, friends, and the fight against cancer on the central coast of California.

In May of 1959, John Moncovich held the very first Original Spring Lamb Barbecue. The Original Spring Lamb Barbecue started as a simple gathering among friends to collect donations for charity. Held annually, it has evolved into a beloved community event benefitting the American Cancer Society. Volunteers from a local produce company, California Giant Berry Farms, and agriculture industry members from the Pajaro Valley commit their time and energy each year to make the event a memorable one. Live music, family friendly activities, and a horseshoe tournament make the event a lot of fun, all while benefitting families who have been affected by cancer.

The Original Spring Lamb Barbecue is the oldest consecutively held fundraiser for the American Cancer Society in the United States and has been recognized as such by the charity. Ten years ago, the organization congratulated the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue for raising over $1 million worth of cumulative proceeds. This year, the event will celebrate its diamond anniversary for 60 years of outstanding community leadership and fundraising efforts for cancer research.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the dedication and commitment to cancer prevention and community service that John and Bill Moncovich and the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue have provided to the Central Coast and the nation. We are fortunate to have such a longstanding tradition of community fundraising organized every year by the Moncovich family and California Giant Berry Farms. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Moncovich family and the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue.

U.S. TERRITORIES MID-DECADE CENSUS ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILI CI CAMACHO SABLAN
OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would require the United States Census Bureau to conduct a census every five years in the U.S. insular areas of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. This legislation is essential because the priority, availability, timeliness, and types of data collected by federal agencies in the insular areas remains deficient compared to data collection in the states. Without accurate and timely information on changes in the economy, employment, income levels, and other key indicators, insular governments are hindered in the establishment of appropriate policy. And without these data, governments and the public are less able to assess the effectiveness of policies that have been established.

Every decade, the Census Bureau conducts a census throughout the country to determine the number of people living in the country. In the insular areas, detailed demographic, housing, and socioeconomic data is also collected in the decennial census using a “long-form” questionnaire consisting of about 75 questions. The decennial census conducted in the states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico only asks 10 questions because the vital information gathered in the decennial census is now acquired annually in the American Community Survey. The American Community Survey does not include data from the insular areas. The Census Bureau has claimed that a lack of funding to collect the data and the absence of a proven methodology tested in the territories leaves the Bureau unable to include our districts and the hundreds of thousands of Americans living there. As a result, the insular areas have to wait every 10 years for critical, up-to-date information on education, income, housing, jobs, and insurance that surveys like the American Community Survey provide. This data is vital to sustain economic development and for prudent government and business decisions. The decennial census is inadequate to this need.

The allocation of federal funding for numerous programs is also largely based on the most recent census data available. With alternative, most current funding allocations to the insular areas are based on data from the previous decennial census. 2010 Census data will continue to be used for many federal program funding allocations until 2023—the earliest key 2020 Census demographic data for the insular areas will likely be available.

As an alternative to annual surveys, my bill would require the Census Bureau to conduct a mid-decade census in the insular areas. The bill starts the first mid-decade census in 2025 and in addition to the decennial census, a mid-decade census will be conducted every five years. This will provide more current data in the insular areas, similar to that provided by five-year estimates produced by the American Community Survey. Having a mid-decade census will also enable insular governments and the Census Bureau to plan and conduct data collection efforts that are often logistically challenging in these diverse, remote regions. My bill also authorizes appropriations for the mid-decade census, based on costs estimates provided by the Census Bureau to conduct the 2020 decennial census in U.S. insular areas. I ask my colleagues for their support.

RECOGNIZING COLTON SCRudder

HON. BRYAN STEIL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our hardworking D.C. office interns, Colton Scrudder. Colton is a native of Coppell, Texas and studies finance at George-town University. He has been with our office since January. Colton was a great help getting our office up and running.

From drafting letters and memos, to giving Capitol tours, Colton was always eager to assist. Colton is an intelligent, diligent young man who aspires to continue serving his community.

We’ll miss having Colton in the office and wish him all the best in the future. On behalf of Wisconsin’s First Congressional District, we thank Colton for his help.

HONORING GARRETT WINHEIM

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Garrett Winheim. Garrett is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship.
and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Garrett has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Garrett has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges but has been very active in and of the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Garrett is a member of the Order of the Arrow and has received the Boy Scout World Conservation Award. Garrett has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Garrett built mobile shelving units to be used as storage space and visual barriers at the Kansas City Pet Project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Garrett Winherr for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING A GIANT OF PUTNAM COUNTY
HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD, the following obituary for Mr. Bill O’Dell of Putnam County:

WILLIAM DOUGLAS O’DELL

William “Bill” Douglas O’Dell, 68, of Poca went to be with his Lord on Monday, May 6, 2019.

Bill was a graduate of South Charleston High School and Marshall University. He worked at Regional Family Resource Network and was the Director of Putnam Wellness Coalition. He dedicated his life to drug and alcohol prevention. He was a mentor to many. His impact on the youth and the community cannot be measured. He touched many lives at Teen Institute, a leadership program that helps young people become educated in prevention of alcohol, tobacco, drugs and other critical daily decisions.

He was a man of Christian faith, integrity, great humor, positive thinking; a role model to many, a devoted husband, father, grandfather and brother. He will be greatly missed. His family would like to thank his Church, friends, co-workers, the community, our extended family and the Putnam Wellness Coalition for their support, love and prayers.

Bill is preceded in death by his parents Dr. Richard Nolan O’Dell and Vera Waldorf O’Dell and father-in-law, Louis “Gene” Barnett. He is survived by his wife Judith O’Dell of Poca, daughter Tina (Mike) Shoemaker and his pride and joy, his grandson, Caden of Ona, WV, son Joshua (Kristina) of Charleston, brother-in-law, John (Lorine) Barnett, brother Larry (Beverly) O’Dell of Chesapeake, OH; sister Verajane (William) Fish of Savannah, GA, brother-in-law and sister-in-law Adrain and Cindy Jones of Winfield, WV; nieces Wendy (Stephen) Mann, Laura (David) Moir; nephews Keith (Jennifer) O’Dell, Joseph (Marie) Fish, David (Heather) Fish and Logan Jones.

A tribute to the life of William “Bill” O’Dell will be 2:00 PM Saturday, May 11, 2019 at Gatens-Harding chapel with Pastor Fred Elliott officiating. Burial will be at Woodburn Memory Gardens, Charleston, WV. Friends may visit at the funeral home 3 hours prior to the service 11:00 AM-2:00 PM on Saturday. In lieu of flowers, please make donations to Wilkinson United Methodist Church, PO Box 226, Crossroads, WV 25320 or donate to the Bill O’Dell Teen Institute Fund, PO Box 3041, Charleston, WV 25331.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. BILL HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes. Had I been present for roll call vote number 201, on Motion to Reconsider with Instructions of H.R. 2157, Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted “yea.” Had I been present for roll call vote number 202, on Passage of H.R. 2157, Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted “nay.”

IN HONOR OF ANDRIS "ANDY" JON SILINS OF WEST BARNSTABLE, MA
HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Andris “Andy” Jon Silins, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to working carpenters, their families and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to commend him for over fifty years of dedicated service to his community.

The son of Olga Silins and Rudolfs Silins, immigrants from Riga, Latvia, Andy was born on January 12, 1947, and immigrated with his parents and older sister to the United States and lived in Jamaica Plain. Andy attended Roxbury High School and graduated in 1965. Subsequent to his graduation, Andy enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and served his country honorably in the Vietnam War. Ultimately, Andy graduated from the University of Massachusetts, Boston.

Upon completion of his distinguished service to our country, Andy joined Carpenters Local 67 in 1968. In 1979, he was elected General Agent and Executive Secretary of the Boston District Council of Carpenters, and President in 1989. In 1995, Andy was elected to the position of General Secretary-Treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters (UBC) and served in that position until his retirement on April 1, 2019. He continues to serve the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a board member of the Massachusetts Housing Authority. He is also one of the founders of First Trade Union Savings Bank, in Boston, where he later served as Chairman of the Board.

Andy has had the good fortune to be married to his wife, Diane for 37 years. He is the proud father of his son, Jake, and the master of his beloved German Shepherd, Sam. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to thank Andris “Andy” Jon Silins for his remarkable service and dedication to the working carpenters and their families and all workers in the Commonwealth and across the United States of America.

IN HONOR OF HARLEY LIPPMAN OF NEW YORK
HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Harley Lippman, who is being recognized today as part of Jewish American Heritage Month. Harley has been a generous philanthropist and humanitarian who has been dedicated to uncovering mass graves of Jews murdered by the Nazis in Poland. His persistence and dedication have meant that the Nazis’ victims will never be forgotten.

Deeply concerned about the possibility that Jews murdered during the Holocaust would simply disappear from memory, Harley has undertaken a unique campaign to remember the Jewish community that was destroyed by the Nazis. With singular purpose and dedication, Harley has searched for unknown gravesites and has paid for the restoration of historic Jewish graveyards.

At my urging, Harley was appointed by President Bill Clinton to the Commission for the Preservation of America’s Heritage Abroad which is involved in restoring desecrated cemeteries in Eastern Europe. Created in 1993, the Commission is tasked with identifying and reporting on cemeteries, monuments, and historic buildings in Eastern and Central Europe that are associated with the heritage of U.S. citizens, particularly endangered properties. Congress recognized that, as a nation of immigrants, the United States has an interest in preserving sites related to the heritage of Americans, particularly Jewish gravesites since the Holocaust wiped out the communities that would ordinarily have cared for them. It is a credit to him, his enthusiasm and dedication, that he was reappointed by both Republican and Democratic Administrations.

Harley has been the sole funder of an effort to find mass graves in Poland—sites where Jews were slaughtered by the Nazis and then buried. So far, his team has found 52 sites. When he finds a site, he ensures that a memorial plaque is erected to honor the victims. He also arranges for a service with the Chief Rabbi of Poland, a Catholic priest and a Protestant minister and invites school children to help memorialize the dead. These ceremonies provide a meaningful opportunity to remind people of the Jews who perished, the tremendous loss in culture and humanity for Poland, the brutality of the Nazis and the success of the Jewish community that survived.

Harley has been a leader of a host of organizations from the Institute for the Study of Global Ant-Semitism and Policy, an organization founded by Eli Wiesel, which he currently serves as President, to the American-Israel Friendship League and American Jewish Congress.

With great generosity and compassion, Harley has also helped orphans in Cambodia. He is the sole funder of an orphanage, enabling children to find stability, get an education and go on to college. It truly has been life-changing for many of these kids.
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Harley Lippman created Genesis 10, a company that currently employs over 2,000 people across the country. Genesis 10 helps companies solve technology problems and find talent to address their needs. Unquestionably, Genesis 10 succeeds because it has a great leader at the helm. USA Today ranked Harley among the top 30 CEOs in America for all large companies including the Fortune 500.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Harley Lippman for his extraordinary contributions to America and the Jewish community.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUTH BROWN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ruth Brown's life and her many accomplishments. We deeply thank her for all of her support and dedication to our military.

Ruth was born in Harryhogan, VA on February 28, 1925. She married George W. Brown Jr., Former Town Sergeant and Mayor of Warsaw, VA in 1946. Ruth went on to have three children, six grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. She held her family at the center of her life.

Ruth was a charter member and secretary of the United Methodist Women and served on many committees within the Warsaw Methodist Church. She was a charter member of the Telephone Pioneers and retired from the Tidewater Telephone Company after 28 years of service. Ruth was also a charter member of the Veteran of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary Post 7167 in Warsaw, VA. Finally, Ruth's heart belonged to our veterans. She spent her time fighting for them and taking care of them. She served our nation well during her long life.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments, tenacity, and dedication of Ruth Brown. Words alone cannot express our gratitude. May God bless Ruth Brown and her family.

CONGRATULATING THE JAIL HILL INN FOR WINNING THE TRAVELERS’ CHOICE AWARDS FOR TRIPADVISOR

HON. CHERI BUSTOS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Jail Hill Inn for winning first place in the Travelers’ Choice Award for TripAdvisor in the United States and for being named second place globally for the bed-and-breakfast/inn category.

The brick building where Jail Hill Inn operates today has been around for 140 years and originally served as a jail until 1977. The Jail Hill Inn was lovingly restored and revitalized by its owner, Matthew Carroll, and has been a hotel over the past 17 years. The hotel has six luxurious rooms complete with a fireplace, wet bar, king-size bed, high-end linens and a Bluetooth-connected sound system. Those who stay in all six of the rooms are dubbed “repeat offenders” for their frequent visits to the inn. Galena’s historic Main Street and downtown area are only a short walk away and provides guests with easy access to all Galena has to offer. I commend Matthew Carroll for creating an excellent stop for visitors hoping to experience the best of our region. The beauty our region has to offer and look forward to hearing about the Jail Hill Inn’s future successes. It is because of creative entrepreneurs like Matthew Carroll that I am especially proud to serve Illinois’ 17th Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate the Jail Hill Inn for its rise to the top of TripAdvisor’s Travelers’ Choice Awards.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS HOME RULE ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Courts Home Rule Act. This bill would give the council of the District of Columbia authority over the jurisdiction and organization of the local D.C. courts. The 1973 Home Rule Act (HRA) expressly prohibits D.C. from enacting any law with respect to any provision of the D.C. Code that relates to the local D.C. courts. Congress can correct this injustice to the District’s tax paying residents by amending the HRA, even before the District becomes the 51st state.

Forty-six years after passage of the HRA, matters involving the D.C. courts almost never come to Congress, so Congress knows virtually nothing about the District’s courts—and could not care less. Notwithstanding the importance of D.C.’s courts to District residents, the D.C. Council, which is the repository of knowledge and experience for the District’s criminal and civil justice systems and the body accountable to our residents, is irresponsibly left on the sidelines while Congress remains the sole entity to correct flaws in the District's courts.

Under the HRA, the D.C. Council has no authority to “enact any act, resolution, or rule with respect to any provision of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to organization and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts).” Matters in title 11 are limited primarily to rules of criminal and civil procedure, court administration, the number of authorized judges, the branches of the courts, the rules of jury service and admission to the bar. Our bill would strike this limitation on the D.C. Council’s authority.

The District has never had authority over its local courts, even when it was responsible for paying for their operations. Under the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, the federal government assumed the costs for several state-level functions, including the courts because it alone has jurisdiction over these courts. This bill, if enacted, would not change the courts’ funding. This bill also would not affect the authority of the President to nominate, or the Senate to confirm, local D.C. judges, which has been within their purview since the creation of the modern local court system in 1970.

This bill is an important step to increase democratic self-government for the District. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE OFFICERS AT THE HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. LORI TRAHAN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise during National Law Enforcement Week 2019 to honor the valiant men and women who protect and serve the town of Haverhill, Massachusetts. The Haverhill Police Department consists of outstanding public servants who devote their lives to keeping the citizens of the city safe, while improving the lives of countless individuals.

Like most Americans each day, they get up, say goodbye to their loved ones, and head to work. But their work, and the work of police officers around the country, is like no other. From the moment they put on their uniform they have answered a call that at any moment may put their lives in harm’s way.

I thank the Haverhill Police Department for their continued and unwavering service and wish them well in their careers and future endeavors to come.

Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the Officers of the Haverhill, Massachusetts Police Department.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARRET GRAVES
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, President Trump visited our home state and I missed two important votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 203; and YEA on Roll Call No. 204.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2018 ALABAMA OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARM FAMILY

HON. MIKE ROGERS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask for the House’s attention to recognize 2018 Alabama Outstanding Young Farm Family, the Upchurch family.

The Upchurch family are multi-generation farmers and received the honor at the Alabama Farmer’s Federation’s 46th Commodity Producers Conference in Montgomery. They also placed in the Top 10 at the American Farm Bureau Federation national contest in New Orleans.

The Upchurches—Chris, Jordyn and son Charlie—owns Rockin U Farm in Clay County.
Their farm encompasses over 300 acres, 130 cows and three poultry houses. They’re hard-working, forward-thinking stewards of the land whose recent diversification allows them to produce over 3,500 bales of haylage annually. They also partner on C&J Farm, a trucking and poultry housing-out business.

Off the farm, they promote agriculture and rural living through Clay County Young Farmers, the county cattlemen’s association and Lineville Baptist Church. Chris also serves as a State Poultry Committee first vice chairman.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 2019 Outstanding Young Farm Family: Chris and Jordyn Upchurch.

HONORING JOHN P. LA RUE
HON. MICHAEL CLOUD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize John LaRue, a resident of Corpus Christi, for his commitment to his community and to the Port of Corpus Christi.

Originally from Reading, Pennsylvania, John LaRue spent the first half of his career serving the City of Philadelphia and its Port Authority. In 1994, Mr. LaRue relocated to Corpus Christi to become the Executive Director of the Port of Corpus Christi Authority. His responsibilities included organizing, planning, and administering the Port Authority’s activities.

Thanks to Mr. LaRue’s 25 years of leadership, the Port of Corpus Christi transformed from a Regional Port Authority to the “Energy Port of the Americas” and the fourth-largest port in the United States. The Port is a key contributor to America’s global energy dominance and is continuing to expand. Mr. LaRue’s widespread expertise on port policy is lauded both domestically and internationally.

In addition to providing leadership and guidance for the POCCA, Mr. LaRue also serves on multiple advisory boards and panels. He is Chairman of the State of Texas Department of Transportation Port Advisory Committee and serves as a member of the Port Industries of Corpus Christi, as well as on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Port Authorities.

On the occasion of his upcoming retirement, I would like to extend to John LaRue my thanks and appreciation for his valuable work at the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, and on the next exciting chapter of his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, regrettably, I was unable to attend the votes series for May 14, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call Vote Number 185 (Passage of H. Res. 273): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 186 (Passage of H.R. 1704, the Championing American Business Through Diplomacy Act): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 189 (Ordering the Previous Question): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 190 (Passage of H.R. Res. 357): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 191 (Passage of H.AMDT. 199 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. Anthony Brown): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 192 (Passage of H.AMDT. 203 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. George Holding): NO; Roll Call Vote Number 193 (Passage of H.AMDT. 207 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. Tom Malinowski): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 194 (Passage of H.AMDT. 208 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. Susan Wild): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 195 (Adoption of Motion to Recommit to H.R. 986): NO; Roll Call Vote Number 196 (Passage of H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Pre-existing Conditions Act): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 197 (Passage of H.AMDT. 209 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. Ed Perlmutter): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 198 (Passage of H.AMDT. 210 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 199 (Passage of H.AMDT. 214 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. Jared Huffman): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 200 (Passage of H.AMDT. 216 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. Lizzie Fletcher): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 201 (Adoption of Motion to Recommit to H.R. 2157): NO; and Roll Call Vote Number 202 (Passage of H.R. 2157, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019): YES.

COMMENDING THE ROANOKE VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM
HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend the Roanoke Valley Christian School boys basketball team, which captured the Virginia Association of Christian Athletics state title on February 23, 2019. The Eagles put on a commanding performance, handily defeating an exceptional team from Timberlake Christian School by a score of 66 to 29.

This victory carries particular meaning, as it is Roanoke Valley Christian’s first boys basketball state championship in its history. Their championship caps a 27–4 season. I applaud
IN HONOR OF ZORICA PANTIC, OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF ONE OF BOSTON’S ‘TOP UNIVERSITIES—WENTWORTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Zorica Pantic, the first woman president of Wentworth Institute of Technology in Boston and first woman engineer to lead an institution of technology in higher education in the United States.

President Pantic is leaving her position at Wentworth at the end of May, following a 14-year-tenure that can only be described as transformative and historic in scope. Dr. Pantic’s contributions to this 115-year-old institution have earned her respect far and wide. Just recently, while saluting Dr. Pantic during his keynote remarks at Wentworth’s graduation on April 28, 2019, Charlie Baker, the esteemed Governor of Massachusetts, characterized President Pantic as, “a gift to Wentworth and blessing to Massachusetts.”

Born in Serbia, Dr. Pantic first became interested in electrical engineering as a young girl, while watching her father work on repairing a radio. She went on to earn her B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Niš, Serbia, and became the founding dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Texas at San Antonio; director of the School of Engineering at San Francisco State University; a Fulbright fellow at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and an associate professor at the University of Niš.

As Wentworth’s President, she has been an important role model and tireless advocate for traditionally underrepresented students, particularly young women wishing to pursue a career in technology. As a result, Dr. Pantic has overseen the introduction of 10 new undergraduate programs (seven in engineering), a $300 million investment in state-of-the-art facilities, and a 20 percent enrollment increase on the school’s campus.

During her presidency, Wentworth has enhanced its experiential-learning educational model by implementing EPIC Learning (Externally-collaborative, Project-based, Interdisciplinary Culture for Learning), and is focusing on innovation and entrepreneurship. The Institute continues to earn annual recognition in the top national and regional college rankings.

Applauding her “energetic, entrepreneurial, and ambitious leadership style,” the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, District 1, in 2017 honored Dr. Pantic with its Chief Executive Leadership Award. That same year, Dr. Pantic was inducted into the National Academy of Construction. In January 2018, Governor Baker appointed her to serve on the Massachusetts Cybersecurity Strategy Council. And more recently, the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce honored her as one of its Pinnacle Award winners for 2019.

President Pantic has served on various boards and professional organizations, including the board of directors for the World Association for Cooperative Education, the American Association for Presidents of Independent Universities and Colleges, the New England Association for Schools and Colleges, the Massachusetts Workforce Investment Board, and the Presidents Council for the NCAA Division III.

Madam Speaker, Zorica is known for her love of students and for helping to guide and serve thousands of young women and men who have attended Wentworth since she became president in 2005. She is the proud mother of one son, Daniel Tanner, who graduated from Wentworth and is busy building his own career.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to thank Zorica Pantic for her incredible leadership over these past 14 years at one of Boston’s oldest and most venerable educational institutions, and to salute her for her many contributions to higher education in the United States.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF WORLD WAR II VETERAN RAYMOND BURRELL

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th birthday of World War II Veteran, Mr. Raymond Burrell.

In the winter of 1944–45, Raymond Burrell was a member of the famous 761st Tank Battalion, the Black Panthers. The 761st Tank Battalion was the first to consist of African-American soldiers, and was deployed to Europe as part of the 99th Infantry Battalion, the Black Panthers. The 761st Tank Battalion was the first to consist of African-American soldiers, and was deployed to Europe as part of the 99th Infantry Battalion, the Black Panthers. The battle of the Bulge. Raymond Burrell demonstrated bravery and a cunning military mind on multiple occasions. Despite experiencing seemingly hopeless situations, Raymond persevered along with the other members of the 761st Tank Battalion and held their vital positions on the battlefield. Our nation is lucky to have had someone like him risk his life to protect us all.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments, bravery, and dedication of Raymond Burrell. Words alone cannot express our gratitude. May God bless Raymond Burrell, and I look forward to seeing his excellence in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE SERGIO AMARAL, AMBASSADOR OF BRAZIL TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Sergio Silva do Amaral, whose invaluable commitment to the bonds of friendship between Brazil and the American people has left an indelible mark on our bilateral and hemispheric relations. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Brazil, I have worked on numerous occasions with Ambassador Amaral to deepen our bilateral relations, and build upon the great history of partnership between Brazil and America.

In September 2016, Sergio Amaral was appointed Ambassador of Brazil to the United States in Washington, D.C. Since then, Ambassador Amaral has worked tirelessly to promote a closer U.S.-Brazilian friendship, as well as to promote the expansion of our economic, political, defense, and cultural relations, bringing a message of friendship and cooperation directly to the American public. In furtherance of his mission to spread Brazil’s message of peace and prosperity for all people. On June 1, when he retires from his Ambassadorial role in the U.S., he will conclude nearly 45 years of service to Brazil. His time as Brazil’s Ambassador is thus an appropriate capstone to his long and distinguished career.

Born in São Paulo, Brazil, and as a graduate of the University of São Paulo and the University of Paris, France, Ambassador Amaral has served in a number of senior official posts in the Brazilian public service over five decades. Prior to his appointment as Ambassador of Brazil to the United States in Washington, D.C., he served as Ambassador to the U.S., as well as Minister of Development, Trade and Industry, and Chief-Minister for Social Communication of Brazil’s Presidency. His other notable positions include Vice Minister of Environment and the Amazon, Secretary for Inter-American Affairs of the Ministry of Economy, and Chief-Minister for Social Communication of Brazil’s Presidency. His other notable positions include Vice Minister of Environment and the Amazon, Secretary for Inter-American Affairs of the Ministry of Economy, and Chief-Minister for Social Communication of Brazil’s Presidency.

Ambassador Amaral has continuously reminded us of the great potential that lies ahead of Brazil and the United States as two of the largest democracies and economies in the Western Hemisphere. We must build upon the common beliefs that have historically connected the peoples of Brazil and America: our commitment to democracy, our commitment to the rule of law, and our commitment to the dignity of all people in our own countries and around the world. Today, I thank Ambassador Sergio Amaral for his service to these ideals, and wish him a long and happy retirement.
RECOGNITION OF SHEIDA SAHANDY
HON. DENNY HECK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, today I recognize Sheida Sahandy for her extraordinary and unwavering dedication to the people of Washington state and efforts to restore Puget Sound. For over five years, Sheida served as the Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership, the state agency leading the coordination of Puget Sound recovery.

Sheida received her bachelor’s degree from the University of California, Berkeley, and then went on to study law at Columbia University. After working as an attorney for several years, Sheida returned to the classroom and earned her master’s degree in Climate, Energy, and Environmental Policy from Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government. Back in Washington state, Sheida used her notable background and legal expertise to spearhead programs and initiatives as Assistant to the City Manager for the City of Bellevue, where she created the City’s first citywide environmental stewardship initiative.

In January 2014, Governor Jay Inslee appointed Sheida to serve as Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership, where for years she demonstrated her commitment to sustainability and conservancy issues in Washington state. The Puget Sound Partnership works with hundreds of partners and stakeholders to coordinate around a common goal: accelerating the collective effort to recover and sustain the Puget Sound. On federal-level issues, Sheida worked with the Congressional Puget Sound Recovery Caucus—which I co-chair along with my friend and colleague, DEREK KILMER—to convene key decision-makers here at the Capitol for the annual Puget Sound Day on the Hill. This event brings people from across the political spectrum to Washington, D.C. to advocate for increased federal attention to Puget Sound. Sheida also worked tirelessly with the Congressional Puget Sound Recovery Caucus to successfully craft and garner support for the PUGET SOS Act, which would increase federal and state coordination on recovery efforts.

Whether it’s leading efforts at the state level to revitalize the salmon and orca populations, or working with legislators in Washington, D.C. to enact critical legislation, Sheida has always been an effective leader and the driving force behind the Puget Sound Partnership’s success.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service of Sheida Sahandy, and I wish her and her family happiness as Sheida proceeds to the next chapter in her remarkable career.

COMMEMORATING THE 213TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CANEY FORK BAPTIST CHURCH
HON. JOHN W. ROSE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Caney Fork Baptist Church in honor of their 213th anniversary.

A longstanding pillar in the Cookeville community, the Caney Fork Baptist Church, originally referred to as “Brown’s Mill Church,” is Putnam County’s oldest church. Joshutil, Leonard, and his wife, Winnie Williams Bartlett, founded the church after relocating to Tennessee from Boonesborough, Kentucky, in 1806. They constructed a fort, and within it was the cabin first used to host worship gatherings for the Caney Fork Baptist Church. The congregation relocated in 1931 to Highway 70 East in Cookeville, where they remain today.

In the early days of Tennessee’s statehood, churches far outnumbered preachers. As was common then, the Caney Fork Baptist Church hosted traveling “revival preachers” for their services.

Throughout its history, the congregation affiliated with the general tenets of the Baptist denomination. From 1865 to 1897, the congregation embraced the Independent Baptist Christian denominational beliefs; they affiliated with the Free Will Baptist congregation from 1897 to 1916; and in 1918, the congregation affiliated with the larger Baptist denomination. Today, the Caney Fork Baptist Church is affiliated with the Stone Baptist Association, the Tennessee Baptist Mission Board, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the Caney Fork Baptist Church for their longstanding service to the community, commitment to strengthening family values, and unwavering faith.

RECOGNIZING TOM MORRISON
HON. ERIC SWALWELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life’s work of Thomas Roger Morrison, who served as a trusted local reporter and staple on televisions in my district since 1985.

Tom was born in Oakland, California on January 7, 1936 to proud parents, Lozetta and Thomas Roger Morrison, who served as a trusted local reporter and staple on televisions in my district since 1985.

Tom took on the role of a volunteer reporter for the Slice of Life show, Tom was a trusted and revered source of news in my district.

After budgets no longer allowed the 580/680 News program to continue, Tom kept our community informed on local news and developments through his bi-weekly “Mayor’s Report.” With this platform, he would meet with local mayors and county supervisors to ensure that local residents had access to information about upcoming events and what was happening in their local government.

Tom’s connection to the community was deep. His voice became synonymous with the annual Saint Patrick’s Day parade in my hometown of Dublin, as he served as the announcer for so many years. Whether he was reporting from the tarmac at the Livermore Airshow, hosting an election special, or a segment of the Slice of Life show, Tom was a trusted and revered source of news in my district.

Tom’s work on behalf of our community continued until just two months ago, very shortly before his passing. His passion and commitment were recently memorialized when the studio at TV 30 adopted the honorary title, “Tom Morrison Studio.”

After a long and valiant battle with cancer, Tom Morrison passed away peacefully on April 18, 2019. He is survived by a large and loving family, including Kathy, his wife of 23 years, his two sons, Kevin and Michael, his step-children, Stacey, Kristin, Amy, and Bradley, his sister Jenean, and the eight grandchildren he absolutely adored.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JOHN K. VADAS
HON. TIM RYAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of Mr. John K. Vadas, age 69, who passed away peacefully on Tuesday, May 7, 2019.

John’s son Matt is one of my longest serving staff members. I very much depend on him to help me fulfill my duties and I am very proud of his service.

John was born on January 19, 1950, in Warren, Ohio to John and Margaret. He was a 1968 graduate of John F. Kennedy High School in Warren. I too am a graduate of JFK.

He proudly served his country in the U.S. Navy from 1969 to 1972, where he was the radar operator on the USS Wasp. Upon his honorable discharge, John took a position working for Packard Electric. He retired from Delphi in 2001.

On April 11, 1970, John married the former Sandra Allen.

John loved the outdoors and found peace in the woods by carving out time to go hunting and camping. He was an avid fan of the Cleveland Indians and NASCAR, cheering on driver Kevin Harvick. He stayed in touch with his shipmates as a member of the USS Wasp Association. Most importantly, John was a patriot who loved his family and was a devoted husband and father.

After 49 years of marriage, John is survived by his wife Sandra, and also survived by his sons, (Jon) Christopher, Jason and Matthew Vadas; his brother, Michael (Judy) Vadas; as well as many other relatives and friends.

He was preceded in death by his son, Kevin Vadas; his parents; and his brother, William Poppal.

I extend my deepest sympathies to Matt and all the family and friends whose lives were blessed by John Vadas.
HONORING CHIEF JEFFREY WALCOTT, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. DANIEL MEUSER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today to honor Schuykill Haven Police Chief Jeffrey Walcott for his 25 years of service. Chief Walcott has been a remarkable leader of the Schuykill Haven Police Department. Through promoting public safety and community he has become a fixture of Schuykill Haven Elementary Center’s “Salute to Blue Program.” A veteran of the United States Air Force, Chief Walcott has been a model officer and public servant for citizens of all ages. He is a skilled officer, certified in firearms instruction, active shooter response, and teaches G.R.A.P.L.E for Law Enforcement and Military Personnel. Personally, I have certainly earned the respect of the community he protects and the officers he serves alongside.

After 25 years leading the “Salute to Blue” Program, I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting Chief Jeffrey Walcott for his dedicated service and dedication to the Greater Schuylkill Haven Community. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the citizens of Pennsylvania’s Ninth Congressional District, I extend my sincerest appreciation and respect for Chief Walcott’s lifetime of service.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Law Enforcement Caucus and a senior member of the Committees on Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise to commemorate National Police Week, which runs from May 12 through May 18, 2019.

Every year, a law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty in our nation and its people.

These brave men and women risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe, but they are too often taken by the violence they are working to stop.

Every year, a law enforcement officer is killed somewhere in the United States every 55 hours, and there are also 60,211 assaults against our law officers each year, resulting in 17,476 injuries.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas in paying tribute to the 158 fallen heroes who will be joining the 21,910 gallant officers who have been killed in the line of duty in 2018 and an additional 213 officers who died in previous years whose story had been lost to history, the names of all of whom will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officer’s Wall of Honor.

HOUSTON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIALIZED ON THE WALL OF HONOR

1. Timothy Scott Abernethy; End of Watch: December 7, 2008; Houston, Texas, P.D.
2. Charles H. Baker; End of Watch: August 16, 1976; Houston, Texas, P.D.
3. Johnny Terrell Bamsch; End of Watch: January 30, 1975; Houston, Texas, P.D.
4. Claude R. Beck; End of Watch: December 10, 1971; Houston, Texas, P.D.
5. Jack B. Beets; End of Watch: March 30, 1956; Houston, Texas, P.D.
6. TROY A. BLANDO; End of Watch: May 19, 1999; Houston, Texas, P.D.
7. James Charles Boswell; End of Watch: December 9, 1988; Houston, Texas, P.D.
8. C.R. Branon; End of Watch: March 20, 1969; Houston, Texas, P.D.
9. John M. Cain; End of Watch: August 3, 1911; Houston, Texas, P.D.
11. Diocionio M. Camacho; End of Watch: October 23, 2009; Harris County, Texas, S.O.
12. Henry Canales; End of Watch: June 23, 2009; Houston, Texas, P.D.
13. Frank Maybry, Jr.; End of Watch: March 25, 2004; Houston, Texas, P.D.
14. E.C. Chavez; End of Watch: September 17, 1925; Houston, Texas, P.D.
15. Charles Roy Clark; End of Watch: April 3, 2003; Houston, Texas, P.D.
16. Charles Robert Coates II; End of Watch: February 28, 1964; Houston, Texas, P.D.
17. Pete Corrales; End of Watch: January 25, 1925; Houston, Texas, P.D.
18. Rufus E. Daniels; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.
19. John P. Decker; End of Watch: February 19, 1921; Houston, Texas, P.D.
20. Worth Davis; End of Watch: June 17, 1928; Houston, Texas, P.D.
21. Keith Alan Dees; End of Watch: March 7, 2002; Houston, Texas, P.D.
22. Reuben Becerra Deleon; End of Watch: October 26, 2005; Houston, Texas, P.D.
23. William Edwin DeLeon; End of Watch: March 29, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.
24. Floyd T. Deloach, Jr.; End of Watch: June 30, 1965; Houston, Texas, P.D.
25. George D. Edwards; End of Watch: June 30, 1939; Houston, Texas, P.D.
26. Dawn Suzanne Erickson; End of Watch: December 24, 1996; Houston, Texas, P.D.
27. J.C. Etheridge; End of Watch: August 23, 1924; Houston, Texas, P.D.
28. James E. Fenn; End of Watch: March 14, 1891; Houston, Texas, P.D.
29. E.D. Fitzgerald; End of Watch: September 30, 1936; Houston, Texas, P.D.
30. C. Edward Foley; End of Watch: March 10, 1860; Houston, Texas, P.D.
31. Joseph Robert Free; End of Watch: October 18, 1912; Houston, Texas, P.D.
32. Guy P. Girlis; End of Watch: January 31, 1994; Houston, Texas, P.D.
33. James T. Gambill; End of Watch: December 1, 1936; Houston, Texas, P.D.
34. Florentino M. Garcia, Jr.; End of Watch: November 10, 1989; Houston, Texas, P.D.
35. Ben Eddie Gerhart; End of Watch: June 26, 1968; Houston, Texas, P.D.
36. G.Q. Gonzalez; End of Watch: February 30, 2000; Houston, Texas, P.D.
37. Charles R. Goupil; End of Watch: April 30, 1955; Houston, Texas, P.D.
38. Carl Greene; End of Watch: March 14, 1928; Houston, Texas, P.D.
39. Leon Griggs; End of Watch: January 31, 1970; Houston, Texas, P.D.
40. Maria Michelle Groves; End of Watch: September 15, 1991; Houston, Texas, P.D.
41. Gary Allen Gyder; End of Watch: June 2, 2008; Houston, Texas, P.D.
42. Antonio Guzman, Jr.; End of Watch: January 9, 1976; Houston, Texas, P.D.
43. Howard B. Hammond; End of Watch: August 18, 1946; Houston, Texas, P.D.
44. James Donald Harris; End of Watch: July 13, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.
45. David Michael Healy; End of Watch: November 12, 1994; Houston, Texas, P.D.
46. Timothy A. Herrin; End of Watch: June 8, 1978; Houston, Texas, P.D.
47. Oscar Hope; End of Watch: June 22, 1929; Houston, Texas, P.D.
48. Elston M. Howard; End of Watch: July 20, 1888; Houston, Texas, P.D.
49. David Huerta; End of Watch: September 19, 1973; Houston, Texas, P.D.
50. James Bruce Irby; End of Watch: June 27, 1900; Houston, Texas, P.D.
51. Bobby L. James; End of Watch: June 26, 1968; Houston, Texas, P.D.
52. John C. James; End of Watch: December 10, 1901; Houston, Texas, P.D.
53. Rodney Joseph Johnson; End of Watch: September 21, 2006; Houston, Texas, P.D.
54. Ed Jones; End of Watch: September 13, 1929; Houston, Texas, P.D.
55. P.P. Jones; End of Watch: January 30, 1970; Houston, Texas, P.D.
56. Frank L. Kellogg; End of Watch: November 30, 1955; Houston, Texas, P.D.
57. S.A. Buster Kent; End of Watch: January 12, 1954; Houston, Texas, P.D.
58. James F. Kilty; End of Watch: April 8, 1976; Houston, Texas, P.D.
59. Kent Dean Kincaid; End of Watch: May 21, 1988; Houston, Texas, P.D.
60. Louis R. Kuba; End of Watch: May 17, 1967; Houston, Texas, P.D.
61. J.D. Landry; End of Watch: December 3, 1939; Houston, Texas, P.D.
62. Robert Wayne Lee; End of Watch: January 31, 1971; Houston, Texas, P.D.
63. Fred Maddox; End of Watch: February 24, 1964; Houston, Texas, P.D.
64. Eydelmen Mani; End of Watch: May 19, 2010; Houston, Texas, P.D.
65. A.P. Marshall; End of Watch: November 8, 1937; Houston, Texas, P.D.
66. Charles R. McDaniel; End of Watch: August 8, 1939; Houston, Texas, P.D.
67. E.G. Meinke; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.
68. Harry Mereness; End of Watch: October 18, 1923; Houston, Texas, P.D.
69. Noel R. Miller; End of Watch: June 6, 1958; Houston, Texas, P.D.
70. Kenneth L. Moody; End of Watch: November 26, 1988; Houston, Texas, P.D.
71. Horace Moody; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.
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MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 20

4 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

5 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Committee on Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing on the prospects for Afghan peace.

MAY 21

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine aging and disability in the 21st century, focusing on how technology can help maintain health and quality of life. SD-562

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Missile Defense Agency. SVC-217

Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine legislation to address the risks associated with per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations. SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy. SD-106

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 123, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, S. 221, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, S. 318, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, S. 450, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to expedite the onboarding process for new medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to reduce the duration of the hiring process for such medical providers, S. 514, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, S. 524, to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, S. 746, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the accessibility of websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs to individuals with disabilities, S. 785, to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 805, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, S. 850, to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans, S. 857, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, S. 906, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, S. 1101, to ensure that only licensed health care providers furnish disability examinations under a certain Department of Veterans Affairs pilot program for use of contract physicians for disability examinations, S. 1154, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an advisory committee on the implementation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of an electronic health record, an original bill entitled, “Janey Ensminger Act of 2019”, and an original bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to eligible persons when educational institutions are temporarily closed. SR-418

MAY 23

9 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020. SR-222

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine resources needed to protect and secure the homeland. SD-342
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2845–2892

Measures Introduced: Twenty-eight bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1471–1498, S. Res. 211, and S. Con. Res. 16.

Measures Reported:

H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office”.

H.R. 828, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the “Congressman Bill Carney Post Office”.

H.R. 829, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”.

S. 347, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”.

S. 1196, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”.

Measures Passed:

National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178, recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Appointments:

Congressional Budget Office: The Chair made the following announcement: The President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency to deal with the threat posed by the unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Vitter Nomination—Agreement: By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 111), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, May 16, 2019.

Bulatao Nomination—Cloture: By 90 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 112), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).

Rosen Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 113), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Vitter, Bulatao, and Rosen Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the votes on confirmation of the nominations of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the
Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 110), Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 110), Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Committee Meetings

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 Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Vicki Christiansen, Chief, and John Rapp, Director for Strategic Planning, Budget and Accountability, both of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

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 Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Vicki Christiansen, Chief, and John Rapp, Director for Strategic Planning, Budget and Accountability, both of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

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 Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Vicki Christiansen, Chief, and John Rapp, Director for Strategic Planning, Budget and Accountability, both of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM UPDATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Intelligence concluded a closed hearing to examine an intelligence program update and global threat assessment, after receiving testimony from Susan M. Gordon, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence; Gina C. Haspel, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; and General Paul M. Nakasone, Director, National Security Agency and Commander, Cyber Command, Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary, and Charles P. Rettig, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, both of the Department of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 920 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

FINANCIAL REGULATORS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine financial regulators, after receiving testimony from Joseph M. Otting, Comptroller of the Currency; Randal K. Quarles, Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Jelena McWilliams, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and Rodney E. Hood, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 737, to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood;

S. 1228, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio;

S. 1289, to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States;

S. 1294, to require Federal agencies with jurisdiction over broadband deployment to enter into an interagency agreement related to certain types of funding for broadband deployment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 1439, to reauthorize activities of the Maritime Administration, with amendments.
NOMINATION
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine issues and challenges at the Power Marketing Administrations, after receiving testimony from Mark A. Gabriel, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration, Daniel M. James, Deputy Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Kenneth E. Legg, Administrator, Southeastern Power Administration, and Mike Wech, Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration, all of the Department of Energy; and Nicki Fuller, Southwestern Power Resources Association, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OVERSIGHT
Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Council on Environmental Quality, after receiving testimony from Mary B. Neumayr, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality.

THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL POST-INF TREATY
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the future of arms control post-Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, after receiving testimony from Andrea L. Thompson, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; and David J. Trachtenberg, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 1378, to repeal the multi-State plan program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 1388, to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training;
- S. 1434, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements;
- S. 1430, to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees, with an amendment;
- S. 1333, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals;
- S. 411, to establish a Counterterrorism Advisory Board, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 1275, to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies;
- S. 1420, to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review;
- S. 580, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the “Former Presidents Act of 1958”, with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. Con. Res. 15, expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2019, as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”;
- H.R. 1079, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms;
- H.R. 1654, to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register;
- H.R. 1590, to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel;
- S. 347, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”; and
- H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”; and

The nominations of James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Ron A. Bloom, of New York, and Roman Martinez IV, of Florida, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.
BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
S. 279, to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program;
S. 832, to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; and
S. 1207, to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Navajo Nation in Utah.

INDIAN PROGRAMS BUDGET OVERSIGHT
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the President’s fiscal year 2020 budget request for Indian Programs, and S. 1211, to provide for improvements to Tribal transportation facilities and Tribal transportation safety, after receiving testimony from Matt M. Dummermuth, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; John Tahsuda, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and Jamie Azure, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Belcourt, North Dakota.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Election Assistance Commission, after receiving testimony from Christy McCormick, Chairwoman, Ben Hovland, Vice Chair, and Thomas Hicks, and Donald Palmer, both a Commissioner, all of the Election Assistance Commission.

SBA INNOVATION PROGRAMS
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's innovation programs, including S. 118, to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I–Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, after receiving testimony from Joseph Shepard, Associate Administrator, Office of Investment and Innovation, and John Williams, Director of Innovation and Technology, both of the Small Business Administration; Stephen J. Ezell, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Jere W. Glover, Small Business Technology Council, Annapolis, Maryland; Sridhar Kota, FlexSys Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Stephen L. Hoffman, Sanaria Inc., Rockville, Maryland.

---

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 2739, 2741–2744, 2746–2778; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 58, H. Con. Res. 39; and H. Res. 383–384 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
H.R. 2740, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–62); and
H.R. 2745, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–63).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Shalala to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.
Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

**Amending the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes:** H.R. 375, to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 323 yeas to 96 nays, Roll No. 208.

Pages H3813–16, H3824–25

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, May 14th.


Pages H3825–26

Director of the Congressional Budget Office—Appointment: The Chair announced the joint appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

Page H3835

Discharge Petition: Representative Mast presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 348, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes (Discharge Petition No. 3).

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that he had issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–35).

Pages H3835–36

Senate Referrals: S. 1231 was held at the desk. S. 1436 was held at the desk.

Page H3801

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3801.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3812, H3812–13, H3824, H3824–25, and H3825–26. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

**Committee Meetings**

**TO REVIEW USDA FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS**

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry held a hearing entitled “To Review USDA Farm Bill Conservation Programs”. Testimony was heard from Matthew Lohr, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; and Richard Fordyce, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture.

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE**

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a markup on the Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. This hearing was closed.

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE**


**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE**


**KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO AMERICA’S SENIORS: RETIREMENT SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Keeping Our Promise to America’s Seniors: Retirement Security in the 21st Century”. Testimony was heard from Representative Larson, and public witnesses.
EXAMINING THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT: PROMOTING INDEPENDENCE AND DIGNITY FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services held a hearing entitled “Examining the Older Americans Act: Promoting Independence and Dignity for Older Americans”. Testimony was heard from Lee Girard, Director, Aging, Disability and Veterans Services Division, Department of County Human Services, Multnomah County, Oregon; Patricia Ducayet, Long-Term Care Ombudsman, Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman, Texas Health and Human Services, Texas; and public witnesses.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “Accountability and Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission”. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Ajit Pai, Chairman; Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner; Brendan Carr, Commissioner; Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner; and Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner.

PROTECTING AMERICANS AT RISK OF PFAS CONTAMINATION AND EXPOSURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Protecting Americans at Risk of PFAS Contamination and Exposure”. Testimony was heard from Brian Steglitz, Manager, Water Treatment Services, City of Ann Arbor, Michigan; and public witnesses.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH: A REVIEW OF PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN THE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR WORKERS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled “Promoting Economic Growth: A Review of Proposals to Strengthen the Rights and Protections for Workers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE USE OF SANCTIONS IN ADDRESSING NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, International Development, and Monetary Policy held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Use of Sanctions in Addressing National Security and Foreign Policy Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CONFLICT IN LIBYA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The Conflict in Libya”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 542, the “Supporting Research and Development for First Responders Act”; H.R. 1158, the “DHS Cyber Incident Response Team Act”; H.R. 2083, the “Homeland Procurement Reform Act”; H.R. 2383, the “Secure Communities and Safe Schools Act”; H.R. 2476, the “Securing American Non-Profit Organizations Against Terrorism Act”; H.R. 2539, the “Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2019”; H.R. 2589, the “Unifying DHS Intelligence Enterprise Act”; H.R. 2590, the “DHS Overseas Personnel Enhancement Act of 2019”; H.R. 2609, the “DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2019”; and H.R. 2621, the “Homeland Security Assessment of Terrorists’ Use of Ghost Guns Act”. H.R. 542, H.R. 1158, H.R. 2383, H.R. 2476, H.R. 2539, H.R. 2589, and H.R. 2609 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2083, H.R. 2589, and H.R. 2590 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Executive Privilege and Congressional Oversight”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES FOR FY 2020

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Department of the Interior Budget and Policy Priorities for FY 2020”. Testimony was heard from David Bernhardt, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

EXAMINING THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON PUBLIC LANDS RECREATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Examining the Impacts of Climate Change on Public Lands Recreation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R.
2532, the “Tribal Heritage and Grizzly Bear Protection Act”. Testimony was heard from Brian Nesvik, Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON EXCESS PROFITS BY TRANSDIGM GROUP, INC.

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “DOD Inspector General Report on Excess Profits by TransDigm Group, Inc.”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: Kevin Fahey, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Acquisition; Glenn Fine, Acting Inspector General; Theresa Hull, Assistant Inspector General for Acquisition, Office of Inspector General; and public witnesses.

CONFRONTING WHITE SUPREMACY (PART I): THE CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Confronting White Supremacy (Part I): The Consequences of Inaction”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADVANCING THE NEXT GENERATION OF SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Advancing the Next Generation of Solar and Wind Energy Technologies”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY HEARING: COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day Hearing: Committee on Small Business”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Case and Cárdenas.

STATUS OF THE BOEING 737 MAX

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled “Status of the Boeing 737 MAX”. Testimony was heard from Daniel K. Elwell III, Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; and Robert L. Sumwalt, Chair, National Transportation Safety Board.

THE ECONOMIC AND HEALTH CONSEQUENCES OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Economic and Health Consequences of Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather, to hold hearings to examine atmospheric science research and forecasting innovation, 10 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy’s carbon capture, utilization, and storage programs, including S. 1201, to amend the fossil energy research and development provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to enhance fossil fuel technology, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic, Kenneth A. Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Sweden, Matthew S. Klimow, of New York, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan, and John Jefferson Daigle, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cabo Verde, all of the Department of State, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1328, to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, S. 1321, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, and the nominations of Ada E. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Steven D. Grimberg, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, David John Novak, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and Matthew H. Solomon, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of James Byrne, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on the Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2020; and the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Department of Defense’s Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan: The Path Forward”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Military Personnel Management—How Are the Military Services Adapting to Recruit, Retain, and Manage High
Quality Talent to Meet the Needs of a Modern Military?”, 2:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 2088, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to reauthorize the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 2041, the “Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability Act”; H.R. 2119, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize grants for improving the energy efficiency of public buildings, and for other purposes; H.R. 1315, the “Blue Collar to Green Collar Jobs Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 2665, the “Smart Energy and Water Efficiency Act of 2019”; H.R. 2044, the “Smart Building Acceleration Act”; H.R. 359, the “Enhancing Grid Security through Public-Private Partnerships Act”; H.R. 360, the “Cyber Sense Act of 2019”; H.R. 362, the “Energy Emergency Leadership Act”; and H.R. 370, the “Pipeline and LNG Facility Cybersecurity Preparedness Act”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2574, the “Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act”; and H.R. 2639, the “Strength in Diversity Act of 2019”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of Prudential Regulators: Ensuring the Safety, Soundness and Accountability of Megabanks and Other Depository Institutions”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.


Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled “Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers: Preparing America’s Law Enforcement to Protect the Homeland”, 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled “Justice Denied: Forced Arbitration and the Erosion of our Legal System”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “Oil and Gas Development: Impacts of Water Pollution Above and Below Ground”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.


Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled “Investigating the Health and Safety Risks of Native Children at BIE Boarding Schools”, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “HIV Prevention Drug: Billions in Corporate Profits after Millions in Taxpayer Investments”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled “CFPB’s Role in Empowering Predatory Lenders: Examining the Proposed Repeal of the Payday Lending Rule”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Event Horizon Telescope: The Black Hole Seen Round the World”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.


Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure, hearing entitled “Oversight of the SBA’s Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Impacts of State-Owned Enterprises on Public Transit and Freight Rail Sectors”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Overcoming Racial Disparities and Social Determinants in the Maternal Mortality Crisis”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “China’s Digital Authoritarianism: Surveillance, Influence, and Political Control”, 9 a.m., 210 Cannon.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, May 16

Senate Chamber
Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana. At 12 noon, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations of Wendy Vitter, and of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management). At 1:45 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Thursday, May 16

House Chamber
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