House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, May 16, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE 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.

COMMUNITY ACTION MONTH

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 recognize May as Community Action Month.

This year marks the 55th year since the Community Action Network was established to help American families and communities overcome obstacles to poverty. There are more than 1,000 Community Action Agencies across the country that reach children and families in 99 percent of America's counties to help provide life-changing services that create pathways out of poverty.

Every year, these agencies help tens of thousands of children and youth with before- and after-school programs; more than 165,000 unemployed people get a job; almost 220,000 families find safe and affordable housing; and about 6.5 million people, including seniors, make their homes more energy efficient and lower their utility bills.

Earlier this spring, I was proud to introduce H.R. 1695, the Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019, with Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM.

This bill renews our Nation’s commitment to reducing poverty through locally driven, comprehensive approaches.

Madam Speaker, the Community Services Block Grant traces its roots back more than 50 years ago to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This act established local Community Action Agencies to help identify why people were in poverty and how to address it using public and private resources, a great public-private partnership.

These agencies act as a safety net for low-income individuals and families. Even more importantly, they help create opportunities for people to move from poverty to independence. That is the true measure of success as we look at these Community Action Agencies.

The Community Services Block Grant is the only Federal program with the explicit goal of reducing poverty, regardless of the cause. Unfortunately, this program has not been reauthorized in more than 20 years.

Our bill makes important updates that will strengthen the Community Services Block Grant and the network it supports, including:

A new federally administered Community Action Opioid Response Grant that will enable Community Action Agencies to fill service gaps and respond to unmet needs of low-income individuals, families, and communities affected by the opioid or substance abuse crisis;

A provision requiring Federal approval of State applications and plans, with provisions to allow direct Federal funding of local agencies if a State plan fails to meet Federal requirements; and

A renewed commitment to streamlining the program’s stated purpose to reduce poverty through support for Community Action Agencies that improve economic security for low-income individuals and families and create new opportunities in the communities where they live.

This bill will help more than 15 million low-income Americans and provide resources necessary to help lift individuals and families out of poverty.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill, especially during Community Action Month.

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized by you for this 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise, and still I rise, because I love my country and because I believe that no one is above the law.

We say that quite religiously here in this institution: No one is above the law.

I have in my hand the “Report on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election.” This document, known as the Mueller report, has been released to the public for some 29 days now.

Since its release, we have had many persons, many of whom are Members of...
this august body, say that they have concluded that the President has committed impeachable acts. Some have gone so far as to say that he should be impeached. I am one of them.

We have also had hundreds of lawyers, many of whom are prosecutors and former prosecutors, say that if anyone else committed the offenses outlined in this document, the Mueller report, that person would be arrested and prosecuted. That person would be prosecuted. That person would not be above the law.

Hence, since this document addresses acts by the President, since the President is not being prosecuted, and since the House of Representatives has not moved to impeach the President, one can conclude that the President is indeed now, for some 29 days, above the law.

No one is above the law, unless you are the President.

No one is above the law. The House of Representatives has a duty to enforce the law.

The President of the United States of America, it has been said by constitutional scholars, by Members of this august body, and by lawyers—hundreds—that he is subject to the law and that he should be properly prosecuted.

It is not happening.

The prosecution of the President in the House of Representatives will take place once impeachment is initiated. Until impeachment is initiated, this President is above the law. He continues to obstruct. He is above the law.

I am using this refrain because it is important for the American public, the people who understand that no one is above the law, to at least see that we have a problem. We have a President who, by most standards, has committed impeachable acts, yet we have not started the impeachment process.

If the President is not impeached, one of two things will happen: one, he won’t be impeached; or, two, the Congress of the United States of America would become a toothless paper tiger, not only as it relates to this President, but also as this relates to future Presidents.

We cannot allow the perception of the Congress to be toothless when it comes to our constitutional responsibilities. We have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to bring the President to justice.

The bar of justice for this President and any other President is this House of Representatives, and each Member of this House has the responsibility to make sure that justice is served.

I will now start a process that will commence on the second anniversary of my initial call for the impeachment of this President, which will be tomorrow. Tomorrow will be the second anniversary, and I will start a process tomorrow of bringing to this floor a display.

We will display the number of days since the Mueller report was produced and the number of days that this President has gone above the law because until the President is impeached, those who say that he should be impeached, those who say there is evidence enough to impeach, until this President is impeached, we who say this must conclude that he is above the law.

I love my country. I stand on the law. I believe in the Constitution. As such, I believe that this House has a duty and a responsibility to take up impeachment.

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

AMERICA LEADS THE WAY

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

Mr. ABRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the warnings to not mention the President, but you know what? They are going to continue to come. They won’t be heeded.

People say they have respect for the rule of law. Do they even have respect for the House rules and the dignity that we have as leaders of our country to follow those rules?

How can we ask the American people to follow rules we pass when we don’t follow the rules even on the House floor?

Madam Speaker, I know you understand this. My heart is heavy because I sit here, prepared to speak about one thing, but I feel like I have to say that I am very concerned for my country when my colleagues on the Democratic side speak of socialism as if history isn’t littered with examples of failure, of destitution, of destruction of not only the economies of countries that go down that road of ruin but what it does to their people.

We see this in the most recent example of Venezuela. How can we be talking about these big-government, socialist ideas? Isn’t that what the Left wants?

Even Speaker Pelosi calls it a fantasy. When colleagues on the other side aren’t talking about giving Washington more control over the American people’s lives, they are talking about party over country, unpatriotic rhetoric, in my opinion, and political theater.

That is the agenda. That is what they have. That is the bold vision of where they want to take this country. Not me, and not the people of west Texas. I can promise you that.

I mentioned the Green New Deal as the Democrats’ signature legislation to steward the environment. They want to eliminate airplanes, ladies and gentlemen. They want to eliminate cows.

They want to give everybody a paycheck, guaranteed income whether you work or not. Whether you are capable of working or not working, everybody ought to get a paycheck, guaranteed, full faith and credit of the United States of America.

That is where this country would go if we didn’t have a Republican Senate, if we didn’t have a Republican President, and if we didn’t have Americans with better sense.

Look, is the climate changing? Yes, it is changing. What are the factors? What are the variables? How serious? What variables are contributing over the others?

Let me tell you what is real. What is real is the responsibility we have to steward our environment.

I want clean air and water for my three children. I think, as leaders of this great country, we should be responsible for providing not only a land of opportunity for the future of our children but a clean land of opportunity.

Let’s just get the facts straight for the American people. America has been leading the way in this regard. The Clean Air Act is one example.

We had six key pollutants that we identified, in a bipartisan way, that had an impact on our health and well-being in this country. We have reduced those pollutants by 73 percent since 1970. At the same time, we have grown this economy 230 percent.

America is leading the way. In greenhouse gases, from 2005 to 2017, U.S. energy-related emissions fell by 14 percent when the rest of the world increased their emissions by 20 percent.

Folks, through American innovation, through reasonable regulations, we have been able to lead the world and provide for a cleaner environment and steward God’s great Earth, a gift to us.

We do have a stewardship responsibility. We have a calling to our creator and our children.

I don’t want the American people to be misled, certainly not at a $303 trillion cost and a plan that eliminates cows and airplanes. Give me a break.

The committee of jurisdiction, the Energy and Commerce Committee, hasn’t even taken up that legislation. But that is what they have.

It is happening in a balanced way. I hope we can find ways to continue to do what we are doing, which is to steward our resources, provide for a cleaner environment for our children, and at the same time, make sure that we have opportunities for our kids to pursue their dreams and dream big and do better for their families because just talking about dirty fossil fuel is not enough of a plan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SEYMOUR “SY” KAPLAN

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Seymour Kaplan, known as Sy, a local hero and World War II veteran who passed away on April 11 at the age of 96.

Sy was born on February 28, 1924, to Morris and Fannie Kaplan. At just 17 years old, Sy enlisted in the U.S.
Army—17—and, boy, was his father mad. But from a young age, Sy didn’t let anything get in the way of serving others.

During World War II, Sy served this country bravely in the 2nd Army 2nd Corps Division under General George S. Patton. He fought for 3 years, advancing through Italy, France, and Germany. Sy was severely wounded while building a bridge to cross the Rhine River into Germany. For his heroism, Sy earned three Battle Stars and two Purple Hearts.

But Sy’s service to our Nation did not end with his military service. Sy was a lifelong advocate for our local veterans. For 25 years, Sy served as the commander of the Disabled American Veterans Chapter 78 in the Coachella Valley. His leadership helped countless veterans find healing, community, and a sense of purpose. Over the years, Sy also helped many homeless veterans find homes and jobs. Sy would show up to every townhall, every event, and every community forum, always ready to make his voice heard.

Shortly after I became a Member of Congress, I remember Sy knocking on my door and asking: “Who is this young guy? What does he know about veterans?”

I sat down with Sy, and I immediately recognized his expertise and, more importantly, his heart. That is why I asked Sy to serve on my veterans advisory board and help my office connect veterans with the healthcare and benefits they have earned and deserve.

Sy said: “Hell, yeah. Let’s do this.”

When Sy came to our meetings, he would often bring along a veteran in need, and before we started the day’s agenda, Sy would give that veteran the space to tell their story. That was Sy Kaplan: a devoted advocate who recognized that good leaders also have to be good listeners.

Sy became one of the visionaries behind Veterans University, my annual event to connect veterans with local and Federal resources. Among his many accomplishments, Sy was instrumental in bringing the Palm Desert VA Clinic to the Coachella Valley. Sy would often visit the clinic to, in his own words: “Make darn sure all of my vets from the Coachella Valley are getting good care.”

Last year, it was my honor to present Sy with the Shirley Powell award in recognition of his service to local veterans in our communities. I looked to Sy as a trusted adviser and a dear, dear friend.

Sy was preceded in death by his beloved wife, Doris, and his daughter Ellen. He is survived by his daughter Ilona and a loving community grateful for his leadership and compassion.

I will always remember Sy’s blue Disabled Veterans of America shirt, his baseball cap, his energy, and his infectious smile. In Sy’s honor, let’s make “darn sure,” as he would say, that we carry his memory in our hearts.

REPORT ON H.R. 2779, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Mr. RYAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-116-64) on the bill (H.R. 2779) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch 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.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT TRUMP FOR NOT WAIVING THE JONES ACT

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise here today commending President Trump for not waiving the Jones Act.

This is a hypothetical picture, thank goodness, a Chinese-built vessel, subsidized by their communist regime, operated by third world labor, suborning the President of the United States to deliver Chinese goods, all in the very heartland of the United States of America. But this could easily become a reality if the Jones Act is waived.

For the past 100 years, the Jones Act has brought strength and certainty to maritime commerce here in the United States. It has protected the rights of American sailors, created and maintained American jobs, and been one of the single largest factors in facilitating the strong American economy that we are enjoying.

The Jones Act states that goods shipped between U.S. ports are to be built, owned, and operated by the citizens of the United States, and to support the Jones Act, which would be an easy decision to continue promoting the policy of America first.

To waive the Jones Act would be to directly jeopardize our national security, our economic growth, and our ability to provide American jobs all across this country. Worst of all, waiving the Jones Act would be allowing these foreign-operated ships into our waterways and could be opening the door to espionage. These foreign vessels would have the potential to literally threaten our national security by exposing our waterways to very real threats.

Not only has the Jones Act played a vital role in economic growth, but it has and continues to play a very large role in disaster recovery and the efforts of emergency response. Take a look at the photos of New York City after the attack on 9/11. You will see the Hudson River and the East River full of American vessels who quickly came to the rescue. Or how about all of the supplies delivered to our communities after catastrophic hurricanes?

The list goes on to include the cleanups of oil spills, fires, and nautical accidents. Americans are always there, and the Jones Act makes that possible.

The Jones Act creates stability and certainty to the maritime and shipping industry. Taking away the Jones Act strips this industry of job and market availability and stability, handing it over to foreign countries and putting the role through questionable labor practices and lower standards of performance. It would single-handedly jeopardize one of the Nation’s most reliable and strongest of our economic drivers.

As a conservative Republican, I am well aware that many groups and thought leaders here in Washington and back in Texas, whom I respect and agree with on most of the other issues, do not share my view on the Jones Act, and they are actively working to try to weaken or even repeal it.

I respectfully, but firmly, disagree, and that is why I am calling on any and all of my colleagues who want to repeal the Jones Act to explain why the image that they see here would make for a better and stronger America.

If they need to borrow this poster, I will be glad to let them use it. Just let me know.

CONGRESS MUST BE INVOLVED AND ENGAGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUZI). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in this august body, and serving the American people and the people of the 18th Congressional District.

Just a few minutes ago, I was at Arlington Cemetery participating in the wreath-laying ceremony for the women of the United States military, those who have fallen, and those who knew. I am proud to recognize young and new women members of the United States military.

In fact, Sergeant Kelly, whom I honored, is in combat, having been given permission to be engaged in combat since 2015 by the Pentagon and the United States Defense Department.

That means that I have the greatest respect for all of these men and women and take very seriously the issues of war and peace.

I was here in the United States Congress during the heinous and devastating attack on this Nation on 9/11. I was here for Afghanistan and Iraq, the Kosovo war, the Bosnian war. Every one of those war zones I visited.

I saw the men and women sacrifice. I saw the Kosovo war, the Bosnian war. I saw the solid resolve of the United States military, those of the United States military, those of the United States military.

I also saw the men and women, those who served in the service of this Nation.

I have had the privilege of serving in this august body, and serving the American people and the people of the 18th Congressional District.

Just a few minutes ago, I was at Arlington Cemetery participating in the wreath-laying ceremony for the women of the United States military, those who have fallen, and those who knew. I am proud to recognize young and new women members of the United States military.

In fact, Sergeant Kelly, whom I honored, is in combat, having been given permission to be engaged in combat since 2015 by the Pentagon and the United States Defense Department.

That means that I have the greatest respect for all of these men and women and take very seriously the issues of war and peace.
briefing today, the Members of the United States Congress, those who care about national security, homeland security, be briefed as to why our vessels are there, others are headed there, and the allegations or suggestion that 120,000 troops will be moving in that direction.

America is strong. We have no fear, but we have always been a defender, not an offender. Iran is not just any old country in the Mideast. Shamefully, we disengaged from the Iran nuclear deal—ourッション, evidenced by what is happening today.

You cannot backdoor conversations. You have to show yourself willing to negotiate with leaders from the position of facts and knowledge.

I can’t stomach the frivolous engagements and noninformation that is translating into our men and women put in harm’s way. We must be involved and engaged.

So I ask the administration to do so post haste. As we move forward with knowledge of what is going on, and each and every Member of this body and the other body should be knowledgeable about this point.

I return to a local issue that has bothered me as a member of the Judiciary Committee. I want the family of Pamela Turner, who is now deceased, to know that I stand with them.

I do not give a blanket assessment of the great law enforcement we have in this Nation, but I am appalled at the shooting death of an African American woman, Black woman, shot down in cold blood in the streets.

Yes, this lady was walking her dogs in her apartment complex. There are suggestions that this individual was well-known to police and that there were some mental health issues, something that we have to fight against and give resources.

Unfortunately, she was with warrants. I have no quarrel with people doing their job; but you are in your home, your apartment, walking your dogs, any other means could have been utilized to pick you up on warrants. You are not going anywhere. We know your address. Through an unfortunate interaction, altercation, the gun was taken out by a law enforcement officer, and she was shot five times—not once to wound, but five times.

So this requires, for the comity of relationships and respect, a full Federal and State investigation—we cannot hide—just as I have indicated that shooting on Harding Street, recently, by officers requires a thorough and full investigation, which is going on right now.

So I would simply say that because we are the land of the free and the brave, we are adherents to the Constitution and democracy and dignity and justice for all, this is an untenable and unacceptable act, that I could be walking my dogs, unarmed, and I proceeded into an unfortunate circumstance which included a Taser, but then it resulted in the absolute ending of my life, and I may be a person who needed mental health assistance.

I am deeply troubled to learn of the death of the Pamela Shantay Turner, who was shot and killed by a Baytown Police Officer. She was a mother of three children, and she died the day after Mother’s Day.

In the investigation following Ms. Turner’s death, the officer indicated that he was patrolling as part of his duty, and recognized Ms. Turner from “prior dealings” and proceeded to commence an arrest at gunpoint. Nothing in the record suggests any wrongdoing by Ms. Turner prior to this chance encounter with Baytown Police. Reports suggest the officer attempted to arrest Ms. Turner. The officer alleges Ms. Turner reached for his Taser and a lieutenant with the Baytown police claims that Ms. Turner actually tased the officer. According to the Baytown Police Department, the officer fired his duty weapon and struck multiple rounds at Ms. Turner. The shooting was recorded by a civilian and caught on cell phone video. After her death, it was revealed that Ms. Turner had a serious mental ailment. Prior to her death, Ms. Turner, 44, was heard stating that she was pregnant. After her death, this was determined not to be the case.

I stand with the family of Pamela Turner. We must get to the truth; the facts and the officer will not relent until justice is served. The circumstances surrounding Ms. Turner’s death are shocking and I demand a state and federal inquiry into her death. First, what predicated the officer involved have in detaining Ms. Turner? Why were no efforts made to de-escalate the controversy so that it did not end in a loss of life? And, if Ms. Turner was known to law enforcement in prior dealings, did they also not know about her mental state?

In recent months, we have seen too many instances of these types of killings. During National Police Week we honor our officers and I abhor attacks on our brave law enforcement personnel. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I look forward to working with law enforcement to protect justly our citizens and them. This disturbing act should not have happened and should never be repeated.

In addition to serving others, Matthew was passionate about hunting, about baseball, about comedy, and he was an active member of his church, Gospel Light Baptist Church, in Jackson, Tennessee.

Trooper Gatti lived a life that very few people have the honor of living.

According to those who knew him the best, Trooper Gatti’s willingness to serve and his constant sacrifice for others was of second nature to him.

He exemplified duty and service both on and off the clock, and for that, I am truly grateful.

Matthew had a deep love for his church, and his strong faith could be seen in everything that he did. His women in uniform as a humble gentleman who would say or do anything to lift your spirits.

Matthew leaves behind his loving wife, Anna; his parents, Christopher and Christy; his sisters, Hannah and Emily; his brother, Joshua; his mother-in-law and father-in-law, Kimberly and Frankie Lax; and his grandparents.

Matthew was a blessing to our community, and his life was a service and an inspiration.

Trooper Gatti died doing what he loved doing: protecting people, protecting his community, and protecting the State of Tennessee. And although his life on Earth has ended, his legacy will live on.

My thoughts are with his family, with his friends, and with the men and women of the Tennessee Highway Patrol.

I also want to thank all the men and women in uniform who risk their lives each and every day to protect all of us for our safety and for our betterment.

Matthew Gatti will never be forgotten.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Green), my colleague.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman KUSTOFF for yielding.

Madam Speaker, most of us run away from danger, but our law enforcement, they run toward it.

Last Monday, Tennessee State Trooper Matthew Gatti was killed in the line of duty responding to a car fire on I-40.

I had the privilege of knowing this young trooper. Our families were dear friends.

This young man was just 24 years old, but he lived a life of exemplary service to us all.

Matthew’s father said that he died doing what he lived for: serving God and serving others.

We honor those who pay the ultimate sacrifice for freedom. We honor this young man for his commitment to our safety. We honor his family for raising a young man who would serve us all in such a way.

HONORING EMILY CARNE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair recognizes the
The Battle of Buford was significant and momentous in the southern campaign during our Revolutionary War. 113 Continental troops perished during this struggle and another 150 suffered terrible wounds.

Witnessing this carnage was Emily Carnes’ great-great-grandfather, Jacob. Emily would go on to tell her ancestor’s story in her book, “Jacob Was There”.

The book describes Jacob Carnes, who was 16 years old at the time, and on the fateful day of May 29 of 1780. Jacob was employed plowing in a field close to the historic site when the Continental troops under Colonel Abraham Buford clashed with the British forces led by Lieutenant-Colonel Banastre Tarleton.

Jacob hid behind a tree during the struggle, but was eventually discovered by British troops, who took him into custody. While in their custody, British troops commanded Jacob to bury an American soldier alive. Jacob refused.

In reply, a British soldier fired his musket and shot off one of Jacob’s fingers, therefore, adding Jacob’s name to the long list of patriots who gave their blood for our freedom.

In remembrance of her great-great-grandfather’s traumatic experience and the historic importance of the battle to the southern campaign, Emily Carnes single-handedly cared for and preserved the 2 acres of leaf and debris-filled battlefield for years. She did this with no support and very few means. Indeed, she couldn’t even afford to fly a flag in remembrance of those who gave their life for our independence.

Finally, in 2010, the Friends of Buford Massacre Battlefield was established, and Ms. Carnes was awarded an honorary member.

Thanks to Ms. Carnes’ lifelong efforts, the former 2-acre site now encompasses over 47 acres of surrounding land on which the battle was fought, with the site now proudly flying the Stars and Stripes, the Buford Battle flag, and the State flags of Virginia and South Carolina.

The site now also includes modern comforts like a patio, walkways, informational kiosks, and a memorial bronze plaque inscribed with the names of 216 men recognized for defending their country in the Battle of Buford.

We thank Ms. Carnes for her lifelong passion and dedication to this sacred soil and for preserving this moment in a state to remember and enjoy.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

WE CAN PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF LGBTQ INDIVIDUALS AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

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

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Equality Act.

The Equality Act, Mr. Speaker, is a straightforward piece of legislation that would end longstanding discrimination across the country and protect rights our values says that all Americans should have.

It’s true. The Equality Act is long past due. This bill would end the discrimination faced by LGBTQ Americans and their loved ones. It would protect our long-held values of equality and opportunity for all Americans, without exception.

I want to be clear: this legislation is about treating people with respect and dignity. It’s about recognizing that LGBTQ Americans are full members of our society, protecting the same rights as everyone else. It’s about advocating for a future where everyone—no matter where they were born or who they love—has the same rights and opportunities as all Americans.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation and join us in affirming the inherent dignity of each and every American. Let’s show our LGBTQ brothers, sisters, and friends that we stand with them and that we will fight for their rights and freedoms. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

RECOGNIZING JUSTIN MASSIELO AND EMELIE CURTIS

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 two impressive student athletes from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who are making their school and our entire community very proud.

Justin Massielo and Emelie Curtis, students at Pennsbury High School in Fairless Hills, Pennsylvania, both recently hit impressive milestones in their respective sports.

Justin, a senior, recently recorded his 100th hit as a 4-year starter for the Falcons’ varsity baseball team, and Emelie, a junior, just notched her 100th career goal as a 3-year starter for the Falcons’ varsity girls lacrosse team.

What makes their achievements even more special, Madam Speaker, is that Justin and Emelie also are cousins.

On behalf of our entire community, I would like to congratulate Justin and Emelie on their notable athletic achievements. We wish them, and their families, continued success.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT TERRY HUGHES

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, this week is National Police Week, and I rise today to recognize a dedicated law enforcement professional from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently retired after a very distinguished career in public service.

Lieutenant Terry Hughes of the Bristol Township Police Department retired after over 30 years in local law enforcement.

A resident of Bristol Township throughout his entire life, Lieutenant
Hughes previously worked at the police departments in Hulmeville, Newtown Township, Northampton, and Middletown before joining his hometown’s police force in 1990. Throughout his entire tenure in Bristol Township, Terry became a senior member of the department, leading detectives, running special investigations, and was a driving force in public outreach.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to personally work with Lieu- tenant Hughes on the Department of Justice’s Weed and Seed program. We thank our friend, Terry, for his years of public service and for protecting our community. Terry has law enforcement in his blood, and I have no doubt whatsoever that his service in protecting our community will carry on.

ST. MICHAEL’S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a faith community in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that recently celebrated a very special milestone.

St. Michael’s Evangelical Lutheran Church in Sellersville commemorates its 150th anniversary this year.

First commissioned in 1869, St. Michael’s was to be a union church between Reformed and Lutheran Chris- tians. Nearly 2,000 people attended one of St. Michael’s consecration ceremonies.

The church is rich with tradition and history. Early sermons were spoken in German, and in 1904, the church became the first building in Sellersville to have electricity.

Today, the St. Michael’s community is as active as ever, participating in community meals, working on commu- nity gardens, and providing food for Pennridge FISH and Keystone Opportunity Center, and offering numerous educational programs.

Madam Speaker, we congratulate the St. Michael’s community on their 150th anniversary of such an amazing and special place.

I would also like to thank Pastor Julie Bergdahl for her pastoral care and leadership.

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 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in re- cess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN) at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Bruce Lustig, Washington Hebrew Congregation, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, without whom life has no spiritual source, no divine meaning, purpose, or destiny, but with whom there is power for the present and hope for the future, refresh our faith that the strains of life may not break our spirits. Restore our confidence that our world is undergirded by eternal pur- pose.

Bless those who give service of heart to this great country. Give this strength to temper their judgments by the compassion of the human soul. Know that none are free until all are free, free from fear, want, bigotry, and callous hatred of the other. Let the courage of their convictions make America worthy of her past and blessed by her future.

Let not cynicism blight, nor faithlessness uproot our confidence to live as we pray, so that, unashamed, our leaders may transmit to generations to come an America better than ours. Hear our prayer.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Jour- nal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI BRUCE LUSTIG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Mary- land (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rabbi Bruce Lustig, who just led us in this wonderful opening prayer.

Rabbi Lustig is senior rabbi of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, which is Washington, D.C.’s largest and oldest synagogue and where many of my constituents worship.

The son of a refugee from Nazi Ger- many, his mother, Hedy Lustig, Rabbi Lustig grew up in Nashville, Tennessee, where he was the only Jewish child at school. The strong cultural identity instilled by his mother, and the emphasis his family placed on en- gaging with his Christian friends and classmates, laid the foundation for his lifelong commitment to interfaith work, including his efforts to open dia- logue and strengthen relationships among Jews, Christians, Muslims, and people of all faiths.

Ordained at the Hebrew Union Col- lege-Jewish Institute of Religion, Rabbi Lustig holds a doctorate of divinity and a master’s degree in Hebrew letters. He earned his bachelor’s with honors from the University of Ten- nessee.

In delivering today’s opening prayer in the House, Rabbi Lustig continues a venerable and important tradition. Since the Washington Hebrew Congregation was created in 1862, every single one of its senior rabbis has deliv- ered an opening prayer before the U.S. Congress. Rabbi Lustig now joins that esteemed group.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to wel- come Rabbi Lustig to the House today, and I would like to extend my thanks for his excellent leadership in our community and for offering today’s prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further re- quests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING HEAD START AND COMMEMORATING THE MEMORY OF DR. EDWARD ZIGLER

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Head Start program on its 54th an- niversary and the 25th anniversary of Early Head Start.

I had the proud distinction of serving with Dr. Edward Zigler of Yale University, who passed away this past year.

He was a leader in this and worked with every President from JOHN KEN- NEDY to Barack Obama.

He is generally regarded as the father of the Head Start program but also re- garded for his longstanding work with children. In fact, it was Ed Zigler who said, “My politics are children,” and then proceeded to dedicate a lifetime to creating remedies for childcare, which he labeled, in America, “a cosmic crapshoot.”

So many young people today experi- ence the dilemma of balancing their work with bringing up their children. But it was Ed Zigler’s leadership that recognized we should utilize our schools. He promoted School of the 21st Century as a way for us to get our arms around the whole issue of having safe, affordable childcare.

I rise today to commemorate his memory and congratulate the Head Start program.
We are waiting as we begin to debate the Equality Act that will have a blind eye to anyone’s difference and be able to celebrate them and support them without discrimination.

Where is the other body? Why haven’t they passed a bill in 3 months? Why can’t we do the work for the American people?

It is time to get the job done.

HONORING OFFICERS DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is National Police Week, highlighted by Peace Officers Memorial Day, which President John F. Kennedy designated, in 1962, as May 15.

Law enforcement officers and their families selflessly serve our communities across the country. Americans appreciate honoring officers, their families, and fallen heroes on Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Law enforcement personnel are national heroes. We are grateful for their sacrifices made to serve and protect our country on a daily basis. We also provide our deepest support and gratitude to those who have been injured or lost their lives in the line of duty and to their families. Grateful citizens across the country will take time to thank a police officer this week.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

STOP PRICE-FIXING ON GENERIC DRUGS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, 44 attorneys general filed a lawsuit in Federal court against 20 generic drugmakers, alleging market manipulation and price-fixing.

The American people’s tax dollars are invested in unprofitable basic research that is essential to bringing highly profitable drugs to market. The United States Government is also a huge purchaser of these generic drugs.

In some cases, it is alleged that one company sets the price of a drug and the others follow suit, cutting competition. All of this results in billions of dollars in harm to patients and the U.S. economy.

Congress must stop this price-fixing scheme and will vote this week to approve legislation to end this price-fixing and market manipulation perpetuated by these generic drugmakers.

ENACT THE JAKE LAIRD ACT OF 2019

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as we recognize National Police Week, let’s provide our law enforcement every tool possible to prevent senseless acts of gun violence from harming or claiming the lives of innocent people, including our law enforcement officers.

That is why, today, I am reintroducing a gun violence reduction bill, categorized as a red-flag bill, with my colleague Ted Deutch, who represents Parkland, Florida, and our colleagues from Michigan, Fred Upton and Debbie Dingell.

Our bill, the Jake Laird Act of 2019, is named after an IMPD officer who paid the ultimate sacrifice serving and protecting his community of Indianapolis, Officer Jake Laird.

Our bill provides grants to States to enact laws substantially similar to Indiana’s red-flag law because we know that, since 2005, this Hoosier commonsense bill has been working.

Specifically, the Jake Laird Act will enable law enforcement to remove and retain firearms from individuals who are determined to be a danger to themselves or others, while ensuring due process under the law.

According to a USA Today article recently published, more than 30 States across the country are either considering similar measures or have passed red-flag laws.

It is past time for our Nation to adopt laws like Indiana’s red-flag law that will keep our law enforcement and citizens safer.

WE DO NOT ALLOW DISCRIMINATION

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to tell you about Gwyn Ciesla of Aurora, Illinois. Gwyn is a wife, a mother of two, and an IT professional with two decades of experience.

She is also a transgender woman.

Gwyn transitioned about 2 years ago. Shortly afterward, she began interviewing for jobs to advance her career.

Gwyn was met with hesitation from potential employers. On multiple occasions, recruiters were suddenly uninterested in Gwyn after they conducted in-person interviews—no follow-up, no phone calls or emails, just complete silence.

This is a horrifying reality for many people in the trans community like Gwyn. A 2016 report by the National Center for Transgender Equality found roughly 30 percent of trans people have been denied a job or a promotion, or were fired, because of their gender identity.

This kind of discrimination is not only hurtful and illegal, but it hurts our economy, which is why groups like the Chamber of Commerce and over 200
major corporations support the Equality Act.

Gwyn is now employed, but there are so many others still forced to sit on the sidelines, keeping top talent out of our workforce.

The Equality Act would ensure everyone has the opportunity to earn a living and contribute to our economy, and it would send a message that we do not allow discrimination in our country.

[121] Honoring David King

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember David King, an indomitable family man, a constituent of mine who passed away after a hard-fought battle with cancer on May 2.

David was born in Houston, Texas, but moved to Virginia in 1995 and spent over 2 decades there. He will be remembered by his lasting contribution to the Virginia wine industry and his King Family Vineyards. It is one of my favorite places for a glass of wine.

David served as a chairman of the Virginia Wine Board and worked tirelessly as a free-market advocate for vineyard agriculture and agritourism in Virginia. He leaves an enormous legacy in both the wine industry and his local Crozet community.

David is survived by his loving wife, Ellen; his six sons and daughters-in-law, Carrington and Corie, Stuart and Ali, James and Kelly; as well as his eight grandchildren.

One of David’s favorite phrases was this: “A rising tide lifts all boats,” and David lived by that, lifting up those around him in success.

We will miss him dearly.

Honoring Ian Jacob Trone

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

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the Abortion Is Not Health Care Act. This bill amends the Internal Revenue Service's treatment of out-of-pocket abortion costs as a medical expense.

This bill was drafted after receiving feedback from my constituents that they no longer wanted their tax dollars to support the abortion industry. It is unfathomable to me that my Democratic colleagues in Congress continue to not only condone the practice of abortion but allow taxpayer dollars to subsidize this abhorrent practice.

For years, the pro-abortion movement has marketed abortion as a form of reproductive healthcare, but it is time for us to be honest with ourselves. Healthcare is primarily a restorative function, one that helps our bodies and minds to heal from disease or ailment. Under no circumstances should healthcare include the intentional taking of life.

The Abortion Is Not Health Care Act is a small step towards ending the Federal Government’s treatment of abortion as a healing medical practice.

I am happy that several of my colleagues and many pro-life groups, including March for Life, Family Research Council, Eagle Forum, Center for Arizona Policy, Arizona Right to Life, and others have endorsed this bill.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to uphold the call for human dignity at all stages of life, including while still in the womb, and support the Abortion Is Not Health Care Act.

Prescription Drugs

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

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Speaker, Iowans are struggling to keep up with the rising cost of prescription drugs.

A teacher in Parragut, who has had diabetes for 20 years, is spending over $750 a month for insulin. That is a third of her take-home pay, and she needs a second job just to cover her costs.

A woman from West Des Moines wrote to me that her medication usage cost $50 for a 90-day supply and now that price has gone to $1,000. Her family found they can buy the same medication in Canada for $60.

In fact, Americans pay more for prescription drugs than any other country in the world. Pharmaceutical drug manufacturers are gaming the system to reap profits and they are using delay tactics to prevent generic companies from bringing the same drugs to market.

I ran for Congress to protect Iowans, not Big Pharma. This bill will help bring generics to market quicker to lower the cost for consumers and save billions in taxpayer dollars.

No one should ever have to decide between putting food on the table and taking their medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs for all Iowans and Americans.

Recognizing Jennifer Baumann

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jennifer Baumann, a high school senior from my district who was named the recipient of the Good Citizen Award by the Illinois Daughters of the American Revolution.

This year, over 400 high school seniors submitted essays for the DAR Good Citizenship scholarship application. Among these, district DAR chapters identified one student as the person who best exemplifies dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism in their area.

Jennifer was selected from Mt. Zion High School as the representative for the Stephen Decatur Chapter and attended the Illinois State DAR Conference, where she was named the statewide winner of the Good Citizen Award.

By all accounts, Jennifer demonstrates well the attributes of dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism. She is active in nearly every aspect of student life in her high school, where she is the captain of all three of her high school teams: cross-country, basketball, and track and field. She also serves as the President of the National Honor Society and treasurer of the Student Council, and even finds time to dedicate to volunteering with both the Key Club and her church.

She plans to study speech, language, and hearing sciences at the University of Arizona in the fall.

I am proud to recognize outstanding students in my district, including Jennifer. I congratulate her on this prestigious honor.

Head Start gives children a brighter future

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Head Start program turns 54. Since this life-changing education program was created in 1965, it has served millions of children, giving them and their families a brighter future.

Head Start and Early Head Start provide comprehensive early childhood
education, health, nutrition, social services to low-income children and their families. It is one of the most important investments that we can make to make sure our children have the greatest opportunities to succeed.

It is particularly important and crucial to my hometown of Flint, Michigan, where early childhood education is the most important thing we can do to help children mitigate the effects of lead exposure.

I am really proud of the school districts in Michigan who host this incredible program and provide wrap-around services to children and to their parents.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the teachers, the workers, and the volunteers who support our Head Start kids every day.

To keep Head Start working, we have to fully fund this program in Congress. Support for Head Start is bipartisan. We must continue that, and make sure that we fully fund this program.

I congratulate the success of Head Start. We ought to make sure that every child that seeks that sort of early childhood education has an opportunity to have it.

HONORING BOB MAXWELL

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the life of an American hero who I was honored to call my friend, Bob Maxwell of Bend, Oregon, who passed away last weekend at the age of 98.

Bob Maxwell represented the best of what Oregon and America had to offer. Bob was the oldest living Medal of Honor recipient in our country, and his gallantry was well known.

On the night of September 7, 1944, in France, Bob Maxwell threw his unprotected body on top of a German hand grenade to protect the lives of his comrades in World War II.

This unhesitating selflessness earned Bob Maxwell America’s highest military honor. He earned him his second Silver Star, a second Purple Heart, and a Bronze Star.

For those who had the pleasure of knowing Bob, as I did, they know that his bravery and heroism were only matched by his kindness, his warmth, his sense of humor, and his humility.

Bob once said of his Medal of Honor: “I am not wearing the medal for any personal deeds. I am wearing it because it represents all the casualties we had in the war. It represents those who were fighting for our country and the ideals that they believed in.”

Like his fellow soldiers, Bob’s service will forever be cherished in the country that he sacrificed so much to protect.

Bob’s legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of everyone he interacted with, and especially in his community in central Oregon, where Bob Maxwell was a pillar.

To the entire Maxwell family, Mylene and I send our heartfelt condolences and prayers during this difficult time of loss.

URGENT NEED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Infrastructure Week and call attention to the urgent need for investment in rural areas like mine in upstate New York.

As an example, every time I am home in my district, I hear from folks about the need to invest in infrastructure to help our family farmers succeed.

When farmers drive their livestock or dairy products down to New York City or the immediately surrounding areas, they need bridges and roads they can rely on, structures that can carry products without potholes or fear of collapse.

But infrastructure does not just mean bridges, roads, and seaports. It means access to markets through high-speed internet.

Astonishingly, 25 million Americans lack rural broadband. This means 25 million Americans who own small businesses, operate small farms, want to apply for college online, or do homework, or access lifesaving medicine cannot, because they lack internet access.

This week, I was proud to launch, with the leadership of Whip CLYBURN, a task force on rural broadband.

I am ready to partner with folks on both sides of the aisle to address the need to rebuild our infrastructure and access broadband both in upstate New York and across the country.

Let’s get this done.

MAY IS MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, May is Mental Health Month, a time when we are encouraged to break down the stigmas that surround mental health.

Normalizing conversations about depression, anxiety, and other conditions will help those affected by mental illness seek the quality care that they need and deserve.

One group that is overwhelmingly impacted by mental health disorders is veterans.

Unfortunately, we know that about 22 veterans commit suicide each and every day.

Congress understands how dire the situation has become and is working diligently to find a solution. Fortunately, we have made progress over the past few years.

Last year’s passage of the VA Mission Act significantly increased the care available to our veterans, ensuring they have access to a medical professional before resorting to suicide.

This is a step in the right direction, but more can certainly be done.

These men and women answer the call of duty, and as a Nation, we must care for them when they return home.

Until veteran suicide rates dwindle to zero, I will continue to work with my colleagues to support veterans’ mental health programs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the teachers, the workers, and the volunteers who support our Head Start kids every day.

To keep Head Start working, we have to fully fund this program in Congress. Support for Head Start is bipartisan. We must continue that, and make sure that we fully fund this program.

I celebrate the success of Head Start. We ought to make sure that every child that seeks that sort of early childhood education has an opportunity to have it.

HONORING BOB MAXWELL

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the life of an American hero who I was honored to call my friend, Bob Maxwell of Bend, Oregon, who passed away last weekend at the age of 98.

Bob Maxwell represented the best of what Oregon and America had to offer. Bob was the oldest living Medal of Honor recipient in our country, and his gallantry was well known.

On the night of September 7, 1944, in France, Bob Maxwell threw his unprotected body on top of a German hand grenade to protect the lives of his comrades in World War II.

This unhesitating selflessness earned Bob Maxwell America’s highest military honor. He earned him his second Silver Star, a second Purple Heart, and a Bronze Star.

For those who had the pleasure of knowing Bob, as I did, they know that his bravery and heroism were only matched by his kindness, his warmth, his sense of humor, and his humility.

Bob once said of his Medal of Honor: “I am not wearing the medal for any personal deeds. I am wearing it because it represents all the casualties we had in the war. It represents those who were fighting for our country and the ideals that they believed in.”

Like his fellow soldiers, Bob’s service will forever be cherished in the country that he sacrificed so much to protect.

Bob’s legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of everyone he interacted with, and especially in his community in central Oregon, where Bob Maxwell was a pillar.

To the entire Maxwell family, Mylene and I send our heartfelt condolences and prayers during this difficult time of loss.

URGENT NEED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Infrastructure Week and call attention to the urgent need for investment in rural areas like mine in upstate New York.

As an example, every time I am home in my district, I hear from folks about the need to invest in infrastructure to help our family farmers succeed.

When farmers drive their livestock or dairy products down to New York City or the immediately surrounding areas, they need bridges and roads they can rely on, structures that can carry products without potholes or fear of collapse.

But infrastructure does not just mean bridges, roads, and seaports. It means access to markets through high-speed internet.

Astonishingly, 25 million Americans lack rural broadband. This means 25 million Americans who own small businesses, operate small farms, want to apply for college online, or do homework, or access lifesaving medicine cannot, because they lack internet access.

This week, I was proud to launch, with the leadership of Whip CLYBURN, a task force on rural broadband.

I am ready to partner with folks on both sides of the aisle to address the need to rebuild our infrastructure and access broadband both in upstate New York and across the country.

Let’s get this done.

MAY IS MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, May is Mental Health Month, a time when we are encouraged to break down the stigmas that surround mental health.

Normalizing conversations about depression, anxiety, and other conditions will help those affected by mental illness seek the quality care that they need and deserve.

One group that is overwhelmingly impacted by mental health disorders is veterans.

Unfortunately, we know that about 22 veterans commit suicide each and every day.

Congress understands how dire the situation has become and is working diligently to find a solution. Fortunately, we have made progress over the past few years.

Last year’s passage of the VA Mission Act significantly increased the care available to our veterans, ensuring they have access to a medical professional before resorting to suicide.

This is a step in the right direction, but more can certainly be done.

These men and women answer the call of duty, and as a Nation, we must care for them when they return home.

Until veteran suicide rates dwindle to zero, I will continue to work with my colleagues to support veterans’ mental health programs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


Honorable 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 Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 16, 2019, at 9:54 a.m.:

Appointment

Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

Cheryl L. Johnson.

MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Pallone. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 377 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 987.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities, with Mr. LANGEVIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 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.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlwoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care Innovation and Affordability Act. This legislation will help to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and those are the three main things it contains.

The first title of this bill contains three bipartisan measures intended to address high prescription drug costs by promoting greater competition in our pharmaceutical marketplace. One of the most effective ways to bring down the cost of prescription drugs is to ensure that generics can come to market as soon as possible.

The first proposal would address existing pay-for-delay agreements between brand and generic drug manufacturers that delay generic enter the market.

And finally, the third drug pricing measure would address situations where some brand drug companies are denying generic drug manufacturers access to samples or to single, shared system REMS.

By eliminating these barriers, we will prevent some manufacturers from manipulating the system to extend their monopolies at the expense of consumers, and this will make prescription drugs more affordable for all Americans.

Now, the second title of this bill, Mr. Chairman, will help lower American health care costs, protect people living with preexisting conditions, and reverse some of the most harmful actions the Trump administration has carried out to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

Two of the proposals will restore funding for the navigator program and outreach and enrollment efforts that help provide consumers with the support and information that they need to make the right decisions for their families. Restoring this funding is critical, considering that the Trump administration gutted funding for consumer outreach and marketing by 90 percent. It cut navigator funding by 80 percent, huge swaths of the country without access to fair and unbiased enrollment help.

H.R. 987 will also provide States with funding to establish their own State-based marketplaces, which will help make healthcare more affordable. In 2018, premiums in these State marketplaces were 17 percent lower than in the federally facilitated marketplace, and enrollment was higher for the State plans.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 987 will reverse the Trump administration’s regulation to expand junk insurance plans, known as short-term limited duration health insurance. The Trump administration expanded these junk plans from the current 3-month term and made these plans available for up to 3 years.

These junk plans are exactly that. Mr. Chairman: They are junk. They discriminate against people with preexisting conditions, they set higher premiums for people based on age, gender, and health status. They deny access to basic benefits like prescription drugs, maternity care, and mental health and substance abuse treatment, and they set arbitrary dollar limits for healthcare services leading to huge surprise bills for consumers. This legislation would prevent the administration’s expansion of these plans from taking place.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an important bill that will lower healthcare and prescription drug costs, protect people with preexisting conditions, and end some of the administration’s ongoing sabotage of our Nation’s healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in my own State that finally had to junk plans from the current 3-month term and make these plans available for up to 3 years. These junk plans are exactly that. Mr. Chairman: They are junk. They discriminate against people with preexisting conditions, they set higher premiums for people based on age, gender, and health status. They deny access to basic benefits like prescription drugs, maternity care, and mental health and substance abuse treatment, and they set arbitrary dollar limits for healthcare services leading to huge surprise bills for consumers. This legislation would prevent the administration’s expansion of these plans from taking place.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an important bill that will lower healthcare and prescription drug costs, protect people with preexisting conditions, and end some of the administration’s ongoing sabotage of our Nation’s healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Second, $100 million a year—$100 million a year—to fund the navigator program. Now, for plan year 2017, navigators received a total of $62.5 million in grants, and they enrolled 81,426 individuals. That means it cost $767 per person that they enrolled, and that accounted for less than 1 percent of the total enrollees.

Now, it is important to understand, by contrast, agents and brokers assisted 42 percent of those in the enrollment year of 2017. Do you know what it cost for them to do it? $2.40. Yet, under this law, you can’t use the funds for the navigators to actually pay for those folks, the brokers and agents, to do this work that they do very efficiently, $767 per enrollee versus $2.40.

Third, the bill reverses the administration’s efforts to allow more State-regulated insurance plan options for consumers who, frankly, are getting priced out of the market and are looking for choices that fit them and their lives.

I want to set the record straight on these plans. The plans you heard described earlier were actually legal under ObamaCare and the Obama administration, and they are legal under the Trump administration. They provide choices to people in between jobs or people who can’t afford these exploding premiums.

You know, the promise that your premium is going to go down 2,500ucks kind of evaporated as soon as the bill became law, so people are stuck with ever-increasing premiums, enormous deductibles, and saying: Could we please allow our States to put together options for us that still have to go through a State insurance regulator? And they certainly care about their system.

CBO projected premiums for these plans could be as much as 60 percent lower than the cheapest Federal mandated plan, 60 percent, and, even more, States can regulate these plans. In fact, in the chairman’s home State of New Jersey, they are simply banned. That is New Jersey’s choice. They should have that choice.

In my home State of Oregon, they are limited to 90 days. That is what we have chosen. This is kind of federalism at its best.

But in their Washington-knows-best mentality, the bills brought before us today strip away this option for longer term plans, and that is wrong and it is unfair.

Fourth, the bill spends $100,000,000 a year to market the Federal plans. They couldn’t stop there. Instead of educating patients on all the plans’ options available to them, their legislation actually places a gag order on the promotion of more affordable choices, specifically association health plans, known as AHPs, and the short-term limited duration insurance plans. You can’t even tell consumers about that.

Oh, we are going to have a gag order from Washington.

So there is simply no reason to combine these bills with our bipartisan, I would say unanimously approved, bills to deal with drugs.

Energy and Commerce Republicans put forth an alternative bill that includes all of H.R. 987’s bipartisan drug provisions I referenced earlier but removes the partisan, the strictly gotcha provisions.

Our pragmatic plan replaces these partisan provisions with language extending funding for community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, and public health extenders for a year. Now, these public health extenders should be a top bipartisan priority for the Congress, as they must be done before the end of the fiscal year, the end of September, and they deserve the attention of Congress.

Let me go back to the navigators for a minute. The Wall Street Journal reported: “One grantee took in $200,000 to enroll a grand total of one person.” They went on to write: “The top 10 most expensive navigators collected $2.77 million to sign up 20,000 people.”

If you take that $2.77 million that they want to give to these navigators—they are the most expensive operators on the planet—to sign people up for insurance and gave that to our community health centers, do you know how many people they could cover with $2.77 million? One estimate is 20,000 patients—20,000 patients.

So Republicans are saying let’s take that money and actually get it out to help patients in community health centers rather than spend it on navigators that can take $200,000 and enroll one person, or $767, on average, versus $2.40 when agents and brokers do this enrollment.

We think we have a better way. Our bill, H.R. 2700, is called the Lowering Prescription Drug Costs and Extending Community Health Centers and Other Public Health Priorities Act. It is pretty straightforward. It is an honest title.

We should take this bill up now. Mr. Chairman, because the majority, unfortunately, has decided to put politics before us today with our bipartisan efforts to lower drug costs.

The bill before us right now is going nowhere in the Senate. They have said that. The White House has weighed in, they don’t like it either.

We should take up the alternative to move our bipartisan work forward and take action to ensure our community health centers and other public health priorities are funded. That has always been a bipartisan effort.

Finally, just to further the point on the blatant and unnecessary partisan ship on display here today, House Democrats made 26 amendments in order on this bill—26. One of those amendments, just one, was authored by a Republican.

Now, they control everything around here, and they said in the opening days they are going to open up this process. Ninety-two percent of the amendments allowed to be brought to the floor so far this year have been from Democrats. When we were in charge, 45 percent—45 percent—were the minority’s amendments that came to the floor.

So, so much for openness. Just one was authored by a Republican. So it is unfortunate that we find ourselves here today.

In the meantime, we have a better way to take care of our community health centers, our patients, and those seeking more choices and more affordable rates for an insurance product than what the Federal Government is mandating.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), our distinguished whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand for the American people and the voters of South Carolina’s Sixth Congressional District who spoke loud and clear last November, demanding that Congress dissolve and uphold the right to have access to affordable care.

This is an effort to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and we stand ready to defend every aspect of this legislation.

We will not stop our efforts to hold this administration and my Republican colleagues accountable as they continue misrepresenting and undermining the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand for the American people and the voters of South Carolina’s Sixth Congressional District who spoke loud and clear last November, demanding that Congress dissolve and uphold the right to have access to affordable care.

Today, this House will vote on a package of seven bills that will halt the administration’s sabotage of the Affordable Care Act, improve the act’s implementation, and lower the cost of prescription drugs.

This legislative package, titled the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, prevents the substitution of junk policies that take advantage of unsuspecting citizens, and it protects against discrimination for preexisting conditions.

This is the right time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this legislation takes meaningful steps to control prescription drug costs by expanding access to generic drugs so patients don’t have to choose between...
lifesaving medications and other necessities, like rent or food.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats are addressing crucial healthcare needs. We stand to protect the healthcare of American citizens.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTRRE), a very accomplished member of our committee.

Mr. GUTRRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 987, the supposed Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

I wish I wasn’t giving this speech. As many of my colleagues know, I have a bipartisan track record here in the House. I have been proud to work with many of my Democrat colleagues on a number of issues that impact Kentuckians and people across the country, such as Alzheimer’s, the opioid crisis, and working to reduce costs.

Last Congress, I had 10 bipartisan bills signed into law, and I had two additional bipartisan bills pass the House. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that I take bipartisanship and our responsibility to get things done for our constituents very seriously. That is why I am extremely disappointed that I will have to vote against H.R. 987 today.

When I was in my district, I hear from Kentuckians about how drug prices are simply too high. This is an issue that affects everyone, and it is one of the few big issues these days that Republicans and Democrats can all agree on. President Trump has made this a priority.

As ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I have launched, with Chair DIANA DeGETTE from Colorado, an investigation into the pharmaceutical companies that are making rip-off drug deals that limit competition and their responsibility to prevent the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs and are making good on our promise that no American should be forced to make the choice between paying their bills and buying their medicines.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), our top Republican on the Health Subcommittee, a former chairman of the subcommittee, and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 987.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, these bills are proof that we can work together across the aisle and do what’s right for the nation. Unfortunately, as The Washington Post so eloquently said yesterday in “The Health 202,” “Democrats are putting a政治 stunt is a wasted political opportunity.

He continued, “You have got the chairwoman of the Freedom Caucus willing to work with Democrats on making real, structural reforms on prescription drug prices. And what do they do? They put a poison pill in, trying to augment a failing healthcare-delivery system."

Fortunately, I am not just here to complain. I also have a solution to the scenario we are facing on the floor today.

On Tuesday night at the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that would take these three drug policies and the $5 billion in savings from those policies, and I introduced H.R. 2700, 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 programs, such as Community Health Centers and Special Diabetes Programs.

Look, reauthorizations are tough. I know. I was chairman of the Health Subcommittee in the last Congress. September seems like a long way away. Many of these programs expire at the end of the fiscal year, but the time to get these things done is now.

We have taken no specific action toward reauthorization of these programs. Again, September seems far away, but we have to account for the time it takes to move through regular order.

On the other issues that we are facing today, the short-term, limited duration rule repeal, according to the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, the policies we are discussing today, the administration’s short-term, limited duration insurance rule would result in 500,000 individuals becoming uninsured.

Is this what you want? Isn’t it better that people have some form of insurance than none at all?

I take meetings in my office back home in my district with families that cannot afford the high premiums, high deductible plans that they have been forced to buy off the ACA exchange. These individuals need lower cost options, and that is exactly what these limited duration plans provide.

States already regulate these plans and have the authority to disallow them if they choose. This is a case for federalism.

I want to quote from the Congressional Budget Office report: “CBO and JCT estimate that enacting the legislation would result in roughly 1.5 million fewer people participating in insurance plans.”

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud, on behalf of the people of the First District of Illinois, to rise today in support of H.R. 987, which includes my legislation, the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act.

My legislation included in today’s package prohibits the practice of pay-for-delay where brand-name companies compensate generics to prevent the entry of cheaper drugs into the marketplace.

I have long stood against these anti-competitive deals that limit competition and force consumers to pay more for their medications.

This disgraceful and deceptive practice ends now. I stand with my colleagues to stop drug companies from continuing to rig the system in an attempt to take advantage of hard-working Americans. My legislation will take a meaningful step toward bringing this behavior to a screeching halt and holding drug companies accountable once and for all.

With today’s package of prescription drug bills, we are making progress toward addressing the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs and are making good on our promise that no American should be forced to make the choice between paying their bills and buying their medicines.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), our top Republican on the Health Subcommittee, a former chairman of the subcommittee, and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 987.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, these bills are proof that we can work together across the aisle and do what’s right for the nation. Unfortunately, as The Washington Post so eloquently said yesterday in “The Health 202,” “Democrats are putting a political pothole in the way of bipartisan drug pricing bills.”

The Democrats have decided to use $5 billion in savings to fund State-based ACA marketplaces, the federally facilitated marketplace navigator program.

This morning, a publication called STAT published an op-ed titled, “In a rising Washington, a partisan approach to lowering drug costs leaves Democrats doubting their own party leadership.”

As this article reported, even House Democrats do not understand why the Speaker is saying the party leadership have decided to politicize bipartisan bills that enjoy widespread support.

The chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee is on record as saying she was “not a fan of what happened.”

Republicans stand ready to work on solutions. Congressman MARK MEADOWS, the chairman of the Freedom Caucus, told STAT that the Democrats’ political stunt is a wasted political opportunity.

He continued, “You have got the chairwoman of the Freedom Caucus willing to work with Democrats on making real, structural reforms on prescription drug prices. And what do they do? They put a poison pill in, trying to augment a failing healthcare-delivery system.”

Fortunately, I am not just here to complain. I also have a solution to the scenario we are facing on the floor today.
Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman.

Of those, more than 500,000 would instead participate in nongroup coverage through the Affordable Care Act, and 500,000 would become uninsured.

The drug policies contained in both H.R. 987 and my bill, H.R. 2700, are commonsense bipartisan measures to lower drug costs for our constituents. I am disappointed they have been rolled into a partisan package that will be dead on arrival in the Senate.

We were able to work together in the committee and subcommittee to ensure these policies would improve access to generics for American patients. I hope the Democratic leadership would consider the bipartisan nature of the policies when moving the packages to the floor in the future.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, the real political grandstanding that we are hearing today is from the Republican side of the aisle, which for nearly 10 years has been fighting against the Affordable Care Act.

Over 80 times, they voted against the Affordable Care Act. Maybe it is because some people call it ObamaCare. We know that millions and millions of people have gotten healthcare because of it.

It is time to stop and to say let's work together to make the Affordable Care Act even better and extend access. The fact is that the Affordable Care Act and affordable prescription drugs are two pillars of healthcare access. They should be separated.

I am proud that we have an opportunity today to do what was impossible while the Republicans were in charge of the Congress. Today, we are voting on making impactful, lasting change in lowering the cost of healthcare, including prescription drugs, for Americans nationwide.

Democrats are at the table and ready to pass this legislation.

Mr. PALONEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1/2 to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who chairs our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1/2 to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who chairs our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee.

We support these drug bills. There is no question about that, because we want to get lower-cost drugs and stop bad behaviors that prevent generics from coming to market sooner.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a pharmacist.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I come before you today a very disappointed person; a disappointed Member of Congress; a disappointed pharmacist. I am disappointed that my Democratic colleagues have decided to prioritize politics over patients by packaging together bipartisan bills to lower drug costs with partisan bills to bail out ObamaCare. They are two completely different subjects.

Republicans and Democrats have worked hard to create strong, bipartisan bills that will increase the amount of generic drugs entering the marketplace, bringing more affordable choices to patients. Now, House Democrats have chosen to use these bipartisan bills to pay for partisan ObamaCare bills.

This bill includes major drug pricing proposals like the CREATES Act, and the pay for delay, which both seek to increase the ability of lower-cost generic drug companies to enter the market quickly, providing patients with more affordable choices.

We had long, hard-fought negotiations with our Democratic counterparts in multiple markups that ran until midnight. We got the proposals, but we were eventually able to come to an agreement.

The other drug-pricing bill in this package is a bill that I have worked on with my friend, Representative SCHRAMER from Oregon, the BLOCKING Act. This bill mirrors the proposal from President Trump’s budget proposal to keep bad actors from clogging up our generic drug pipeline.

Hear me, Mr. Chair, and hear me clearly. This bill is the picture-perfect definition of good bipartisan legislation. Democrats are throwing that work away by prioritizing politics over patients. All of these three bipartisan drug-pricing bills save money, so the simple answer is clear: why not use their hard-fought savings and wish lists for partisan politics.

The bill before us today will throw hundreds of millions of dollars at the failed ObamaCare marketplace and further restrict patient choice. The bottom line is, there is no need for this course. Drug pricing should not be a partisan issue.

In all of my years of being a pharmacist, I have seen patients struggle with the high cost of prescription drugs. Now that I am in Congress, I hear about it all the time from my constituents back home. We all do.

I call on my colleagues to do the right thing. Let’s work together on drug pricing and stop bad behaviors that prevent generics from coming to market sooner.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, if you put patients before politics.

Mr. Chair, this is important. Strike these partisan poison pills in this bill and send our excellent drug-pricing work over to the Senate and on to the President’s desk and have him sign them into law. The other drug-pricing bill in this package shows that we can, in fact, do that. We can work together on important issues.

When we work together, we can achieve real results that help patients. But once again, we are letting politics become the priority instead of helping people. Republicans want to work together on drug pricing. The people want us to work together on drug pricing.

Voters across the country sent us up here to work together on issues, like drug pricing. The three drug-pricing bills in this package show that we can, in fact, do that. We can work together on important issues.

Mr. Chair, this is not just. Strike these partisan poison pills in this bill and support the passage of H.R. 987 in its entirety.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, before I recognize our pharmacist, Mr. CARTER from Georgia, I just want to say I have been on the floor a lot in the last few weeks on this issue, and we keep getting the same refrain about Republicans voting 60 times to repeal ObamaCare.

What is never said is that 30 of those bills, my friends on the other side of the aisle voted for, and President Obama signed them into law—I’m sorry. Twenty-one of those bills were signed into law by President Obama. So it is 21 of the 30 were signed into law by President Obama.

So my political being is, ObamaCare had problems. We worked together and tried to address those problems with this legislation, repealing the unsustainable CLASS Act, the co-ops, the Cadillac and medical device taxes we voted to delay, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and on and on. My friends on the other side of the aisle voted with us and we with them to fix those sorts of things. So don’t come down here and tell me it is only Republicans who voted to do things on ObamaCare.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to pass this legislation.
are for protecting you against pre-existing conditions. We just don’t vote that way.

This week House Democrats are continuing to strengthen access to affordable healthcare by passing H.R. 987, an additional package of bills aimed at strengthening our healthcare system and lowering prescription drug costs because patients don’t just worry about prescription drugs, they worry about their health coverage. As a matter of fact, it is hard to separate the two.

This effort is critical because the Trump administration, in its campaign and from its very first day, and congressional Republicans, have been working tirelessly to sabotage healthcare access and undermine the reforms of the Affordable Care Act. They voted against it and, yes, they voted over, and over, and over again to repeal it.

With all due respect to my friend, we didn’t vote for those bills.

Now, we may have voted for some bills to improve the Affordable Care Act, but we certainly didn’t vote for any of your bills which had the effect of repealing ObamaCare, because we believe it is the best legislation for the American public, and so does the majority of the American public.

Last year, 1.1 million Americans lost health coverage after years of gains in coverage. This shows us, dangerously, that the Trump administration’s administrative sabotage is having its intended adverse effect, from limiting access to open enrollment, to allowing junk plans.

Let me say something about junk plans because the gentleman says: Well, some people can’t afford it. Yes, they get a plan and they think they have health coverage, and by the way, it doesn’t cover something when they get really ill, or they have lifetime limits or annual limits. They don’t have this covered. They don’t have the other covered.

Not only that, but guess what happens to the insurance pool? It becomes riskier. And guess what happens then? The price goes up. You don’t have to be a genius or know much about the insurance business to know that that is the case.

From repealing votes in Congress, to anti-ACA lawsuits in the courts, Republicans have been trying to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

From shortening enrollment periods, to cutting funding for outreach to let people know what is available to them and what is the best policy for them. Advice and counsel, they don’t have to take any of it, but they ought to have that available to them.

This sabotage is hurting access to affordable, quality healthcare coverage for the people. That is what we are here for. For the people. And that is what this legislation is for. For the people.

The legislation before the House today would push back on these efforts that sabotage in several ways: first, we are banning junk plans that don’t provide adequate coverage and raise premiums for comprehensive health plans.

Next, we are taking action to bring generic drugs to market more quickly, helping to lower the cost of prescription drugs. I appreciate the fact that my Republican colleagues support those bills. I appreciate the gentleman who knows full well as a pharmacist the crisis that confronts people when they can’t afford and health-enhancing prescription drugs.

But they also are facing real problems on the availability of health insurance should they have to have health providers, whether they are doctors, or hospitals.

Finally, H.R. 987 increases funding for outreach, enrollment, and navigators to help Americans find the right healthcare plan. That is for the people, to help the people, and to have access, and to be secure in knowing they have adequate healthcare for them and their families.

It also provides States with additional funding to expand State-based marketplaces. Innovation. Our legislation will provide insurers, providers, and patients alike with greater certainty that the Affordable Care Act will continue to make healthcare available and to all Americans with preexisting conditions.

I am pleased that my Republican colleagues are supporting the prescription drug titles of this bill. Perhaps we will send it over to the Senate, and maybe that is all that is left behind.

But the fact of the matter is, we have a broader responsibility than just prescription drugs. Democrats are committed to bringing healthcare costs down and making sure more Americans can have quality, affordable coverage.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representatives Cicilline, Rush, Schrader, Castor, Kim, and Blunt Rochester for their leadership in the committee, which will make the security for healthcare better for the people. They have introduced the constituent parts of this bill.

Of course, I want to thank my good friend, Frank Pallone. Nobody has worked harder for a longer period of time to enhance the healthcare of Americans. Nobody has worked harder in committee, both initially on the Affordable Care Act, of which he was a very significant part of the authorship, and since then pursuing it and trying to enhance it. This bill is important for us to pass to do just that.

That is why I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in standing up for the Affordable Care Act. This is not the first step. This is not the final step. But it is an important step. And it is an important step.

I hope that Republicans and Democrats would support this bill overwhelmingly because, as I said, it is for the people.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to make a couple of points before I introduce the author of the CREATES Act. The gentleman that just spoke, Mr. Hoyer, voted 21 times, on 21 of the bills that were signed into law to repeal parts of ObamaCare. The gentleman voted for it because those parts were unworkable. So when you hear about 60 times, remember the leader, the distinguished leader, my friend, actually voted for 21 of those, as did I.

When we talk about the people, let me read you a little statement from Tom from Medford who wrote me in October of last year. He said, "Greg, I just received a letter from the insurance company stating their monthly premium next year will go up nearly 40 percent, from $632 to $883 per month, and that is with the plan more or less staying the same, but without any out-of-network healthcare.”

That is not affordable. That is why we think States should have options. It comes to this: if it is true that they want to dump all this money into, remember agents and brokers in the private sector cost about $2.40 for them to sign somebody up. The navigators would cost, based on 2017 numbers, $767 per enrollee. And for the $2.7 million they spent to sign up 314 people, if you put that money—as Republicans want to do—into community health centers, one estimate is you could cover 20,000 people with that $2.77 million.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). My friend is the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the former chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and a leader of this CREATES effort legislation on bringing drug prices down.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 987, the ObamaCare bailout act.

One of the things that has frustrated me in the almost 5 months that the Democrats have controlled this Chamber is that anything that is good, bipartisan, and for the people they turn in partisan politics. That is exactly what they have done with the CREATES Act, which will bring down prescription drug prices and has strong bipartisan support in both Houses and, as a standalone bill, would have a very good chance of being signed into law.

So we can talk today about all of these things about ObamaCare that the other side of the aisle wants to put more money into, but that is going nowhere. I think what we should do is look at what we can accomplish, and we can accomplish changing the way that drugs are priced through the CREATES Act.
At a time when everything is a dramatic political battle, lowering prescription drug prices is one of the few opportunities where it seemed like Republicans and Democrats could get something meaningful done for the American people.

Just a few weeks ago, the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committees worked across the aisle unanimously reporting out several bills to that end. My friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WELCH), and I are sponsors of one of those bills, the CREATES Act. Our commonsense legislation would allow consumers to access cheaper generic drugs sooner, driving down costs and saving taxpayers money.

According to CBO estimates, our bill would save the American taxpayer $3.9 billion over 10 years. This bill has the kind of bipartisan support to become law. However, instead of letting this body consider a commonsense bill in standalone form, the Democratic leadership has tacked it on to this ObamaCare bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The ObamaCare health package has no chance of passing in the Senate. The majority leader just admitted that. This is a missed opportunity, and it is highly disappointing.

The American people want us to work in a bipartisan manner. The American people want us to accomplish things, and this is a poison pill that will make sure that this bill never sees the light of day in the Senate and will never become law.

When they take up this bill, I hope they strip out all the ObamaCare bailout—free of poison pills—and pass the bipartisan drug pricing bills so the House will be able to reconsider them in a more bipartisan fashion.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to reinforce what the gentleman from Wisconsin said.

This is from The Washington Post: “The Health 202: Democrats Are Putting a Political Pothole in the Way of Bipartisan Drug Pricing Bills.”

That is all you need to know. It didn’t have to be this way. These bills came out of the committee individually. Bipartisan leadership put them together knowing full well they could put a poison pill into a drug reform bill and delay consumers’ ability to get more affordable drugs sooner. Because this legislation could move through the Senate and down to the President more quickly if it didn’t have these provisions.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUJ). Ms. MATSUJ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 987, legislation that advances Democrats’ commitment to rein in the soaring costs of healthcare for consumers.

I am pleased that we are taking important steps forward to address an issue I hear from constituents almost daily: the rising cost of prescription medications. I recently heard from Mary, who is living with a lifelong chronic condition. The cost of her medication has skyrocketed in recent years to the point that it has forced her to cancel prescriptions and forgo treatment entirely.

The bills before us today represent an opportunity to make progress by allowing lower-cost generic drugs to come to market sooner. Furthermore, these efforts aim to make healthcare more affordable for patients with preexisting conditions by reversing the Trump administration’s relentless and ongoing sabotage of the ACA.

This is critical for people like Charis, a constituent in my district who fears the worst that, without affordable care, she could have to hide her rare disease in order to get adequate medical care. No patient should have to live with such a worry. I am pleased to be able to support these patient protections on the floor today, but it is not enough. It is keeping the pressure on tackling prescription drug and insurance costs and working to defend Americans’ rights to quality and affordable healthcare.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Chairman, Democrats are doing everything that we can to lower the cost of prescription drugs. So I strongly support the act that is on the floor today. It contains two bills that I authored.

First is H.R. 1010, which prohibits the expansion of these junk insurance plans through association health plans. These are the ones that do not cover preexisting conditions. You can often be tricked into buying one of these plans and find out it doesn’t even cover the trip to the hospital.

In fact, I asked Secretary Azar, in committee, about this. I asked him: You are aware that these junk plans do not cover preexisting conditions?

He said: That is correct.

The bill also contains another section that I authored, the ENROLL Act, to restore funds to our independent navigators who are helping American families choose the right health insurance options for them. Agents and brokers are important, but they are no substitute for independent navigators who are trusted in the community.

We have got to pass these bills today to lower healthcare costs for families across the country and lower prescription drug costs. I am very proud to have authored two portions of this.

Let’s not let them expand these junk plans and leave you on the hook. Let’s make sure that families have the independent advice that they need to choose what makes the most sense for them.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the State of Florida actually allows State-regulated plans to go up to 364 days to give Floridians an opportunity to have choice. When it comes to association health plans that allow small businesses like I used to own to get together and offer more affordable health insurance, they put a gag order on so that you can’t tell America’s patients they might have that option.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don’t know that I would fully trust all these navigators. According to The Wall Street Journal, one grantee took in $200,000 of your tax dollars and enrolled one person. The
Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for true bipartisan efforts to reduce prescription drug costs. Seniors, patients, and families in my district and all across America are counting on us so that they can afford their medication and have the certainty that they need.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have led. Republicans and Democrats on our committee have been working together on provisions to bring generic drugs to the market faster by incentivizing more competition among generic manufacturers. We recently passed three drug-pricing bills with overwhelming, bipartisan support. These are three solutions that President Trump stands ready to sign, and we should send them to his desk.

This is an opportunity to build on the bipartisan work from the last Congress to lower drug costs and keep our promises to the American people. Remember, just last fall, President Trump signed our bipartisan bill to ban the gag clauses so patients can save on prescriptions and trust they are getting the best price.

Again, we should build on that work. That is what the people elected us to do; that is what they expect; and that is what they deserve.

So, what has changed, and where are we today?

The new majority—at the expense of patients, seniors, and families—is playing politics with lowering the costs of prescription drugs. H.R. 987 includes our bipartisan bills, but my colleagues across the aisle have packaged them with very partisan bills to bail out ObamaCare.

These partisan proposals would restrict access to healthcare coverage and stop the administration’s work to reduce wasteful spending on programs that aren’t working. The Washington Post called these poison pills a political pothole. We don’t need any more political potholes. We need real reforms that the President will sign. This is a ploy, and it is just the latest.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has historically been the most bipartisan committee in the House, putting more bipartisan legislation on the President’s desk than any other. I am disappointed that we have found ourselves here.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Oregon is right on the drug pieces, and like other Democrats I know, there are a lot of people who think that we should keep these bills separately and they would zoom on through here, but not package them up the way that we have in the generic space, the more savings we see. It is with that knowledge that we provide generic manufacturers that incentive of 180 days of exclusivity.

Unfortunately, in the current system, some generic manufacturers delay bringing their drugs to market by parking their applications, once being awarded the exclusivity, and not actually bringing their drug to market. Doing so does not allow others to come to the market and compete against or treat unfairly when they need help the most.

Asthma, allergies, Alzheimer’s, cancer, diabetes—are things we can go right through the alphabet—having a child, these are preexisting conditions. And I believe people should not suffer more when they are at their most vulnerable. Patients should not be discriminated against or treated unfairly when they need help the most.

I am committed to reversing the Trump administration’s continuous, unrelenting sabotage of the Affordable Care Act that allows and encourages junk health plans.

H.R. 987 invests in access to quality care while lowering prescription drug prices. It ensures that generics can come to market as soon as possible so that seniors are not skipping the medications they need because they cannot afford it.

I support this legislation because it puts patients first. I thank Representative Lisa Blunt Rochester for her leadership on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 987.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our dynamic leader, our Speaker.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, congratulations. What a joy to see the gentleman in the chair. I thank Chairman PALLONE for his extraordinary leadership as chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, chair of the Health Subcommittee. I thank them so much for all their hard work to bring us to this series of bills today, in addition to the bills of last week.

I commend our colleagues who just spoke, Ann Kuster, for her important legislation to preserve the benefit of preexisting conditions not being a barrier to access to care and insurance, and also to Lisa Blunt Rochester for her leadership on the legislation before us today to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, on Sunday we marked Mother’s Day, a special tribute to our mothers and also a somber reminder of the days when being a mother—when being a woman—was a preexisting medical condition. As a mother of five, I can speak from some experience as to what an obstacle that could be to access to insurance.

Last week, we took action to block the administration’s cynical efforts to drag our country back to the dark days of discrimination in healthcare coverage by passing the Protecting Americans With Preexisting Conditions Act. Again, I salute Congresswoman Kuster for her leadership on this, and also our chairman.
This is not a fight about legislation that we are gathered about here today. This is about a fight for our lives, the lives of many people affected.

I want to take the opportunity to salute a hero, a hero who testified last week on healthcare at the Rules Committee, Mr. Ady Barkan.

Ady Barkan is a hero to us. He is a man who suffers from ALS, but, in speaking out for better healthcare, with courage, he testified before the committee 2 weeks ago.

Ady said: I was healthy a year ago. I was running on the beach. I am 33 years old. I have an 18-month-old son, Carl. And, out of nowhere, I was diagnosed with ALS. Which, as you know, has a life expectancy of 3 to 4 years. No treatment, no cure.

Like so many others, Rachael—that is his wife—and I have had to fight with our insurers, which has issued outrageous denials instead of covering the benefits we paid for.

We have so little time left together, yet our system forces us to waste it dealing with bills and bureaucracy.

That is why I am here today urging you to build a more rational, fair, efficient, and effective system.

That was Ady testifying 2 weeks ago.

Since then, Ady lost his grandmother, Dina Abramov; and our sympathy goes out to him. Our congratulations to her for having such a magnificent and courageous grandson.

But Ady has been here so many times with our Little Lobbyists who have preexisting conditions, with many of the stories which represent people with diagnoses that need prescription drugs and cannot afford them.

So, in the coming weeks and months, Democrats will continue our action to strengthen health protections for people like Ady, the Little Lobbyists, and others, because this is life or death. It certainly is quality of life.

And now, our Democratic House, today, is proud to pass the Strengthening Healthcare and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, with Congresswoman BLUNT ROCHESTER.

With this legislation, we are further reducing the price of prescription drugs by promoting competition with generics and reversing the Republican sabotage that we have seen.

Mr. Chair, when we passed the Affordable Care Act, it was absolutely necessary that we do so. Even if everyone in our country approved and loved it, there was no guarantee that we could sustain the costs of healthcare in our country at the time, for the individual; for a family; to a small business; to corporate America, who was paying a big part of the bill; and to the public sector, was a tremendous burden.

With the Affordable Care Act, we were able to begin the rate of decrease of healthcare costs in our country.

But one sector, one segment of the healthcare arena that we did not conquer was the cost of prescription drugs, which continues to contribute to the increase of healthcare costs in our country.

That is the main reason healthcare costs rise: the cost of prescription drugs.

So, I salute the chairman and the committee and ANNA ESHOO, chair of the subcommittee, and our distinguished chairman of the full committee for his legislation today which helps to lower the cost of prescription drugs to people, to individuals, to families, to everyone who has a part in funding the good health of the American people.

This is really essential. And it is a fight. And it is a fight, but we are taking it one piece at a time.

The reason it had to be combined with other bills is so that it could be paid for. Our Republicans salute the first part of the bill where we encourage transparency and, this, that, and the other, but want to walk away from the part of the bill that is essential for paying for the legislation.

So, we want to be very, very responsible in all of this.

One of our colleagues on the floor earlier said that this bill was going to go die in hell or someplace. I don’t know where. Actually, the distinguished—well, not so in this case, but the Republican leader of the Senate has said that the group rider and all these bills will die, designating the Senate a graveyard for legislation that would help the good health of the American people, lower costs for them, improve their lives. But he talked about everything that we passed here.

I have some news for the distinguished leader in the Senate, the Republican leader, Mr. MCCONNELL. The support for this legislation, these bills, is alive and well among the American people, and I am hearing from them, because this legislation, these bills, are a matter of life and death and, certainly, quality of life for America’s working families.

So we will never limit the aspirations and meeting the needs of the American people to what might be legislatively acceptable in the mind of a person in the United States Senate, but we will recognize our responsibility to not only pass the boldest common denominator, but to do so in a way that honors what President Lincoln told us: Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, you can pass almost anything; without it, practically nothing.

But, in order for the public sentiment to weigh in, the public has to know.

And passing legislation of this kind is the first step to stop the rigging of the system so there is no delay to get generics to consumers faster.

That will increase competition, and it will keep drug prices down for consumers.

While there is still much more work that needs to be done to drive down the price of prescription drugs, this bill is a strong first step in ensuring that all Americans can afford the medication they need.

Let’s pass this bill and move forward in helping consumers.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN).

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans who are struggling to afford their lifesaving medications. Every day, millions face the tough decision of having to pay for their prescriptions or other basic costs of living like groceries and rent. Americans like Victoria Stuessel from Los Angeles, a mother of three who was just diagnosed with MS.

Because of the high cost of her medications which she uses to delay the progress of her disease, she was forced to skip doses. But this is just one of many stories of people like Victoria who ration their care or stop taking their medication altogether.

Not only is this dangerous, but it could result in death.

The Strengthening Healthcare and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act is the first step to stop the rigging of the system so there is no delay to get generics to consumers faster.

That will increase competition, and it will keep drug prices down for consumers.

We will fight them in the Supreme Court, but we will also fight them in the court of public opinion. This is very, very important to, not only the health, but also the financial wellbeing of America’s working families.

So, I salute the chairman for this legislation, and I urge a vote for it. And I know that there is bipartisan support for some parts of the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN).

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans who are struggling to afford their lifesaving medications. Every day, millions face the tough decision of having to pay for their prescriptions or other basic costs of living like groceries and rent. Americans like Victoria Stuessel from Los Angeles, a mother of three who was just diagnosed with MS.

Because of the high cost of her medications which she uses to delay the progress of her disease, she was forced to skip doses. But this is just one of many stories of people like Victoria who ration their care or stop taking their medication altogether.

Not only is this dangerous, but it could result in death.

The Strengthening Healthcare and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act is the first step to stop the rigging of the system so there is no delay to get generics to consumers faster.

That will increase competition, and it will keep drug prices down for consumers.

While there is still much more work that needs to be done to drive down the price of prescription drugs, this bill is a strong first step in ensuring that all Americans can afford the medication they need.

Let’s pass this bill and move forward in helping consumers.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman PALLONE for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act. This legislative package includes common sense proposals that will advance important gains made by the Affordable Care Act and further improve our healthcare.
system by, one, lowering the cost of prescription drug prices and, two, increasing access to care.

Included in this package is my bill, the MORE Health Education Act, which will restore funding to the Affordable Care Act’s marketing and outreach programs, according to the CBO, help an additional 5 million Americans get health coverage.

Educating Americans about when they can enroll and what their options are gets us one step closer to stabilizing the individual marketplace.

ACA outreach not only boosts enrollment, but is also cost effective. The private sector spends between $250 and $1,000 per enrollment; however, it costs the government just $29 to enroll someone in the individual marketplace using TV ads—$29.

The goal of Affordable, accessible, and high-quality healthcare is not a D or an R, it is an A for American.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who chairs the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am here to wade through the pool of crocodile tears shed by Big Pharma who, for eight long years, have done nothing meaningful to address prescription price gouging.

This bill provides some protection from anticompetitive pharmaceutical practices. And while it fails to lower drug prices immediately as we need, it offers great hope for the future. Key provisions are substantially the same as legislation I have introduced twice before.

Big Pharma depends on monopoly power to spike prices. Taxpayers finance much of the drug development; then the government grants a monopoly to Big Pharma, exempt from the antitrust laws.

Today’s modest action is very important, but it will not fulfill our Democratic promise to deliver on lowering drug costs until we use the full power of the Federal Government, its purchasing power, to directly negotiate drug prices, much the way that the Veterans Administration gets lower prices for our veterans.

Big Pharma will not yield its monopoly prices willingly. It will take more than a cry of, “Kumbaya.” It will take enough Members here with the intestinal fortitude to stand up to one of the most powerful lobbies in America and provide genuine relief.

Let’s do that. Mr. WALDEN, Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Kini), who is the sponsor of the legislation that encourages State exchanges.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of taking action to lower healthcare and prescription drug costs.

In each of my townhalls, I heard from my neighbors that they are tired of the politics; they can’t afford the partisanship; and they need Congress to be the adults in the room and to act now.

I am proud that my bill, the SAVE Act, has been incorporated into the bill that we will be voting on today.

The SAVE Act came from a conversation, a single conversation, as I reached across the aisle to Congressman BRIAN FITZPATRICK, put aside our parties, and worked together to help the people we wake up every day committed to serve.

Congress needs more conversations like that. Congress needs bold action like the one we will be taking today.

I call on our colleagues in the House to recognize that our neighbors need healthcare relief, and I call on our colleagues in the Senate to recognize that our neighbors cannot wait for that relief to come.

This is our moment to act to lower healthcare costs. This is our moment to get something done for the American people.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Austin Scott).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened, again, I want to point out the same thing I pointed out the other day, that they act as if you go to the doctor and the doctor says you have a dreaded disease, they get you out the next day and get an insurance contract. That is simply not true.

Affordable Care Act contracts are not available until January 1 of next year. You can sign up for them starting in November, but you will not have coverage until the first of next year.

And if you think healthcare was expensive and insurance was expensive before the Affordable Care Act, you sure ought to look at it now, because it is significantly more.

I just want to point out that there is a lot of good stuff in this legislation, there really is. I commend both the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee for the work that is done to help the American citizens on the prescription drug issue.

But as a Representative who has 24 counties, in over half the counties that I represent, they have only one insurance carrier—only one insurance carrier. I can tell you these skinny plans are important. If you lose your coverage, where we live, it is, in many cases, the only thing that is available to you.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Neguse).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, across the State of Colorado and across my district, the cost of healthcare is an urgent concern to so many of my constituents. That is why I am proud to support the legislation championed by our chairman today.

Today’s legislation will provide much-needed reforms to lower the cost of healthcare, protect people with pre-existing conditions, and lower the cost of prescription drugs—and these reforms are urgently needed.

We know for a fact that American consumers pay far more for prescription drugs than it costs to manufacture them. In Colorado, over half a million people can’t fill a prescription because of the cost—half a million people. The burden has led to heartbreaking stories across my State and
across the Nation of individuals forced to choose between feeding their loved ones and taking life-sustaining medications.

Today’s legislation will provide much-needed reforms, will lower prescription drug prices by ending the practices used by so many drug manufacturers to keep less expensive drugs off the market, and will bring generics to market faster.

I urge passage of the provisions on the one hand to ensure that no American has to skip doses of lifesaving medication because of the cost and no American goes bankrupt paying for their healthcare.

I thank the chair for his leadership in championing this legislation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the Democratic Caucus chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chair for his leadership on this critically important issue.

The reckless and reprehensible Republican assault on healthcare is un-American, unconscionable, and unacceptable.

The administration wants to take away healthcare protection from tens of millions of Americans.

This administration wants to impose an age tax on people between 50 and 64, which will dramatically increase premiums for older Americans.

This administration wants to take away protections for those with preexisting conditions, adversely impacting more than 100 million Americans.

Here is the Democratic response: Keep your hands off of the healthcare of everyday Americans.

Our legislation will strengthen the Affordable Care Act, protect people with preexisting conditions, lower healthcare costs, and drive down the high costs of lifesaving prescription drugs because Democrats believe that, in this great country, no American should ever have to choose between putting food on the table, paying the rent, or getting access to lifesaving medication. We believe that healthcare is a right; it is not a privilege. We are not going backward; we are just going to move forward.

This is the wealthiest country in the history of the world. Every single American should have access to high-quality and affordable healthcare, and we are taking a substantial step in that direction today.

I thank the chair and the tremendous members of the relevant committees for their great work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I think I am prepared to close, but I just want to ask about the time on each side once more.
Mr. Chairman, we should be reducing the cost of insurance for most Americans, not increasing the cost. 

Mr. Chair, this bill will prevent the administration from going in the wrong direction, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 987. 

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. 

Mr. Chairman, I rise as leader of the Republicans on the committee of jurisprudence over employer-sponsored healthcare, the House Committee on Education and Labor. We have a vital stake in this debate because that is how most Americans get their healthcare, through their employer. Our focus should be on improving those options. Instead, we are here so our Democratic colleagues can hang an ax against the few remaining healthcare options they don’t get to control.

Among its many choice-eliminating, freedom-limiting provisions, this legislation eliminates short-term, limited-duration insurance plans. These plans are an obvious potential solution for millions of Americans, working or not, who may find themselves between jobs or unable to afford rising premiums in the already expensive individual market.

If any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim to be champions for hardworking Americans or the unemployed, their support for this provision is proof that those claims are empty. It is worth noting for the RECORD that short-term, limited-duration plans were legal under the Obama administration and that States still have the authority to regulate these plans both under the Obama administration and under the current rules. If States choose to limit or prohibit the sale of these plans, they are free to do so. 

By this bill, House Democrats are once again defaulting to their standard uncreative, blind support for one-size-fits-all Federal mandates instead of respecting the judgment of State lawmakers and authorities, as well as individuals, to act in their States’ and their own best interests.

Republicans on the Education and Labor Committee have been and remain fully dedicated to protecting Americans with preexisting conditions and establishing new customizable, affordable, workable healthcare options that take into account the changing needs of all Americans at all stages of life.

The bill before the House today will not lower drug prices, will not protect anyone from surprise billings, will not lower premiums, will not cut any out-of-pocket costs, and will not provide one cent of tax relief.

Its failure to achieve any of those objectives makes it completely unacceptable for us as Republicans.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. Scott for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 987. I want to follow through on key campaign promises: lowering drug costs by removing barriers to generic drugs coming to market, reversing the sabotage of the ACA, and rescinding the administration’s rule to expand junk plans.

As we all know, junk plans are sometimes engaged in hyperbole, but this is not hyperbole: These plans are truly junk. They are not required to include essential benefits, coverage requirements of the ACA. They can deny consumers coverage or charge more based on age, gender, or health status. They come with no guarantees for basic benefits like maternity care, mental healthcare, prescription drug coverage, and other preventive services. They are not subject to the out-of-pocket limitations of the ACA that are designed specifically to protect consumers.

I know a bit about these junk plans because I spent time over Mother’s Day weekend desperately helping my 26-year-old find healthcare coverage. In March, he turned 26 and found himself uninsured. He is in a sandwich situation between his 26th birthday and when he will again become eligible for employer-provided healthcare. Only because I have read countless insurance policies over the years of my legal career did my son avoid the trap of paying $6,000 for a policy that would afford him almost no coverage with a $10,000 deductible. That deductible would have applied even to his prescription drugs, of which he needs one.

Just as important, my son is exactly the kind of person we need in the marketplace.

Let’s encourage robust participation in many plans and allow the intent of the Affordable Care Act. These junk plans lure young, healthy people away from the ACA pool of plans, resulting in more expensive premiums for the rest of Americans.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, well, here we go again, another bait and switch by the Democrats.

We have a great bill, the CREATERS Act, that allows consumers to access cheaper generic drugs, driving down costs, saving Americans $3.9 billion over 10 years.

What have they done with it? They have stuck in poison pills designed to take choice away from Americans when it comes to their health insurance plans.

As lawmakers, we owe it to Americans to protect the rights that make their own choices, particularly as it relates to healthcare. The fact that we are here debating even further reducing these options available to Americans proves that we are not keeping up our end of the bargain.

Obamacare created a healthcare paradigm that aimed to take away options from Americans and give that authority to the government. As a result, premiums are skyrocketing, with the highest in the country being in my home State of Virginia.

President Trump, thankfully, has stepped in to allow flexible, short-term, limited-duration plans to help those in my district, where my constituents are pleading for more choices in health insurance. This administration is simply trying to give more options to Americans in this desert of choice.

We should be creating an environment that encourages more choices for individuals and families. This includes a more individualized market, particularly with regard to employer-sponsored health insurance.

It also means increasing pricing transparency at the point of sale to avoid surprise medical billing, which the President championed last week.

Finally, we should address consolidation in the healthcare system through increased enforcement from the FTC and the DOJ under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

This legislation is the height of arrogance. Government knows best, yet again. The American people know nothing about their own choices when it comes to health insurance.

To double down on Obamacare and take away the few options that are left for constituents, and giving those choices to those who caused this failure in the first place, the Federal Government, is beyond offensive to American citizens.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this legislation. Reject this idea that government knows best, and stand up for affordable and accessible health insurance for all Americans.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield today in strong support of H.R. 987. We must reverse the administration’s attempt to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

Healthcare should not be a partisan issue. It doesn’t matter if you are a Democrat, Republican, or unaffiliated. If you get sick, you need to see a doctor. Your body certainly doesn’t make the distinction about what your politics are.

The ACA has given millions of Americans, including 500,000 in my home State of North Carolina, access to quality and affordable care. That is huge because people need health care. No one should worry about losing access to quality, affordable health insurance because of a preexisting condition. We all have them.
Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE), the distinguished ranking member of the Veterans Affairs’ Committee.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 987, the Democrats’ Obamacare bailout act. This legislation includes three bipartisan bills that could help lower the cost of prescription drugs. Unfortunately, the majority has decided to package these positive bills with four bills that double down on trying to force Obamacare on people who don’t want it and can’t afford it.

We are back on the floor again using valuable time to consider legislation that will not pass the Senate. Make no mistake: If House Democrats wanted to accomplish anything, they could have put their three drug pricing bills on the floor by themselves today and they would have passed. Everyone needs to understand that.

Instead of working together to find ways to lower the costs of healthcare, House Democrats are acting to eliminate affordable options that many folks across the country rely upon for covering their family’s healthcare needs.

One provision in this bill would be to limit the availability of short-term limited duration plans to no more than 3 months. This change by President Obama went into effect January of 2017 and overturned 20 years of regulations that had been in place since Bill Clinton was in office, including the entirety of President Obama’s administration.

These plans are for essential health benefits chosen by the individual consumer, not the Federal Government. We have different needs at different points in our life. Unfortunately, theACA does not allow for plans to be sold as “compliant” unless they contain government approved what you need, not what you and your family decide what is in your best interest and can afford.

If my colleagues want to get rid of junk plans, they can start by working with us to get rid of Obamacare.

In my district, while the individual mandate was in effect, there were 20,000 people who purchased their coverage through the exchange and about 15,000 who paid the penalty. Many of those people who paid the penalty were able to find a plan that was affordable through the Tennessee Farm Bureau or the Christian sharing ministries. I have said it before and I will say it again: Obamacare is a good deal for you if you get a subsidy, of which about 90 percent do. But these subsidies hide the true cost of the care, and for people who don’t receive a subsidy, it is unaffordable.

When the Education and Labor Committee marked up the short-term bill last month, I heard the argument that these short-term plans were too difficult to understand, that consumers don’t know what they are getting. This is offensive to me. This is saying, just because patients don’t choose plans that Washington bureaucrats think they should, they don’t have enough sense to figure it out on their own.

They do. I trust the American people. Why on earth when we do something using common sense and creating association health plans that allow small groups to get together—Washington State does that, hardly a conservative State. They have had AHPs for over 20 years, and they are working well.

If my friends across the aisle want to engage in a good faith effort to find solutions to high healthcare costs, I am all in, Mr. Chairman. I want to help. But the point is that people are finding ways outside of ObamaCare to best access coverage for their families.

The CREATES Act would be 27 million people in the exchanges in 2019. That number is 8 million. Competition works.

I hope my colleagues oppose this legislation, and I am ready to work in a bipartisan way to solve these problems. Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time left.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SABLAN). The Acting Chair (Mr. SABLAN) points out that the gentleman from Tennessee has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, every day in kitchens and living rooms all across America, working men and women sit down and try to figure out how to pay for their prescription drugs. That is because 25 percent of the people in this country can’t afford the medicine they have been prescribed.

Seniors are choosing between COPD and their the groceries. People with cancer are being forced to delay their treatment or cut pills in half, or even forgo treatment altogether. This is happening in the richest, most powerful nation in the history of the world. It is a disgrace.

If government is going to work for the people, then the people who serve in government need to end this crisis, and Democrats are committed to doing just that. We are taking on the big pharmaceutical companies and their lobbyists, and we are going to get the job done.

That is why I am proud that my legislation, the CREATES Act, is included in this legislative package. The CREATES Act will save taxpayers $3.9 billion, according to the CBO, and bring down the cost of some prescription drugs by as much as 85 percent.

The CREATES Act does this by directly addressing the abusive delay tactics that big drug companies use to block or delay generic competitors from entering the marketplace. Over the past decade, some of the biggest drug companies have abused regulatory protocols so they can prevent the sale of affordable drugs. This leads the American people to pay more, and it forces the American people to pay more.

The CREATES Act will create a tailored path for generic drug competitors to obtain the samples that are necessary for regulatory approval of their lower cost formulations.

I am proud that this bill is not only backed by many of our colleagues, but it also has the support of a diverse coalition of healthcare providers, patient groups, and public interest organizations, including AARP and Public Citizen. And I am proud it is included in this package today.

The majority leader in the Senate likes to describe himself as the grim reaper for Democratic legislative proposals. I hope that won’t be the case here. He needs to put the interests of the American people ahead of his obsession with fighting Democrats every step of the way.

The CREATES Act and these other proposals that are contained in this package deserve an up-or-down vote in the United States Senate. The American people deserve relief from these outrageous prescription drug prices, and this legislation will achieve that.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the distinguished Republican leader on the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 987, and I truly lament the fact that the other side is once again, under their leadership’s direction, trying to score political points instead of truly solving problems.

Republicans and Democrats agree on the need to tackle out-of-control prescription drug costs. It is an issue that touches all of our districts. People are struggling and in need of relief.

All of the names mentioned today, the illustrations, from the Speaker of the House on to my colleagues, names that were mentioned of people who are hurting and need relief from drug costs, are being let down by the Democratic leadership today.

Up until today, we have been working together on solutions. On the Energy and Commerce Committee on which I sit, as well, we passed three drug pricing bills with overwhelming bipartisan support. The CREATES Act, the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act, and the Bringing Low-cost Options and Competition while...
Keeping Incentives for New Generics Act. These bills would foster greater competition and help bring generic drugs to market as soon as possible and at more affordable prices.

Once again, they all had bipartisan support. They were bills that were good bills.

Unfortunately, the Democrats turned this bipartisan issue into a political football by adding several partisan provisions to this bill package, and they let down everyone that they have talked about today who needs affordable prescription drugs. They are costly, prohibitions that bail out failed ObamaCare programs and strip away affordable healthcare options for families.

The Democrats also rejected a number of commonsense amendments, including one I offered to protect expanded access to association health plans. These association health plans give more affordable options to workers and small businesses to purchase healthcare that fits their needs. We should be encouraging these options, not removing them.

But most of all, today should be a moment of bipartisanship, a moment of meaningful results. We had an opportunity to get something done today on behalf of our constituents who are struggling with skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. Instead, politics got in the way and we missed that opportunity.

The American people deserve better than that, and I think most of us are better than that. We stand ready to work on lowering prescription drug costs.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will talk to their leadership and put politics aside and join us in this effort. I believe we and they are better than that and, by standing up to leadership that wants to make it political, if they do that, we can get this done. I stand ready to work.

I hate to do this, Mr. Chairman. I want to keep talking about this and get a solution, but my time is up.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise and support, enthusiastically, H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Cost Act.

This omnibus bill combines three key bills to lower drug costs by promoting generic competition—long overdue—and four key bills to strengthen healthcare, reverse the GOP sabotage, and rescind the Trump administration’s devastating junk plan rule. I know full well what happens when individuals are impacted by junk plans, and they don’t have the courage they need. I encourage my good friends on the other side of the aisle to drop politics and join with us to pass this legislation.

This omnibus bill invests most of the savings of $13.8 billion created by its cracking down on junk plans into strengthening healthcare, which will fund about 500,000 additional enrollees into non-group coverage and Medicaid. Let me say to you, in 2017, due to the direct interference by the Trump administration, the number of uninsured people increased by 700,000, the first increase since implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

I know full well that Texas, which is the number one State in the number of uninsured, is experiencing the devastation of not having the expanded Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act at its fullest.

We had a roundtable discussion with people who experience diabetes. Insulin is going through the roof. These people are suffering. The average uninsured resident in my congressional district pays 23 times more for a form of insulin than people living in Australia, 15 times more than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 times more than they would in Canada. Let’s protect those with preexisting conditions, and let’s pass this bill to bring down these drugs and save the lives of our constituents.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Cost Act. This is an omnibus bill that includes the:

H.R. 938, The BLOCKING (Bringing Low-Cost Options and Competition While Keeping Incentives for New Generics) Act;

H.R. 1499, Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs of 2019;

H.R. 965, The CREATES (Creating and Restoring Equal Access to Equivalent Samples) Act; and


This omnibus bill invests most of the savings of $13.8 billion created by its cracking down on junk plans into strengthening healthcare, which will fund about 500,000 additional enrollees into non-group coverage and Medicaid, including $237 billion in direct medical costs and $90 billion in productivity losses.

Diabetes drugs, including insulin and oral medications that regulate blood sugar levels, play a critical role in helping people with diabetes manage their condition and reduce the risk of diabetes-related health complications. After the Democrats took control of the House in January we got to work on a report on the high cost of insulin and we determined that the Americans with diabetes are in crisis. Insulin—used by approximately 7.5 million Americans to treat their diabetes—was discovered nearly a century ago by Canadian researchers Frederick Banting, Charles Best, J.B. Collip, and J.J.R. Macleod, who assigned their patent to the University of Toronto with the goal of making the medication widely available.

The researchers charged $3.00 to transfer ownership of insulin to the University of Toronto. Even though insulin has been on the market for nearly 30 years, it has no meaningful generic competition.

Over the past two decades, manufacturers have systematically and dramatically raised the prices of their insulin products by more than tenfold—often in lockstep. The increases dwarf manufacturing costs.

One study found manufacturers could charge as little as $7 to $11 per month for insulin and still make a profit.
In recent years, the high prices of diabetes drugs have placed a tremendous strain on diabetes patients as well as the federal government, which provides diabetes medications to more than 43 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Reva Verma, is a type 1 diabetic who faces firsthand the struggles of managing diabetes in an era of rising insulin prices.

Diabetes is a life-threatening disease that disproportionately affects communities of color.

Diabetes is associated with serious health problems, including heart disease and stroke, kidney failure, and blindness.

There are 15,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Eighteenth Congressional District who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

These individuals are my constituents and I know that on average, each of them spend 4.8 times the cost of similar medication in Australia, 3.6 times the cost in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 times the cost in Canada.

Additionally, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, there are 191,000 uninsured residents in this district and, because they lack insurance, they often pay significantly more than their insured counterpart, or any patient overseas.

The average uninsured resident in my congressional district pays 23 more times for a form of insulin than people living in Australia. 15 more times than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 more times than they would in Canada.

The consequences of these staggering costs are not benign.

Many patients often speak of having to make wrenching decisions about what to buy with the commonly fixed incomes attendant to seniors.

Many medical professionals indicate that the high prices for prescription drugs are a function of a lack of competition, and authorizing Medicare to create a program to negotiate drug prices may be an estimable way to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

All told this reflects a disturbing trend: in our country, the cost of branded drugs tends to go up, whereas in other countries, the costs tend to go down.

These high prices lead many people to raise the question to bring generic drugs to the market sooner.

I am a person who is really particular about what I pay for medication, or do I purchase food, or school fees, or transportation to and from work?

While my home State of New York has banned the sale of short-term health insurance plans, they are legal in other states and often do not provide a comprehensive level of healthcare insurance and coverage in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, let’s do the right thing and enact legislation that will lower the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs and give protections to the consumers of health insurance coverage, lifting the burden of access and affordability from the American people.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, “sabotage” is an act or process intended to hurt or hamper. I am a person who is really particular about words, and I have heard this word used a lot. And when I look at what has happened to the Affordable Care Act over the past few years, the administration has slashed the enrollment period, we scrubbed the ACA from government websites, we have cut in-person assistance, and eliminated almost all of the educational outreach for the open enrollment period.

All of the administration’s actions were intended to deliberately damage the ACA and hamper American’s access to affordable, quality healthcare.

I don’t question people’s motivations. I think we all want the same thing. We all want healthcare for Americans. But this bill, H.R. 987, is intended to do two things. Number one, lower the cost of prescription drugs, and number two, strengthen this historic legislation, the ACA.

Today, we have an opportunity to reverse the administration’s relentless sabotage of the healthcare system and lower prescription drug prices. And as I think about individuals in my State, I think about a woman who came to me crying because of the cost of her prescription drugs.

Every one of us in here wants to see something happen. Today, we have the opportunity to make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 987.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1⁄2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the administration has not done anything that prohibits State insurance commissioners from allowing for so-called silver loading.
Let me walk you through how we got to this point. Because while silver loading has worked to keep costs on the exchange lower for folks who get subsidies, it has only been used because the President was actively trying to kill the Affordable Care Act.

In 2017, the President decided to stop reimbursing health insurance companies for what are called cost-sharing reductions, or CSRs. CSRs are payments that health insurance companies are required to make to help low- and moderate-income people afford healthcare.

Under the Affordable Care Act, the health insurance companies must help people that have more affordable, and, possibly, no co-pays or deductibles.

The Federal Government was supposed to reimburse health care providers for making these payments; however, in October of 2017, the administration stopped making these payments.

This was a deliberate attempt to make health insurance on the exchange unaffordable, and undermine, weaken, and ultimately kill the Affordable Care Act.

In response to this, States let health insurance plans do what is now called silver loading. State insurance regulators, in a desperate and creative attempt to stabilize the insurance marketplaces, allowed insurance companies to bill the unpaid CSR costs into their silver plans on the exchange. This was a very creative attempt to stabilize the insurance market.

This wasn't the solution that anyone wanted, but it is a solution that has worked and has created some stability and predictability in the insurance market in the face of an administration that seeks chaos.

Because the tax credits are benchmarked to the silver plan, silver loading has meant that most who receive subsidies did not see an increase in their health insurance premiums.

In due course, new data shows that 2.6 million healthcare.gov consumers are now paying lower premiums as a result of silver loading.

States that allowed for silver loading as a way with the manufactured chaos to placate the administration tried to inflict on the market, actually saw an increase in enrollment in the exchanges.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALITA. Mr. Chairman, the administration must stop trying to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

My amendment expresses that it is the sense of Congress that the secretary of Health and Human Services shall not do anything to prohibit the use of silver loading, a program designed by the States to stabilize the health insurance marketplace.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 45 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman enjoys the right to close.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans predicted all the bad things that have resulted from the so-called Affordable Care Act. It has not been affordable and has actually increased the cost of health insurance and care.

Unfortunately, our colleagues are so invested in supporting this legislation that they blame Republicans for its failure.

The legislation has failed because it is hopelessly flawed and cannot be fixed.

Mr. Chairman, the piece of legislation before us, as I said earlier, is a choice-limited, freedom-limiting bill, and should not pass.

I would also like to make one more observation.

My colleagues have made repeated references to junk plans. Every time they do that, they are insulting the person who has chosen that plan for one reason or another due to individual circumstances or preferences.

Just because a product isn't something I would buy, or you would buy, does that make it junk? No.

Dismissing less expensive and more flexible health plans as junk isn't talking up for anyone, it is actually putting them down.

That is not the way we should be in this country.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a final word about these junk plans.

The problem with them is that you allow them to screen for preexisting conditions and have lower benefits. That might be a good idea for the person buying the plan, but what happens is under the Affordable Care Act everybody pays anyway. If you let healthy people buy these junk plans, everybody else's premium will go up.

This sabotage has been estimated to cost 500,000 each year over the ten year period as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. Due to the methodology adopted by the Congressional Budget Office to estimate the enrollment effect of the underlying measure, the figure is more appropriately represented as increasing enrollment by about 500,000 each year over the ten year period.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 116-14, shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 987

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 "Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—LOWERING PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Subtitle A—Bringing Low-cost Options and Competition While Keeping Incentives for New Generics

Sec. 101. Change conditions of first generic exclusivity to spur access and competition.

Sec. 111. Unlawful agreements.

Sec. 114. Commission litigation authority.

Sec. 151. Determination of budgetary effects.

TITLE I—LOWERING PRESCRIPTION DRUG STABILIZATION

Sec. 101. Preserving State option to implement health care marketplaces.

Sec. 202. Providing for additional requirements with respect to the navigator program.

Sec. 203. Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities.

Sec. 204. Short-term limited duration insurance (RULING).
the value received by such subsequent filer that is reasonably attributable to the violation of this section.

(II) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining such amount, the court shall take into account—

(I) the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation;

(II) the extent to which the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of violations, the ability to pay, any effect on the ability to continue doing business, profits earned by the NDA or BLA holder, and any effect on the ability of a subsequent filer to pay, any effect on the ability to continue doing business, profits earned by the subsequent filer that received the value described in subsection (a)(1), and the amount of commerce affected; and

(III) other matters that justice requires.

(D) INJUNCTIONS AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.—In a civil action under subparagraph (A), the United States district courts are empowered to grant mandatory injunctions and such other and further equitable relief as they deem appropriate.

(4) REMEDIES IN ADDITION.—Remedies provided in this subsection are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other remedy provided by Federal law.

(g) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Commission under any other provision of Federal law.

(e) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION RULE-MAKING.—The Commission may, in its discretion, by rule promulgated under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, exempt from this section certain agreements described in subsection (a) if the Commission finds such agreements to be in furtherance of market competition and for the benefit of consumers.

(f) ANTITRUST LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, limit, or supersede the applicability of the antitrust laws as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)) with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of violations, the ability to pay, any effect on the ability to continue doing business, profits earned by the subsequent filer that received the value described in subsection (a)(1), and the amount of commerce affected; and

(i) in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who received the value described in subsection (a)(1), and the amount of commerce affected; and

(III) other matters that justice requires.

(5) NDA OR BLA HOLDER.—The term ‘‘NDA or BLA holder’’ means—

(A) the holder of—

(i) an approved new drug application filed under section 505(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) for a covered product; or

(ii) a biologics license application filed under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)) with respect to a biological product;

(B) a person owning or controlling enforcement of the patent on

(i) the list published under section 505(f)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(f)(7)) in connection with the application described in subparagraph (A)(i); or

(ii) any list published under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) comprised of patents associated with biologics license applications filed under section 351(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)); or

(C) the predecessors, subsidiaries, divisions, groups, and affiliates controlled by, controlling, or under common control with any entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) (such control to be presumed to exist if the controlling person owns or controls an application filed with the Food and Drug Administration under section 505(b)(1) or a published patent application).

3. PATENT.—The term ‘‘patent’’ means a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(T) STATUTORY EXCLUSIVITY.—The term ‘‘statutory exclusivity’’ means those prohibitions on the submission or approval of drug applications under clauses (ii) through (iv) of section 505(g)(3)(E) (5- and 3-year exclusivity, clauses (II) through (IV) of section 505(b)(2)(B)(iv) (180-day exclusivity), section 527 (orphan drug exclusivity), section 505(j)(5)(F)(ii) (interchangeability biological product exclusivity), and section 505(d)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(j)(2)) that prohibit the submission or licensing of biologics license applications under section 351(k)(6) (interchangeable biological product exclusivity), section 351(k)(7) (biological product reference product exclusivity) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)(6), (7)).

(B) SUBSEQUENT FILER.—The term ‘‘subsequent filer’’ means—

(A) in the case of a drug, a party that owns or controls an approved new drug application submitted pursuant to section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)) or a new drug application submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(2)) and filed under section 505(b)(1) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) or has the exclusive rights to distribute the covered product that is the subject of such application; or

(B) in the case of a biological product, a party that owns or controls an application filed with the Food and Drug Administration under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) that has the exclusive rights to distribute the biological product that is the subject of such application.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies with respect to agreements described in subsection (a) entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 112. NOTICE AND CERTIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS.

(a) NOTICE OF AGREEMENTS.—Section 1111(7) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (21 U.S.C. 355 note) is amended by inserting ‘‘or the owner of a patent for which a claim of infringement could reasonably be asserted against any person for making, using, offering for sale, selling, or importing into the United States a biological product that is the subject of a biosimilar biological product application’’ before the period at the end.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS.—Section 1112 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355 note) is amended by adding at the end following:

‘‘(d) CERTIFICATION.—The Chief Executive Officer or the company official responsible for negotiating any agreement under subsection (a) or (b) that is required to be filed under subsection (c) shall, within 30 days of such filing, execute and file with the Assistant Attorney General and the Commission a certification as follows: ‘‘I declare that the following is true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge: The materials filed with the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice pursuant to section 1112 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, with respect to the agreement referenced in this certification—

(i) embrace the complete, final, and exclusive agreement between the parties; ‘‘

(ii) include any ancillary agreements that are contingent upon, provide a contingent condition for, were entered into within 30 days of, or are otherwise related to, the referenced agreement; and

(iii) include written descriptions of any oral agreements, representations, or promises between the parties that are responsive to subsection (a) or (b) of such section 1112 and have not been reduced to writing.’’.’’

SEC. 113. FORFEITURE OF 180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD.

Section 505(g)(3)(D)(ii)(V) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(g)(3)(D)(ii)(V)) is amended by inserting ‘‘section 111 of the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act or’’ after ‘‘that the agreement has violated’’.

SEC. 114. COMMISSION LITIGATION AUTHORITY.

Section 16(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 56(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘or’’ after the semicolon,

(2) in subparagraph (E), by inserting ‘‘or’’ after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

‘‘(F) under section 111(d)(2)(A) of the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act;’’.

SEC. 115. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

In section 5(d)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) for violation of section 111 of this Act and the proceeding for the issuance of such order was commenced within the period required by section 1112(c) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (21 U.S.C. 355 note) does not prohibit the commencement, after such period, of a civil action under section...
Subtitle C—Creating and Restoring Equal Access to Equivalent Samples

Section 121. APPROVAL DELAYS OF GENERIC DRUGS AND BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(A) the term ‘‘commercially reasonable, market-based terms’’ means—

(i) a nondiscriminatory price for the sale of the covered product at or below, but not greater than, the most recent wholesale acquisition cost for the drug, as defined in section 1841c(c)(6)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395s–7(j)(9));

(B) a schedule for delivery that results in the transfer of the covered product to the eligible product developer consistent with the timing under subsection (b)(2)(A)(i); and

(C) no additional conditions are imposed on the sale of the covered product;

(2) the term ‘‘covered product’’—

(A) means—

(i) any drug approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262);

(ii) a supply of a drug or biological product described in clause (i); or

(iii) when reasonably necessary to support approval of an application under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262), as applicable, or otherwise meet the requirements for approval under either such section, any product, including any device, that is marketed or intended for use with such a drug or biological product; and

(B) does not include any drug or biological product on the drug shortage list in effect under section 506E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 356e), unless—

(i) the drug or biological product has been on the drug shortage list in effect under such section 506E continuously for more than 6 months; or

(ii) the Secretary determines that inclusion of the drug or biological product as a covered product is likely to contribute to alleviating or preventing a shortage by the eligible product developer.

(3) the term ‘‘device’’ has the meaning given in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) the term ‘‘eligible product developer’’ means a person that seeks to develop a product for approval pursuant to an application for approval under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or for licensing pursuant to an application under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k));

(5) the term ‘‘license holder’’ means the holder of an application approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or the holder of a license under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) for a covered product;

(6) the term ‘‘REMS’’ means a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1); and

(7) the term ‘‘REMS with ETASU’’ means a REMS that contains elements to assure safe use under section 505–1(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1(f)) and

(8) the term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(9) the term ‘‘single, shared system of elements to assure safe use’’ means a single, shared system of elements to assure safe use under section 505–1(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1(f)); and

(a) conduct testing to support an application under—

(i) subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355); or

(ii) section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)); and

(b) fulfill any regulatory requirements relating to approval of such an application.

B. CIVIL ACTION FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT QUANTITIES OF A COVERED PRODUCT

I. IN GENERAL.—An eligible product developer may bring a civil action against the license holder for a covered product seeking relief under this subsection in any district court of the United States alleging that the license holder has failed to provide sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms.

II. REMEDIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To prevail in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), an eligible product developer shall prove, by a preponderance of the evidence—

(I) that—

(aa) the covered product is not subject to a REMS with ETASU; or

(bb) the eligible product developer has provided a copy of the REMS with ETASU to the eligible product developer; and

(ii) that, as of the date on which the civil action is filed, the product developer has not obtained sufficient quantities of the covered product for purposes of—

(aa) conducting testing to support an application for marketing approval under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv); and

(bb) the eligible product developer has provided a copy of the REMS with ETASU to the eligible product developer at commercially reasonable, market-based terms; and

(iii) that the eligible product developer has requested to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product from the license holder; and

(iv) that the license holder has not delivered to the eligible product developer sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms—

(aa) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 31 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received the request for the covered product; and

(bb) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, by 31 days after the later of—

(aa) the date on which the eligible product developer received the request for the covered product; or

(bb) the date on which the license holder received a copy of the REMS with ETASU from the Secretary.

(B) AUTHORIZATION FOR COVERED PRODUCT SUBJECT TO REIMS WITH ETASU

I. REQUEST.—An eligible product developer may submit to the Secretary a written request for the eligible product developer to be authorized to obtain sufficient quantities of an individual covered product subject to a REMS with ETASU.

II. AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a request under clause (i) is received, the Secretary shall, by written notice, authorize the eligible product developer to obtain sufficient quantities of an individual covered product subject to a REMS with ETASU for purposes of—

(I) development and testing that does not involve human clinical trials, if the eligible product developer has agreed to comply with any conditions the Secretary determines necessary; or

(ii) development and testing that involves human clinical trials, if the eligible product developer has—

(a) submitted protocols, informed consent documents, and informational materials for testing that include protections that provide safety protections comparable to those provided by the REMS for the covered product; or

(bb) otherwise satisfied the Secretary that such protections will be provided; and

(b) any other requirements the Secretary may establish.

III. NOTICE.—A covered product authorization issued under this subparagraph shall state that the provision of the covered product by the license holder under the terms of the authorization will not be a violation of the REMS for the covered product.

IV. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), it shall be an affirmative defense, on which the defendant bears the burden of persuasion by a preponderance of the evidence—

(A) that, on the date on which the eligible product developer requested to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product from the license holder—

(i) neither the license holder nor any of its agents, wholesalers, or distributors was engaged in the manufacturing or commercial marketing of the covered product; or

(ii) neither the license holder nor any of its agents, wholesalers, or distributors otherwise had access to inventory of the covered product to supply to the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms; and

(B) that—

(i) the license holder sells the covered product through agents, distributors, or wholesalers;

(ii) the license holder has placed no restrictions, explicit or implicit, on its agents, distributors, or wholesalers to sell covered products to eligible product developers; and

(iii) the covered product can be purchased by the eligible product developer in sufficient quantities commercially reasonable, market-based terms from the agents, distributors, or wholesalers of the license holder; or

(C) that the license holder made an offer to sell sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer at commercially reasonable market-based terms—

(i) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 14 days after the date on which the license holder received the request for the covered product, and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 20 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder; or

(ii) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 20 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received the request for the covered product, and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 19 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder.

V. METHODS FOR TRANSMISSION OF REQUESTS FOR COVERED PRODUCT SUBJECT TO REIMS WITH ETASU

A. SUBMITTED TO SECRETARY.

B. PERSONAL DELIVERY.

C. ELECTRONIC MEANS.

VI. REMEDIES.—

A. IN GENERAL.—If an eligible product developer prevails in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the court shall—

(i) order the license holder to provide the eligible product developer with the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(ii) award to the eligible product developer reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of the civil action; and

(iii) order the eligible product developer to pay the license holder a monetary amount sufficient to deter the license holder from taking a similar action in the future.
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holder from failing to provide eligible product developers with sufficient quantities of a covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms, if the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the license holder failed to comply with an order issued under clause (1).

(II) that the license holder delayed providing sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer without a legitimate business reason.

(II) that the license holder failed to comply with an order issued under clause (I).

(B) maximum monetary amount—A monetary award awarded under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall not be greater than the revenue that the license holder earned on the covered product during the period—

(i) beginning on—

(I) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the date on which the license holder received the request; or

(II) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the later of—

(aa) the date on which the license holder received the request; or

(bb) the date on which the license holder received a copy of the covered product authorization issued by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2)(B); and

(ii) ending on the date on which the eligible product developer received sufficient quantities of the covered product.

(C) avoidance of delay—The court may issue an order under subparagraph (A)(i) before conducting further proceedings that may be necessary to determine whether the eligible product developer is entitled to an award under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A), or the amount of any such award.

(d) limitation of liability—A license holder for a covered product shall not be liable for any civil action, State, or local law arising out of the failure of an eligible product developer to follow adequate safeguards to assure safe use of the covered product during development or testing activities described in this section, including transportation, handling, use, or disposal of the covered product by the eligible product developer.

(e) no violation of REMS—Section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) avoid samples not a violation of strategy. The provision of samples of a covered product to an eligible product developer (as those terms are defined in section 121(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12)) and of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 5) to the extent that such section applies to unfair methods of competition.

(f) anti-trust laws—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the operation of any provision of the anti-trust laws.

SEC. 123. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) in general—Nothing in this subtitle, the amendments made by this subtitle, or in section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1), shall be construed as—

(i) prohibiting a license holder from providing an eligible product developer access to a covered product in the absence of an authorization under this subtitle; or

(ii) in any way limiting the applicability of a REMS with ETASU, as otherwise required under section 505–1, with respect to such covered product.

(b) definitions—In this section, the terms “covered product”, “eligible product developer”, “license holder”, and “REMS with ETASU” have the meanings given such terms in section 121(c).

SEC. 201. PRESERVING STATE OPTION TO IMPLEMENT HEALTH CARE MARKET STABILIZATION

(a) in general—Section 1311 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “under this subsection” and inserting “under this paragraph or paragraph (1)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

“(6) ADDITIONAL PLANNING AND ESTABLISHMENT GRANTS.—(A) in general.—There shall be appropriated to the Secretary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $200,000,000 to award grants to eligible States for the uses described in paragraph (3).

(B) duration and renewability.—A grant awarded under subparagraph (A) shall be for a period of two years and may be renewed.

(C) limitation.—A grant may not be awarded under subparagraph (A) after December 31, 2022.

(b) eligible state defined.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘eligible State’ means a State that, as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph, is not operating an Exchange pursuant to section 155.200(f) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(c) exchange for general.—In establishing an Exchange under this section (other than in establishing an Exchange pursuant to a grant awarded under subsection (a)(6)); and

(b) by adding the following:

“(ii) additional planning and establishment grants.—In establishing an Exchange pursuant to a grant awarded under subsection (a)(6) or (a)(7).”;

(d) for additional requirements with respect to the navigator program.—

(a) in general.—Section 1311(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” and inserting “, and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking “the” and inserting “an”;

(3); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) NAVIGATION CENTER.—In awarding grants under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) select entities to receive such grants based on the entity’s demonstrated capacity to carry out each of the duties specified in paragraph (3);

(ii) not take into account whether or not the entity has demonstrated how the entity will provide information to individuals relating to group health plans offered by a group or association of employers described in section 2503 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(iii) consider an entity’s record with respect to waste, fraud, and abuse for purposes of maintaining the integrity of such Exchange.”;

SEC. 202. PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE NAVIGATOR PROGRAM.

(a) in general.—Section 1311(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” and inserting “, and”;

(2) by striking “the” and inserting “an”;

(3); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) NAVIGATION CENTER.—In awarding grants under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) select entities to receive such grants based on the entity’s demonstrated capacity to carry out each of the duties specified in paragraph (3);

(ii) not take into account whether or not the entity has demonstrated how the entity will provide information to individuals relating to group health plans offered by a group or association of employers described in section 2503 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(iii) consider an entity’s record with respect to waste, fraud, and abuse for purposes of maintaining the integrity of such Exchange.”;

SEC. 203. PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE NAVIGATOR PROGRAM.

(a) in general.—Section 1311(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” and inserting “, and”;

(2) by striking “the” and inserting “an”;

(3); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) NAVIGATION CENTER.—In awarding grants under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) select entities to receive such grants based on the entity’s demonstrated capacity to carry out each of the duties specified in paragraph (3);

(ii) not take into account whether or not the entity has demonstrated how the entity will provide information to individuals relating to group health plans offered by a group or association of employers described in section 2503 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(iii) consider an entity’s record with respect to waste, fraud, and abuse for purposes of maintaining the integrity of such Exchange.”;
Such amount for a fiscal year shall remain available for the fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year.

Section 1321(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Labor may not take any action to implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the rule entitled “Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance” (83 Fed. Reg. 38212 (August 3, 2018)), and the Secretaries may not promulgate any substantially similar rule.

**TITLe III—BUDGETary EFFECTS**

**SEC. 301. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETary EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

**AMErican AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFErED BY Mr. PALLOne**

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-61. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**RANGE RULE PROHIBITION**

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-61.

**Agenda Item No. 1 Offered by Mr. Pallone**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, strike lines 8 through 11 and insert the following:

(iii) that the eligible product developer has submitted a written request to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product to the license holder and such request—

(I) was sent to a named corporate officer of the license holder; and

(II) was made by certified or registered mail with return receipt requested; and

(iii) specified an individual as the point of contact who can provide direct communications related to the sale of the covered product to the eligible product developer and a means for electronic and written communications with that individual; and

(IV) specified an address to which the covered product was to be shipped upon reaching an agreement to transfer the covered product; and

Page 32, strike lines 15 through 18 and insert the following:

(C) that the license holder made an offer to the individual specified pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(II)(B), by means of communication (electronic, written, or both) specified pursuant to such paragraph, to sell sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer at commercially reasonable market-based terms—
Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman. I am very disappointed that my Republican colleagues want to strike all of the ACA stabilization measures that we passed through our committee.

These are important bills that should have strong bipartisan support, but, unfortunately, my Republican colleagues continue to be unwilling to work together on commonsense proposals that would lower healthcare costs for consumers.

Funding for outreach and advertising, why is this even controversial to my Republican colleagues? Outreach and advertising are critical to ensuring that people know about the option to enroll in comprehensive coverage.

We know that last year just one in four uninsured people who buy their own insurance were aware of the open enrollment season and the deadline to enroll in coverage.

Another commonsense proposal to lower healthcare costs is to provide funds to States to set up State-based marketplaces. Again, why is this controversial? Over the last few years, State-based marketplaces have had lower premiums and better enrollment than the Federal marketplace.

Enrollment on healthcare.gov has declined since the Trump administration’s sabotage. Enrollment in the State-based marketplaces has actually increased. The navigator funding provisions the Republicans are trying to strike from the bill, again, this is a program to help hard-to-reach individuals sign up for comprehensive coverage.

Finally, the Republicans want to remove protection that would block the Trump administration’s expansion of junk insurance plans that discriminate against people with preexisting conditions.

I really can’t understand why my Republican colleagues who claim to support protections for preexisting conditions want to defend these plans that discriminate against preexisting conditions and put consumers at extreme financial risk, other than the fact this is a Trump administration initiative, so they don’t want to oppose it.

In addition to discriminating against people with preexisting conditions, these plans exclude coverage for many important benefits, such as maternity care. And even when you think you are covered, if you get sick while you are on one of these, the insurance companies find a way to avoid paying the bills.

So in closing, this amendment demonstrates what we all know clearly: that Republicans don’t want to do anything to actually help lower healthcare costs for Americans or safeguard preexisting condition protections.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the third time today I have heard the word ‘sabotage’ so that must be the new operative word coming from my colleagues across the aisle.

I would submit to you, I will turn the tape back because if there is someone trying to sabotage the effort of lowering healthcare prices, it is you.

Our chairman on the other side, however, I think genuinely wanted to lower the healthcare prices when the bills came out in a bipartisan fashion which was universally adopted by us. But someplace from the time they left Energy and Commerce to the time they came to the floor, they were put into something that the Senate has already indicated they have no appetite for.

So if we truly want to lower healthcare prices in this vote, then it is a ‘yes’ vote. But if you want to sabotage this legislation, you go right ahead and do what you have to do.

So I know, Mr. Chairman, there were good efforts here, bipartisan efforts to try to get something done. It looks like something has crept in to cause a problem.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to turn back the sabotage of the Trump administration on people’s healthcare for the folks back home who we represent. The Trump administration has done everything they can to make it more expensive, whether we are talking about prescription drugs or that all-important health insurance policy.

Don’t just take it from me and my Democratic colleagues. Take it from folks who are on the side of our families day in and day out: the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association. I could go on and on.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD letters from over 20 health groups that represent our families back home who say: Pass this bill.

May 15, 2019.

Hon. Kathy CASTOR. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Representative CASTOR: The 23 undersigned organizations, representing millions of American patients, providers, and consumers, write today in strong support of H.R. 1010, To provide that the rule entitled “Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance” “shall have no force or effect,” which is now included in H.R. 987. Our organizations strongly support providing protections for patients from short-term, limited-duration (5 or 9 months) or short-term, limited-stay prevent action on implementing or enforcing the “Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance” final rule (83 FR 38222, published August 3, 2018).

Our organizations remain concerned about this final rule which expands the maximum...
duration of short-term health insurance plans from three months to 364 days. Previously, short-term plans were available to fill a temporary gap in coverage, such as gaps in coverage. However, during the time they were finalized, the growth and availability of these products continues to threaten patients with pre-existing conditions. Insurers offering these policies can either deny coverage or charge higher premiums to individuals with pre-existing conditions. Expanding access to these policies could cause premiums in the marketplace to increase, as younger and healthier individuals choose to enroll in the short-term plans. This forces individuals with serious or chronic conditions into a smaller, sicker risk pool to obtain the coverage they need to manage their health. Premiums for these comprehensive plans would likely skyrocket, making insurance unaffordable.

Short-term plans also lack patient protections guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act (ACA), severely impacting individuals with serious or chronic health conditions. Plan providers are permitted to consider pre-existing conditions and deny coverage, charge higher premiums, or not cover certain care and treatments. After enrolling in a short-term plan, providers are permitted to rescind or amend coverage based on new health issues. Short-term plans are not required to cover all of the Essential Health Benefits (EHBS) categories outlined in the ACA, allowing individual carriers to create a smaller, sicker risk pool. Segmented in this way, the market will result in increased premiums for comprehensive ACA-compliant plans in the marketplace, decreasing marketplace stability, and reducing affordable access to insurance.

H. R. 1010 would both protect patients and consumers and insulate products and assist in stabilizing the marketplace. The decreased up-front costs of short-term plans may be more appealing to younger, healthier individuals, thus driving the individual marketplace risk pool. Segmenting the market in this way will result in increased premiums for comprehensive ACA-compliant plans in the marketplace, decreasing marketplace stability, and reducing affordable access to insurance.

It is for these reasons we enthusiastically endorse your legislation and urge Congress to act swiftly to limit the sale of short-term insurance plans. People with pre-existing conditions need access to adequate, affordable, and predictable health insurance. Again, our organizations thank you for your leadership on this critical issue for people with pre-existing conditions and support your efforts to expand access to affordable health insurance.

Sincerely,
American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network
Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chair, I would like to revise my remarks made during debate of amendment No. 2 of H.R. 987, offered by Mr. McKINLEY. In my remarks, I stated that the marketing and outreach programs under Title II of H.R. 987 would increase enrollment into health plans by five million over the ten year period as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. Due to the methodology adopted by the Congressional Budget Office to estimate the enrollment effect of the underlying measure, the figure is more appropriately represented as increasing enrollment by about 500,000 each year over the ten year period.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McKINLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following new section:

SEC. 205. PROTECTION OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE IN CERTAIN EXCHANGES.

In the case of an Exchange that the Secretary of Health and Human Services operates pursuant to section 1321(o)(1) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18041(o)(1)), the Secretary may not implement any process that would terminate the health insurance coverage of an enrollee solely because such enrollee did not actively enroll during the most recent open enrollment period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which I will describe in a moment, is about improving and preserving the Affordable Care Act. The word “sabotage” has been used here. We don’t need that word. We have a very straightforward, very transparent difference of view.

The Democrats supported and passed the Affordable Care Act. We have been defending it for years. The Republicans opposed it. President Trump made it a campaign pledge to get rid of it, and they came within a vote in the Senate, except for John McCain, of repealing the law altogether.

We don’t have to use words that are pejorative. We think we should have the Affordable Care Act. We think we should make it stronger, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to vote against it and now want to repeal it.

One of the ways to make the Affordable Care Act effective is to have automatic reenrollment. If a family is in the Affordable Care Act and the time for reenrollment comes up, if they take no action, then they are automatically reenrolled in the plan that they are already in.

If you take away the automatic reenrollment, folks fall off, oftentimes for no particular reason. They were doing other things; they didn’t notice it; they didn’t have the time; or they didn’t get to a navigator. There are lots of things that come between automatic reenrollment and picking your own plan.

By the way, studies have shown that automatic reenrollment, like automatic withdrawal to go into your retirement account, is very, very effective.

The President has indicated a desire to get rid of the automatic reenrollment program. He hasn’t done that yet. This amendment would prohibit him from doing so.

The reason why the administration would like to get rid of automatic reenrollment. The evidence suggests that that would mean about 2 million Americans would then lose access to their healthcare because they hadn’t reenrolled.

We don’t want that to happen. We want those American families who depend on the healthcare that they have to continue receiving that healthcare next year just like they received it this year.

This amendment makes it very clear that that automatic reenrollment program would continue to be part of the Affordable Care Act.

Keep in mind, it in no way limits the ability of a family or an individual to decide to get into a different plan or to affirmatively say they don’t want to be in any plan. That can still happen. There is total and complete freedom of choice, but it gives security. It is going to be very beneficial to about 2 million American families.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DeSaulnier) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2379. An act to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1208. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to penalties to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. Cox of California). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, we just have a difference of opinion. We think the Affordable Care Act is important to preserve and important to improve. My colleagues, when they have had an opportunity, have voted to repeal it.

Failing to repeal it, what the Trump administration has done is chip away at it. We don’t want the administration to be able to get rid of automatic reenrollment, which would likely result in the loss of 2 million families having access to healthcare.

There has been a number of other things that have happened: slashing funding, slashing funding for consumer outreach and enrollment education by 90 percent, cutting back the uninsured rate for 4 years, and 1.1 million Americans losing coverage last year.

In the latest ACA marketplace final rule, the administration openly contemplated getting rid of this automatic reenrollment. This amendment protects the automatic reenrollment. It is going to protect continued access to care under the Affordable Care Act for 2 million Americans.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, it is great being on the floor with a lot of my friends on the Energy and Commerce Committee and my colleagues across the aisle. Obviously, we have a fundamental disagreement. As someone from southern Illinois, one of the biggest questions I always got and concerns was that ObamaCare plans are too expensive, and the deductibles
are too high, so we can’t use them. Hence, no one wanted to use them.

Part of the change in the political landscape because of that was Republicans controlled the House. That is what happened politically. Here we are, and now I have labeled this point all day. Mr. Chairman, about what we are trying to do. We are trying to lower the cost of prescription drugs, but we have to go back to this ObamaCare debate.

Republicans control the Senate. They are not going to bring it up. The President is not going to sign the bill. It is instructional to have this debate. We understand it. We will eventually come back, and we will address these prescription drug bills. We will get there, but we have to go through this exercise. I understand that.

The three bills that we could vote on and pass right now, probably on a suspension calendar and a voice vote, would be the three prescription drug bills included in the first part of this package. Those are the CREATES Act, the Protecting Consumers’ Access to Generic Drugs Act, and the Bringing Low-cost Options and Competition while Keeping Incentives for New Generics Act, called the BLOCKING Act.

That is what we could be doing today, that and some other things. We hope that what we will be addressing will make major changes in affordability, transparency, and the like.

My colleagues also point out the numerous votes to repeal or replace parts of ObamaCare. I am proud to say I voted for all of them. The facts state that a lot of Democrats supported these, to fundamentally change provisions of ObamaCare.

In fact, 30 of the bills my friends are citing were signed into law. Twenty-one of those bills were signed into law by President Obama. Of the 30 that were signed into law, Speaker PELOSI voted for 21. These are part of the 60 bills that would repeal and replace, and we have 21, and 19 were voted for by Speaker PELOSI. Leader HOYER voted “yes” on 21 of them. My friend Chairman PALLONE voted on 20 of them.

Here are the examples that we want to lay out: repealing the unworkable and unsustainable CLASS Act, rescinding billions of dollars for the failed ObamaCare co-op program, delaying the medical device tax, cutting funding to the Independent Payment Advisory Board, providing regulatory and financial relief from ObamaCare’s requirements for small business and independent contractors, requiring accurate income verification before disbursing subsidies to ObamaCare exchanges, and modifying eligibility for ObamaCare exchange subsidies.

We can have this tit for tat, Mr. Chairman, as there will still not be able to defend ObamaCare. We will always say that the private market is better to provide lower cost and rapid response. It is an ideological fight.

We will get through this debate. We will eventually come back and address these prescription drug issues that, as I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, we probably would pass on a voice vote once we return to this.

I thank my colleagues. I have great respect for my colleague from Vermont. He is a very sincere and good friend. We look forward to debating this more in the future.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-61.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is as follows:

Page 47, line 24, strike “Section 1231(c)” and insert:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1231(c)

Page 49, after line 18, insert the following:

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall release to Congress all aggregated documents relating to studies and data sets that were created on or after January 1, 2014, and related to marketing and outreach efforts. The studies and data sets must be with respect to qualified health plans offered through Exchanges under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment designed to ensure that Congress is able to review the Department of Health and Human Services’ own analysis of the ACA’s marketing and outreach programs.

In April of this year, I led a letter signed by 30 of my House colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee requesting HHS disclose any studies and related marketing and outreach efforts for the ACA. HHS and CMS have had more than 50 days to respond to this request and provide crucial documents to the public and Congress. The lack of response confirms our concerns about transparency and commitment to implementing the current law.

While estimates vary, it is clear that marketing and outreach efforts created by the ACA could significantly improve the lives of tens of thousands of Americans. Many of these Americans are simply unaware of the health insurance and financial assistance options available to them. HHS and CMS have the power and obligation to assist the public in understanding these options.

My colleagues would agree that HHS and CMS also have the obligation to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars by doing this effectively. Because of this, I sent a follow-up letter requesting that these documents be released without delay.

The results of this study need to be made public so that Congress can enact effective policy that reaches our common goal of quality and affordable health insurance for all Americans.

Simply put, public awareness of the ACA isn’t as high as folks are made to believe, and the ACA’s marketing and outreach program was an effective tool in helping Americans make informed decisions for their families.

According to Joshua Peck, a former senior adviser at CMS who oversaw the marketing program, the private sector spends between $250 and $1,000 per enrollment. How much did it cost the Federal Government? Twenty-nine dollars.

It costs government just $29 to enroll someone in the individual marketplace using TV ads. That is a good use of taxpayer dollars.

July 2018 Government Accountability Office report on ACA outreach and enrollment even cites the HHS’ study, which looked at the most cost-effective forms of advertising for new and returning enrollees. The GAO found that the study named television ads as one of the best forms of advertising for enrolling Americans. Despite objective, fact-based analysis, the administration eliminated these ads.

Mr. Chairman, I support the underlying legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and make clear that HHS should be transparent and release these studies.

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and also support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
ObamaCare plans to 1332 waivers within the States, which we think is a good deal.

Part of the debate on this is: Let’s pump more money in and maybe these people will stay in these failed ObamaCare plans and we reject that. We reject it based upon what we have done with Medicare Advantage and Medicare part D.

The executive branch has said: Let’s spend the same amount of money that we do for Medicare part D and Medicare Advantage, which have much higher enrollment than the ObamaCare exchanges.

So we think that is appropriate. We do think that, with $100 million or more to try to get people to buy a product and you see enrollment go down, that is not a good use of money.

Mr. Chair, with that, we would ask for a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle D—Study on Role of Federal Assistance in Drug Development

SEC. 131. STUDY ON ROLE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN DRUG DEVELOPMENT.

(a) In general.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Health and Human Services shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Medicine to conduct a study on such revenue and profits the Secretary, in consultation with the National Academy of Medicine, recommends should be returned to Federal entities for Federal funding used in the development of the drugs involved.

(1) The percentage of drugs developed in the United States using at least some amount of Federal funding from any Federal source.

(2) The average cost incurred by a drug developer to develop a drug.

(3) The average amount of revenue and profits made by drug developers from the sales of drugs.

(4) The percentage of such revenue and profits that are reinvested into research and development of new drugs.

(5) The appropriate percentage, if any, of such revenue and profits the Secretary, in consultation with the National Academy of Medicine, recommends should be returned to Federal entities for Federal funding used in the development of the drugs involved.

(b) Enforcement.—A drug developer shall, as a condition of receipt of any Federal funding for the development of drugs, comply with any request for the data necessary to perform the study required under subsection (a).

(c) Confidentiality.—This section does not authorize the disclosure of any trade secret, confidential commercial or financial information, or other matter listed in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) The term “drug” has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(2) The term “drug developer” means an entity that submitted, and received approval of, an application under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to find information that will help with the high cost of prescription drugs in the United States, to help inform this institution and the American public.

Mr. Chair, I have a form of incurable blood cancer. In my pocket is a pill I take every day that keeps me alive. It costs $500 a day.

Most of the research that developed this pill was through Department of Defense and the National Institutes for Health. American taxpayers did the basic research.

Earlier today, we had a long hearing in the Committee on Oversight of a similar situation where most of the development for an HIV lifesaving drug was developed at the University of California in San Francisco with NIH funding and no funding from the drug supplier that is now making billions of dollars.

What my amendment does is direct the Academy of Medicine to get the information to differentiate what is basic taxpayer healthcare and how much that contributes to these billions of dollars of profits of pharmaceutical companies.

It is not to say that these private investments are not good, but are they low risk and high reward or are they high risk and high reward? That is to say: as we are getting a really high risk based on what the taxpayers have done in investment?

All this amendment does is direct the Academy of Medicine to come back with that information.

We hear arguments from our Republican colleagues often that we need these investments in private-sector pharmaceutical companies. I don’t disagree, but we need to know what portion of it is actually returning a reasonable rate of return. We want to attract those investments.

Absent this kind of information, it is just a political opinion and argument. My amendment would get to that information that is so important to this debate.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chair, I would hope that all the Members would support this amendment. It provides us valuable information by a source that we all value, the National Academy of Medicine, and it will get to this argument that my colleagues across the aisle have an amendment at the desk.

If their argument is right, then the public and the Congress will see it; it will be verified. If it is different—and I believe it is—we will start looking at the real value of private investment and the return on investment that is due the American public.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I don’t know why my colleague is speaking for himself, but I think it is instructive to our citizens as a whole that Members come from across this great land and have a lot of different issues. I think it is instructive that even Members of Congress can be fighting illnesses and need life-saving medicine to do that.

I don’t think we are fundamentally opposed to the amendment. We don’t think it does exactly what the author is claiming it will do.

In this package, in this bill, it is not, obviously, going to go anywhere because the President is not going to sign this bill. It is not going to go through the Senate.

Mr. Chair, I would encourage my colleague to come back and visit with us so that we start moving something that can get bipartisan agreement that I think would be very instructive in looking at this as an addition.

Now, I am speaking for myself, not for the ranking member of the full committee, because the gentleman is right that we need to have information. And when government is helpful in creating the initial science that then goes over to the private sector, that then goes to creating blockbuster drugs, then we should know, kind of, the skin in the game, Mr. Chairman, and how much that is due to good Federal policy by not just legislators, but also our agencies that help push that research by NIH or the CDC or the National Cancer Institute.

Had this bill been brought and the three prescription drug transparency lower cost options been brought to the floor, as I said before—and I am not going to restate this every amendment debate—but we probably would have had a voice vote and we could have gone out for dinner. But it is attached to the ObamaCare rescue mission, which we think the public has already rejected.

So we will get through this process, but I would encourage my colleague to join with the chairman of the committee and Republicans in looking at what we can do on this provision in the future.

Mr. Chair, I would ask my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).
The amendment was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HARDER OF CALIFORNIA**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 46, beginning on line 17, amend clause (ii) to read as follows:

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

Page 46, line 20, strike “clause” and insert “clauses”:

Page 46, line 23, strike the period and the end quotes.

Page 46, after line 23, insert the following:

“(iv) receive opioid specific education and training that ensures the navigator can best educate individuals on qualified health plans offered through an Exchange, specifically educate individuals on qualified health plans offered through an Exchange, specifically

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

Families in my district, in the California Central Valley, need prescription drugs to go down in cost now, and they need access to care for every condition, including mental health and treatment for substance use disorders.

That is exactly what my amendment is going to help with. The navigators that help folks understand healthcare through the exchanges are great, but they need additional tools to make sure folks struggling with opioid addiction have access to the care that they need. My amendment gives them just that.

In most communities I visit, I hear from someone who has been touched by the opioid epidemic, and I am no exception. When I was in high school, I had a friend who was in a tough family situation, so I drove him to school every day for 2 years. He was one of the best golfers I ever met, had an amazing sense of humor. But, after graduating, he developed an addiction to opiates, and about 5 years ago we lost him to an overdose.

Stories like my friend’s are far too common. About 130 Americans die every single day from opiate overdose. Folks with substance use disorder deserve access to care just like everyone else, and every person in this country deserves prescription drugs that they can actually afford.

It is for my friend and for our loved ones all across the country who have struggled with that that I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I would reserve the balance of my time unless my colleague yielded back.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has the only time remaining.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I appreciate my colleague coming down to the floor, especially when, in his opening statement, he says he wants drug costs to go down now.

It is not going to happen now because it is in a package that is not going to be accepted by the Senate and the President is not going to sign.

So, if we really want drug prices to go down now, we would have done what we did out of the full committee. We would have packaged this up with H.R. 965, the CREATES Act, which is a bipartisan agreement that is part of this bill, which would penalize branded drugmakers that withhold samples from generic manufacturers.

We would have brought to the floor, either separately or in a package, H.R. 1099, the Providing Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act, bipartisan out of the committee. This would ban pay-for-delay agreements, which are a problem.

And we would have brought up H.R. 938, the Bringing Low-cost Options and Competition while Keeping Incentives for New Generics, which is called the BLOCKING Act, which would limit the first-approved generic maker’s ability to stall another rival’s launch.

I think we all want to get there. I think we will get there. We still are going to go through this process. But, make no mistake, this is not going to be signed into law that we can go down to the White House for a ceremony.

Again, I would encourage my colleagues to work with the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my friend Frank Pallone, and we can address the issues that other processes are not bringing the bipartisan bill to the floor that would address a lot of other colleagues’ concerns and really work on a bipartisan agreement that, then, by that bipartisan approach, the Senate would have to really look at seriously, and, hopefully, we would convince the President to sign the bill.

I am just a simple man from southern Illinois, taught high school civics: two Chambers, President has got to sign the bill. Sometimes when we use all this time, it is for other purposes than really trying to have a bill become law.

So, with that, I would ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

**AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 116–61.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following new section:

**SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE PRACTICE OF SILVER LOADING.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not take any action to prohibit or otherwise restrict the practice commonly known as “silver loading” (as described in the rule entitled “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2020” published on April 23, 2019 (84 Fed. Reg. 17533)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this amendment expresses a sense of Congress that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not do anything that prohibits State insurance commissioners from allowing for so-called silver loading.

Let me walk you through how we got to this point because, while silver loading has worked to keep costs on the exchanges lower for people who get subsidies, it has only been used because the administration was actively trying to kill the Affordable Care Act.

In 2017, the administration decided to stop reimbursing health insurance companies for what are called cost-sharing reductions, CSRs. CSRs are payments that health insurance companies are required to make to help low- and moderate-income people afford healthcare.

Under the Affordable Care Act, health insurance companies must help people have more affordable and, possibly, no copays or deductibles. The Federal Government was supposed to reimburse insurance providers for making these payments. However, in October of 2017, the administration stopped making these payments. This was a deliberate attempt to make health insurance on the exchanges unaffordable and to undermine, weaken, and attack the Affordable Care Act.

In response to this, the States, bipartisan States, including my own, let insurance plans do what is now called “silver loading.”
State insurance regulators, in a separate and a very creative attempt to stabilize the insurance markets, allowed insurance companies to build the unpaid CSR costs into their silver plans on the exchange.

This was the tax solution anyone wanted, but it is a solution that has worked and has created some stability and predictability in the insurance markets in the face of an administration that seeks chaos.

Because the tax credits are benchmarked to the silver plans, silver loading has meant that most who receive subsidies did not see an increase in their health insurance premiums. In fact, new data shows that 2.6 million exchange consumers are now paying lower premiums as a result of silver loading.

States that allowed for silver loading as a way to cope with the manufactured chaos that the administration tried to inflict on the market actually saw an increase in enrollment in the exchange.

The administration has to stop trying to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. My amendment expresses that it is the position of Congress that the Secretary of HHS shall not do anything to prohibit the use of silver loading to stabilize the health insurance marketplaces.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, obviously, I rise in opposition to this, and I understand my colleague from Florida’s great expertise in this area and served in the previous administration. But the House has to subsidize a plan—there are a couple of problems. First of all, before ObamaCare came into being, or the Affordable Care Act—I am not trying to be disrespectful—insurance was regulated by States. The new law yanked that away from States to the point where they created a system of mandatory coverage that was unaffordable.

So then part of the plan was, well, we need to subsidize these plans because, actually, if they are not going to work without government intervention.

Now, the Court case on this, we thought—and actually, I guess the Court case is still pending. Can the Federal Government force someone to buy something they don’t want to buy?

And we probably will hear another ruling on that. Initially, they said, yeah.

The real debate shifted to: Does the Federal Government have the power to tax, versus do you have the power to force someone to buy something they don’t want to buy?

So the Supreme Court, in that ruling, said, since the Federal Government has the power to tax, this is really a tax; then, yeah, we can do this.

So then we had the rollout. And the rollout, I think, in the public’s eye as a whole—first, due to the delay because of the computer system, the network couldn’t manage it. And then, just the cost.

As I said before, premiums way too high; deductibles too high; people forced to buy an insurance product that they could not use.

People would say, oh, I got coverage. Okay. But your coverage is you still got to pay the first $10,000 in deductible. And people say, what? That is not very good insurance.

Well, that is what we created in this national healthcare delivery system.

The public rendered judgment, as they do, through the political process. Republicans came back into control.

Now, what we are trying to do is return to federalism. We have returned to States’ regulations of insurance; provide more options to consumers. That is what is occurring now, so the higher cost or the costs are going down. In fact, I think there was a projection that 30 percent—there was 30 percent increases, when there was a 3 percent increase. Why?

Well, because, under the law, there are 1332 waivers which allow States to present another package; and you see our citizens, our constituents, voting with their feet to go to these State-based plans. That is a good thing.

So we are trying—we don’t want to turn the clock back again. So that is why I would ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the gentlewoman’s amendment. Although brought well-intentioned and lovingly, I know.

Mr. Chairman, I reject that. I ask for a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, line 3, strike “Grants under” and insert “Subject to subparagraph (C), grants under

Page 47, line 6, strike “paragraph” and insert “subparagraphs”.

Page 47, line 18, strike the end quotations and the second period.

Page 47, after line 18, insert the following: “(C) STATE EXCHANGES.—For the purposes of carrying out this subsection, with respect to an Exchange operated by a State pursuant to this section shall be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year. Each State receiving a grant pursuant to this subparagraph shall be provided in an amount that is not less than $1,000,000.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is fitting that H.R. 967, a bill that would protect the progress of the Affordable Care Act, should include language that would reinforce the Federal navigator program, which provides outreach, some of the enrollment assistance to consumers looking to buy health insurance.

This administration has slashed funding for Federal marketplace navigators in recent years, with some States facing cuts near 96 percent, undermining the exchanges and hindering the ability of consumers to choose the insurance plan that works best for them.

My background in education makes it hard for me to understand why we would ever want to eliminate tools to help educate the public about how to access healthcare. It is even harder for me to understand why we would want to limit this critical funding just to States that operate within the Federal marketplace.

Residents in States like California, New York, Minnesota, and Connecticut deserve to have the same opportunity as people throughout the rest of the country to learn about their healthcare options, to learn how to sign up for coverage, and to learn how this coverage will work.

And so my amendment would open navigator funds to State-run marketplaces, so that my home State of Connecticut, and the 11 other States that operate a State-based exchange, could benefit from this funding.

The Affordable Care Act helped more than 20 million Americans sign up for health insurance. People of color experienced some of the largest gains in coverage under the Affordable Care Act, finally reducing longstanding racial disparities.

But in recent years, my own State’s exchange, Access Health CT Exchange, experienced a marked decrease in enrollment with communities of color; a worrisome sign that the progress that has been made in healthcare coverage with the passage of the Affordable Care Act may be slipping through our fingers.

Cutting funding to the navigator and outreach programs represents under-handed attacks on the people that need healthcare the most. It is part of this administration’s subtle strategy to roll back the protections of the Affordable Care Act by reducing healthcare access as a last-ditch effort.

The simple fact is that brokers do not always serve these communities. There is an urgent need to reinforce and expand outreach programs to make sure that we are reaching people in all zip codes, of all demographics.

State-based exchanges are already doing their part to be flexible, to invest
in outreach, and to partner with all communities. Access Health CT even expanded their open enrollment period this year after the Texas v. United States decision was upheld in December. The exchange knew that it had to combine the efforts of the Affordable Care Act with other efforts to combat misinformation—that the Affordable Care Act was still in place despite the Texas decision—and that people could still sign up for coverage.

State-based exchanges need all the help they can get to support these efforts.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chair, I want to point out that an estimated 90 million Americans still have low health literacy. These people are disproportionately lower-income Americans, elderly Americans, and Americans with low English proficiency.

There is a clear need and urgency for the Federal Government to help these people in States that operate State-based exchanges, and there is precedent for my amendment. My State exchange has received roughly $3 million for the In-Person Assister program from the Federal Government.

The bottom line is that the rules of the road have changed since changing the requirement to provide healthcare coverage to all Americans. There has never been a greater need to shore up programs that make certain working Americans, especially underserved populations, are protected and insured; that people in all communities know what their options are and how to access these benefits.

I strongly support H.R. 967. I think that my amendment will make it even better.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the leader of this important bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just think that the navigator program is so important, and all the outreach that we have to do these bills is very important. I obviously support the gentlewoman's amendment because every effort to reach out and educate people about their options in the marketplace is so important.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Wall Street Journal reported an investigation that one grantee took in $200,000 to enroll a grand total of 1 person; and they found the top 10 most expensive navigators collected 2.77 million taxpayer dollars, 2.77, Mr. Chairman.

Do you know how many people they signed up? 1. They want to add $25 million more on top of the $62,500,000 in grants. We are talking about less than 1 percent.

Meanwhile, while they are talking about oh, we have got to educate people about their options, then they put a gag rule in here that says, can’t talk to you about short-term duration plans. Oh, no, we can’t educate about that choice. No, you can’t know about that. No, we are going to stop that. Oh, and you can’t know about association health plan options either. It might be better for you and your family and actually be more affordable. No, no, no, because that is not our Federal decision here. They decide, and they don’t want you to even know. So navigators can’t talk about those things. That is gagged in this law.

The amazing thing we never hear about is the good work of the Trump administration and the economy as it has taken off. And I say that in the context that we have seen the lowest unemployment rates for virtually every American and group of Americans; whether it is African Americans, Hispanic Americans, you name it, we are seeing, the lowest rates, in some cases, since they began keeping track of unemployment.

So the economy is doing really well. Over 3 percent GDP growth the first quarter.

So what has that meant for insurance?

We have heard the constant, unrelenting attacks; you might as well use imprisonment here at some point probably today.

Look, the number of Americans in employer health coverage has increased by more than 2.5 million since President Trump took office. Two-and-one-half million more Americans aren’t having to get their healthcare through the government and taxpayers. They are getting it through a job and their employer.

In fact, today, there is a greater percentage of Americans in employer health coverage since Trump took office than any time since 2000, any time since 2000.

See, there is another way to provide healthcare and that is through a job.

Now, I know those who support a full Federal takeover of everybody’s health insurance don’t like to hear that because, see, they don’t think that employers should offer health insurance. They think only the government knows best. And so their Medicare for All plan, which would cause great delays in access to care, drive up costs, you would pay more; but it would take away all choice. If you get it from your employer, or if you get it from your union, or if you are a senior on Medicare and you have a Medicare advantage policy, that goes away too. Veterans with TRICARE? Democrats' Medicare for All program, that is gone, too.

It is kind of ironic to talk about how wonderful the Affordable Care Act is working for Americans, who, by the way, tell me: “Look, I am getting stuck with the highest deductibles and premiums I have ever seen. I can’t afford it.”

We had an example from Grand Island, Nebraska, last week. A 60-year-old couple makes $70,000 a year. They were paying $38,000 in premiums and $11,000 in deductibles.

That is affordable insurance? I don’t think so.

That is why we think States should have the ability to experiment and regulate plans at the State level, as they did under Obamacare.

All that talk about junk plans and all that, by the way, those were approved under ObamaCare. Those were allowed under ObamaCare. Trump just allowed them to be there longer. But because he changed something, there is that automatic part.

I think we all ought to come together here. I have fought my entire legislative career in Oregon and here to make healthcare more affordable.

The underlying drug bills, there is no limit between us, none, between Republicans and Democrats. Those bills came out of committee unanimously.

The only reason we are having this fight on the floor today is because somewhere along the way, the political operatives, Mr. Chairman, decided to bolt these two unrelated sets of bills together. They knew it would be kind of a poison pill and kind of fun to watch Republicans squirm on the floor.

That is why we are here.

The ObamaCare bills we are voting on today just dump more money into programs that investigations have shown are filled with fraud and abuse. How can you justify putting another $11,000 into a program where the top 10 most expensive navigators collected $2.77 million and signed up a grand total of 314 people? Who in their right mind in private business, Mr. Chairman, would make that kind of investment?

The Las Vegas Review-Journal said, after reading that, “The navigator scheme is a make-work government jobs program rife with corruption and highly susceptible to scam artists.”

Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. McBATH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mrs. McBATH, Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.
The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I of the Rules Committee report:

Subtitle D—Pharmacy School Outreach

SEC. 131. PHARMACY SCHOOL OUTREACH.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education shall make every effort necessary to ensure appropriate outreach to institutions of higher education to ensure that students and faculty at schools of pharmacy are made aware of materials regarding generic drugs and biosimilar biological products, including materials:

(1) how generic drugs and biosimilar biological products are equivalent or similar to brand-name drugs;

(2) the approval process at the Food and Drug Administration for generic drugs and biosimilar biological products;

(3) how to make consumers aware of the availability of generic drugs and biosimilar biological products;

(4) requirements for substituting generic drugs and biosimilar biological products in place of corresponding drugs; and

(5) the impacts of generic drugs and biosimilar biological products on consumer costs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. McBATH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. McBATH. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am so proud to be voting today to stabilize healthcare for millions of Americans and to bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

I came to Congress, like many of my fellow colleagues, to protect healthcare for my constituents with preexisting conditions and to make healthcare more affordable and accessible. I myself have a preexisting condition, having suffered breast cancer twice.

My amendment today is focused on ensuring that our future pharmacists and those in the workforce are provided with materials regarding generic drugs and biosimilar biological products. Specifically, it would have the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education make every effort necessary to ensure appropriate outreach to institutions of higher education to ensure that students and faculty at schools of pharmacy are provided with appropriate materials.

This will allow for students and faculty to have material on how generic drugs and biosimilar biological products are equivalent or like brand-name drugs, and the products of these products on consumer costs, requirements for substituting these types of drugs with corresponding drug products, the impacts of these products on consumer costs, and more.

Pharmacists spend a great deal of time with individuals when they come to the counter to fill an order. They provide guidance and educate patients on the prescriptions that they are taking. I have even met with my own local pharmacists many, many times to discuss my own prescriptions.

They are very intelligent individuals who are relied on by their community daily. By instilling them with the information that they need to know to best help those whom they serve, we will all be better off.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying package.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. McBATH. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I would like to say that, as a two-time breast cancer survivor myself, I have relied many, many times on the specific information and guidance that has been given to me by my own pharmacist.

Our pharmacists should be allowed to be able to give resource information to help the patients that they serve. By tying their hands and not being able to give them the information that they need to really best serve their patients, we do them a great disservice.

I truly believe that this information is very relevant. Giving pharmacists the ability they need to do their jobs is of great importance.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), the distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Georgia, a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

We really have come to rely upon Mr. CARTER for his guidance, especially on areas related to pharmacies and trying to get the costs of prescription drugs down for consumers. We are all about that.

We worked together in the last Congress to empower the FDA to get more generics to market sooner so we have more competition. That was a bipartisan bill.

That is the way we operated in the last Congress, Mr. Chairman, as Republicans and Democrats. I led the committee, and we revamped everything at the FDA in generics, on medical device approvals, and on pharmaceuticals so we could benefit the patient first.

We brought those bills to the floor unanimously. We didn’t mess around with them and package them up with poison pills. We said: Let’s go legislate, and let’s get this done and let’s do it.

They got done. They got into law, signed by President Trump.

And guess what? Last year, the FDA approved more generics in one year than at any time in its history. So we did things, led by Republicans in the House, the Republican leader of the Senate, and President Trump, joining with Democrats, just as we have attempted to do on the drug bills before us today.

We are in full agreement. Stop the bad behaviors, get competition into the market, and bring down costs of drugs. But we also believe we should make sure Americans have choices that are
more affordable when it comes to their insurance.

Democrats voted for ObamaCare. They blocked every amendment we had as Republicans at the time that was legislated. Remember, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives Speaker of the House, they have to pass it so you can find out what is in it. It is kind of an odd way to legislate, but, anyway, here we are.

By the way, the short-term plans they call junk plans on that side, Mr. Chairman, those short-term plans are the same ones we are debating today, except all President Trump did is say you can have them a little longer, because guess what? For some people, it is the only affordable health insurance they have access to in their States.

They are regulated by the States. They are not unregulated. States can do all kinds of things. We should empower them to do things to make insurance more affordable.

Until recently, on the other side, Mr. Chairman, they want to gag the navigators so they can’t even tell them about alternatives that may actually benefit them and be more affordable.

The plans that the other side of the aisle is talking about today, Mr. Chairman, are plans that are very much like the ones that were approved under President Obama and ObamaCare. It is just that President Trump said you can have them for longer if they work for you. But the States can come in and say, no, no.

My State says just 3 months. That is it. Boom. Other States say 30 days. Some States say none at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. McBATH). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 116-61.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 99, insert after line 2, the following:

SEC. 205. CONSUMER OUTREACH, EDUCATION, AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) OPEN ENROLLMENT REPORTS.—For plan year 2019 and each subsequent year, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall issue biweekly public reports during the annual open enrollment period on the performance of the Federal Exchange. Each such report shall include a summary, including information on a State-by-State basis where available, of—

(1) the number of unique website visits;
(2) the number of individuals making an inquiry;
(3) the number of calls to the call center;
(4) the average wait time for callers contacting the call center; and
(5) the number of individuals who enroll in a qualified health plan; and

(b) the percentage of individuals who enroll in a qualified health plan through each of—

(A) the website;
(B) the call center;
(C) navigators;
(D) agents and brokers;
(E) the enrollment assistant program; and
(F) directly from issuers or web brokers; and

(G) other means.

(b) OPEN ENROLLMENT AFTER ACTION REPORT.—For plan year 2020 and each subsequent year, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall publish an after action report no more than 3 months after the completion of the annual open enrollment period regarding the performance of the Federal Exchange for the applicable plan year. Such report shall include a summary, including information on a State-by-State basis where available, of—

(1) the open enrollment data reported under subsection (a) for the entirety of the enrollment period; and

(2) activities related to patient navigators described in section 1311(i) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(i)), including—

(A) the performance objectives established by the Secretary for such patient navigators;
(B) the number of consumers enrolled by such a patient navigator;
(C) an assessment of how such patient navigators met established performance metrics, including a detailed list of all patient navigators, funded receiving by patient navigators, and whether established performance objectives of patient navigators were met; and

(D) with respect to the performance objectives described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) whether such objectives assess the full scope of patient navigator responsibilities, including general education, plan selection, and determination of eligibility for tax credits, cost-sharing reductions, or other coverage;
(ii) how the Secretary worked with patient navigators to establish such objectives; and
(iii) how the Secretary adjusted such objectives for case complexity and other contextual factors.

(c) REPORTING ADVERTISING AND CONSUMER OUTREACH.—Not later than 3 months after the completion of the annual open enrollment period for a plan year, the Secretary shall issue a report on advertising and outreach to consumers for the open enrollment period for the 2020 plan year. Such report shall include a description of—

(1) the division of spending on individual advertising platforms, including television and radio advertisements and digital media, to raise consumer awareness of open enrollment;

(2) the division of spending on individual outreach platforms, including email and text messages, to raise consumer awareness of open enrollment; and

(3) whether the Secretary conducted targeted outreach to specific demographic groups and geographic areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment that would create greater accountability from the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to the Affordable Care Act.

Time and time again, we have seen Republicans and the administration attempt to undermine the important work of the Affordable Care Act.

In addition to attempting to strip away protections for preexisting conditions or reducing coverage for Medicaid recipients, the administration is trying to depress coverage by cutting consumer outreach and marketing for ACA. Not only does sabotaging the enrollment process make it harder for the American people to get health coverage, but it also drives up costs.

Unfortunately, this strategy has been working. We are currently at our highest uninsured rate in 4 years, with Affordable Care Act enrollment rates declining every year this President has been in office.

Everyday Americans, like the folks in my district in southeastern Pennsylvania, can’t afford more barriers to healthcare. When their choice is often between putting food on their table or going to the doctor, it is important that people have more information and access to the Affordable Care Act marketplace, not less.

My amendment would require greater transparency from the administration by requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide vital statistics on plan enrollment, outreach, and advertising, and the overall performance of the programs within the ACA.

This information will allow Congress to perform better, quicker oversight on Health and Human Services’ attempts to roll back information and outreach for potential Affordable Care Act enrollees.

No longer will the administration be able to hide its lack of investment in ACA outreach and education or refuse to turn over data on how its say-nothing sabotage is hurting Americans.

Mr. Chair, I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to support this common-sense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentlewoman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. AGUILAR). The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I would just, again, urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her amendment. We are not going to object to the amendment. The exchanges already do a lot of this reporting, and more information is better than less.

Now I want to talk about these short-term, State-regulated, limited duration insurance policies because I think I have got a chart here, and we
will put it in the RECORD that there are 27 of our States, Mr. Chairman—27—that have decided that short-term plans are good for their people to be able to take advantage of. There are States from Alaska to Wyoming, from Kansas to Iowa, to Idaho and Pennsylvania, and you can go up to 363 days.

Now, there are 12 other States that have said, you know: We want to limit these to 6 months. That includes places like Colorado and Arizona and Nevada and Oklahoma, North Dakota.

The Trump administration actually expanded the authority for the agents and brokers to assist in enrollment, and my friends on the other side of the aisle want to keep dumping more and more money into the navigator program that, as I pointed out earlier, we have found all kinds of wasteful spending in.

So there is really an issue about spending. We know the results. We know there is a much better way to do this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose this particular amendment. It is fine, and more information is better than less.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. Scanlon).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MORELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 116-116.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, after line 18, insert the following:

(b) STUDY ON EFFECTS OF FUNDING CUTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall study the effects of funding cuts made for plan year 2019 with respect to the navigator program (as described in section 1311(i) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 13311)) and other education and outreach activities carried out with respect to Exchanges established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 1321(c) of such Act. Such study shall describe the following:

(1) How such funding cuts negatively impacted the ability of entities under such program to conduct outreach activities and fulfill duties required under such section 1311(i).

(2) The overreach on health insurance coverage offered in the individual market for plan year 2019; and the costs of health insurance coverage offered in the individual market.

Page 47, line 19, strike “(B)” and insert “(C”).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment intended to detail the full harm done to our Nation by the White House’s sabotage of the Affordable Care Act.

Last summer, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services announced a 70 percent cut, $26 million to the navigator program. This amendment provides important person assistance to people who wish to sign up for insurance through the Affordable Care Act. In just 2 years, funding for this program has plummeted from $62.5 million to just $10 million.

The President also cut digital TV and radio advertising by 90 percent, reducing investment from $100,000,000 to $10 million. The failure to use Federal funding for these activities leaves it to the States to fill in the gaps and puts on them the burden for the continued success of State and Federal exchanges.

My amendment directs the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of these cuts to detail how reduced funding has harmed enrollment across the Nation and the resulting costs to our Nation’s families.

Funding for ACA outreach is essential to ensuring that Americans know their options and their healthcare benefits. Without public messaging campaigns, many people have been left confused about the open enrollment process, when they can begin signing up for coverage, and the deadline for enrolling before the new year.

As we approach planning for the 2020 enrollment season, we need to fully understand the results of the cuts to outreach and advertising that were put in place in recent years. That is what my amendment seeks to do.

I want to thank my colleague Congresswoman WEXTON for joining me in these efforts, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the chair and the ranking member for their work, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON), my colleague.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Representative for offering this amendment and for yielding.

This amendment requests a GAO report on how funding cuts to the navigator program and to Affordable Care Act marketing and outreach have impacted health insurance enrollment and the cost of coverage on the individual markets.

Navigator programs provide critical assistance to consumers by raising awareness about the availability of marketplace plans, assisting people as they apply for Federal subsidies, and providing impartial information about different marketplace plans. Importantly, these programs help otherwise hard-to-reach groups get health insurance coverage, including people living in rural and underserved communities.

The Trump administration has made significant funding cuts to the navigator program, providing only $10 million in funding for the program for 2019, an 80 percent reduction over the past 2 years.
Navigator funding in my home State of Virginia has been reduced by an astounding 76 percent between 2016 and 2018, down from approximately $2.2 million in 2016 to just $325,000 in 2018. To manage these cuts, programs have had to lay off staff, and limit their availability to help consumers.

The administration’s cuts hamper navigators’ ability to do their jobs, leaving many consumers on their own during the enrollment process, and, as a result, people may not obtain coverage in the individual market, causing people who do get coverage to see their premiums increase.

Constituents in my district and people throughout the U.S. rely on navigators to learn about coverage options and to enroll in the best possible healthcare plans for them. We need to know how the administration’s drastic funding cuts have impacted the individual markets, and this amendment will allow us to do that.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting; the prior amendment that passed added $25 million more to this navigator program. For the plan year 2017, navigators received a total of $69.5 million in grants and yet only enrolled 81,426 individuals. That is less than 1 percent of the total enrollees.

You see, the issue here isn’t whether we should or shouldn’t enroll more people. This issue is most efficient with the taxpayer or private-sector dollar to do that.

We keep pouring more and more money into this navigator program and we know there is all this, well, I guess I am going to call it waste. I don’t know if it is fraud.

But holy smokes, as I have said before, one grantee, according to The Wall Street Journal, took in $200,000 and enrolled one person—one person. You run into with employers now is not making work government jobs program rife with corruption and highly susceptible to scam artists. It’s a slush fund for progressive constituent groups.

Now, when I was chairman, we did that at a record level because they deliver record good healthcare. We have had no plan yet to figure out how to pay for that, but you are going dump $25 million more into this navigator program. Why don’t we put it into actual healthcare?

We reauthorized the Children’s Health Insurance Program under Republican, fully funded it for a decade. The longest that had ever been done was 5 years, and, unfortunately, most of my friends on the other side of the aisle voted repeatedly against doing that for a whole host of reasons, but they voted “no.” In Oregon, we have 122,700 children and expectant moms that rely on CHIP, SCHIP, partnership with the State for their health insurance.

So there are a lot of things we can invest in with the proceeds from the savings from the drug bills, but investing in the navigator program? $5,000 per enrollee?

There are 100 navigators, that is all they did? One for 200,000, enrolled one person? I mean, come on, there has got to be a better way to not spend the taxpayers’ money than that.

And so I think you look at the incredible group of women working in America, getting better paying jobs, bigger paychecks and healthcare, 2.5 million since President Trump took office, and Republicans put progrowth regulatory policies into the Tax Code, progrowth regulatory policies into the bureaucracy.

Jobs are coming up. The biggest issue I run into with employers now is not overregulation; it is: Where do I find more employees?

So we need to look at job training. We need to work at available workforce. But this, this amendment, I think, is, frankly, from my perspective—with all due respect, GAO doesn’t think, is, frankly, from my perspective, is—highly susceptible to scam artists. It’s a slush fund for progressive constituent groups.

So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I find it a bit interesting, though, that under the navigator program, on the one hand, my friends on the other side of the aisle say, Look, you can't talk about it—in fact, you can't talk anybody about association health plans and those as options.

You can't educate the public, the consumers about an opportunity to save money by having a state-regulated plan. No, not under the navigator. You can't do that.

And yet, with this amendment, they want to expand that knowledge, so they can get training on the other government plans, Medicaid and CHIP enrollees. And that is not necessarily a bad thing. I am not saying that is a bad thing.

But what I am saying is, why wouldn't we want full education? Why would we want, basically, a gag order here that prevents the navigators from telling the consumers. Here are some other options you may want to look at. Now, they have limitations; they are regulated by your State; you need to be fully informed—in fact, really informed, because some of them don't cover everything—as we have heard—because that was how it was designed under President Obama's plan, that there would be these options and they wouldn't be the fully covering plans, but they were okay because they would fill a gap.

And those are the same plans we have heard a lot about today that States regulate. And I would go back to the fact that in some States it is 3 months.

Well, in 27 States they go up to almost 1 year, including States such as Rhode Island and Tennessee, even Texas, Virginia, Georgia and Idaho.

In 12 States, they go up to 6 months. In eight States, including mine, we said—in Oregon—just 3 months, that is all we are going to do in short-term duration plans.

California, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, said no. Zero. We are not going to allow them.

That is okay. That is federalism.

But why, in the navigator program, would we say, You can't talk about things.

I got a degree in journalism a long time ago at the University of Oregon, and I believe in the facts. And I believe marketplaces and consumers are better served when they have complete information to make choices.

And I know that these insurance products are on the market. Some are fine, people like them.
And I get these letters—I got one from Tom in Medford—that talked about how his premium, I think, went from 400-and-some dollars to $800 in 1 year. And he is not sure what he is going to do. That was in October when the new numbers came out.

And why we put all this reliance on these navigators. We know from the Wall Street Journal, one grantee took $200,000, enrolled one person.

I guess, if you are the grantee, that is a pretty good deal. All you have to do is find one person to enroll, and you get 200 grand. To me, that sounds like a big waste of taxpayer dollars.

The ten most expensive navigators collected $2.77 million, signed up 314 people.

Now, we heard about how the government needs to borrow and spend more than taxpayer dollars—or at least spend more taxpayer dollars—and do more education because the enrollment in the government plans has gone down by, I think, the figure is about $1 million or so. I guess, that is what is bandied about.

What isn’t mentioned, however, Mr. Chairman, is that under President Trump and the policies Republicans put into law, the economy took off. The economy took off. Thank goodness the economy took off.

And 2.5 million Americans now get their insurance, more get their insurance through their employer.

And my guess is that accounts for some of that downturn. They don’t have to come to the government to get their insurance. They are getting it through their employer.

So you might have had like $1 million roll off on the exchanges, but you got a 2.5 million pickup in the private insurance side. And I think that is pretty cool. I mean, that is important.

And I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle with their national takeover of health insurance want to abolish ObamaCare and replace it with a single-payer system, which sounds sort of simple on its face, but we know that means you would have to double the personal income tax, double the corporate tax, and our doctors and hospitals, they would have to take like a 40, 50 percent hit. That means that time period, so it will not increase the cost. It simply gives States additional time.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment as well as the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I think I have said enough. It is a technical amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, this section provides $200 million for States to establish State-based marketplaces. The Federal law provided States with the option of building their own State-based marketplace or utilizing the Federal marketplace.

I know my own State blew through close to $300 million trying to create its own exchange. It was a terrible financial disaster, a total waste of money. They couldn’t get it going. They finally closed the thing up, but not before they blew through hundreds of millions of dollars, and then they went to the Federal exchange.

Every State except Alaska applied for these grants. Florida and Georgia were awarded planning grants but later returned their entire grants. Other States returned some of the grant money they received but also kept some.

This would have been under the Obama administration when they were enacting ObamaCare. No funding was awarded after December 31, 2014, in accordance with the law.

The 2018 plan year, 34 States had federally facilitated marketplaces; 12 States had State-based marketplaces; and 5 States had State-based marketplaces using the Federal platform.


I think it is important to share with my colleagues, among the report’s key findings in 2016 were: CMS was not confident that the remaining State-based exchanges would be sustainable in the commerce. It wasn’t heard in the Ways and Means Committee. It was heard in the Rules Committee, the Speaker’s committee.

This is a high priority for the Speaker. This bill was heard in the Speaker’s committee. That tells me that this is something that really needs to come forward. Unfortunately, it is just not a very good plan.

And the gentleman is right, doctors would be required to take a significant reduction.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a couple of amendments at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, beginning on line 6, strike “December 31, 2022” and insert “December 31, 2023”.

Page 43, line 6, strike “January 1, 2024” and insert “January 1, 2025”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would extend by 1 year the deadline by which States may apply for Federal grant assistance to set up State-based health insurance markets, moving the deadline from December 31, 2021, to December 31, 2023.

My amendment would also extend by 1 year the corresponding date by which the exchanges must be self-sustaining, from January 1, 2024, to January 1, 2025.

Currently, 11 States and the District of Columbia have such health insurance exchanges. However, no health exchanges have been established since the ACA’s original deadline of 2015.

While I do support H.R. 367’s language which provides an additional 2-year window for States to establish their own insurance exchanges, given the complexity of the current debate with the possibility of single-payer being an option and also Medicare for All, it is my hope and expectation that, by extending these application periods from 2 to 3 years, more States will have the opportunity to weigh those outstanding options and explore the option to establish their own State-based exchanges.

It was reported recently that the Governor of New Jersey, for example, has announced that his State would seek to establish its own State-based healthcare exchange for 2021. It is quite possible that other States that may have held off in setting up similar exchange marketplaces and are contemplating those other possibilities could also be reconsidering setting up an exchange, and that is why my amendment. I believe that ensuring that States have the time to consider and plan for setting up such an exchange is the right thing to do.

I would note that my amendment does not seek additional funding during that time period, so it will not increase the cost. It simply gives States additional time.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment as well as the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.
long term, and as of September 2016, every State-based exchange still relies upon Federal establishment grant funds 20 months after the State-based exchanges were supposed to be self-sustaining by law.

CMS estimated the transition for these failed State-based exchanges so that they could join healthcare.gov by allowing them to keep the user fees collected by insurance carriers intended to pay for the use of healthcare.gov.

Now, here we are, 5 years after the fundings are coming to a bill to reopen grants for States to establish State-based marketplaces. We have seen kind of a spotty record here. Maybe it is just a coincidence that $200 million is being made available now, because my friends on the other side set the agenda and they want to continue pushing out this idea.

On Friday, Politico reported that New Jersey is proposing to create a State-based health exchange. Now, I think they have told us they actually don't need Federal money for that.

But anyway, I don't think we are dealing with earmarks here; but earmarking money to help States create their own marketplaces is not what we should be about, and I am not sure we are.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 305. GAO REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a study that analyzes the costs and benefits of the establishment of State-administered health insurance plans to be offered in the insurance market of such States that choose to administer and offer such a plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment directs the Government Accountability Office to prepare a cost-benefit analysis of the establishment of a State-sponsored public health insurance option for States that may want to offer public options in their State’s health insurance exchanges.

A State-run public option would allow individual States to offer very basic, low cost insurance plans without the high cost of commercial advertising and other overhead costs that can sometimes add as much as 30 percent to the cost of some health insurance plans, or perhaps States could optimize the use of community health centers that we all love so much. Once these low-cost public option plans are on the market, private insurance companies would be forced to compete with that lower price by offering similar low-cost plans.

State-sponsored public options could help address the lack of competition that is driving up the cost of healthcare in many States where one or two insurance companies are allowed to dominate the market due to the fact that the Affordable Care Act currently exempts insurance companies from antitrust laws.

While State-run public options were a feature in the House version of the ACA, I supported, Senate action deleted that from the final versions of the ACA which eventually passed and which I opposed.

I believe that the information that the study will provide will be an important resource for States in regions looking to offer more healthcare options to their residents.

Mr. Chairman, one of the loudest messages that came out of the last mid-term election was that, 9 years after the passage of the ACA, the American people still want us to fix their broken healthcare system.

For many people, the Affordable Care Act is not affordable. But I believe it is possible to make health insurance options more affordable. He just said: Well, if it is good for 3 months, what is wrong with 364 days.

So as a result, you have got 27 States that go up to nearly a year; 12 are 6 months; 3 at 3 months; and 4 say, no, we don’t want this at all. So I think the report is probably going to give us some valuable information.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I have actually convinced myself I am going to support this amendment despite my initial reservations, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following new section:

evaluation, and I think it is important to have cost-benefit analyses of State-administered health insurance plans for States that may want to offer a public option.

Again, here we have a situation where States are experimenting, and States are given a feature in the original version, the public option.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is pretty straightforward in asking the GAO to do this
Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report examining whether the Department of Health and Human Services has been conducting maintenance on the website commonly referred to as ‘‘Healthcare.gov’’ during annual open enrollment periods (as defined in section 1302(a)(6)(B) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(c)(6)(B)) in such a manner so as to minimize any disruption to the use of such website resulting from such maintenance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, American families are increasingly struggling with rising healthcare costs. That is why I am pleased to support the underlying bill which contains some commonsense provisions that will protect consumers, lower drug prices, and stabilize the individual market, which will provide families with some needed relief.

The amendment I am offering will further help Americans who purchased health insurance on healthcare.gov.

American families in 39 States without a State-based exchange depend on healthcare.gov to purchase insurance during open enrollment. This past year, over 8.4 million plan selections were made on this website.

Over the past 2 years, the Department of Health and Human Services had announced maintenance outages on healthcare.gov for over 12 hours every Sunday during open enrollment. I am an engineer. I understand the complexity of this website and the heavy volume of users, which means that routine maintenance is necessary, even during open enrollment. However, I want to ensure that HHS is doing all it can to ensure this maintenance is conducted in a way that has the least impact on consumers.

Families need ample time to choose health insurance plans. We must make sure that enrollment is not being negatively impacted by these outages. My amendment would require a GAO study to determine if healthcare.gov outages are having a negative impact on enrollment.

HHS claims that maintenance is scheduled for times of low site traffic, but they have not provided data to support this claim. I know that when I am using the online exchange to purchase my insurance each year, I often will try to do it on a Sunday when I have free time. This may be an anomaly. We need to figure this out.

What the GAO study would provide is clarity on the best time to schedule maintenance. This would help us to make sure HHS is doing right by Americans as they navigate the complex process of buying health insurance.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, commonsense amendment. I urge a ‘‘yes’’ vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think this is a commonsense amendment. I ask GAO to look at the study and say: Okay. What is the best time to take healthcare.gov offline to do maintenance?

Let’s do this the right way. As an engineer, that is the way I think. I think most companies would look at it this way.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, commonsense amendment. I am pleased to support the underlying bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is "on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the amendment was agreed to."

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 45, line 24, strike ‘‘and’’.

In section 202(a)(2)—

(1) redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) insert after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B): (in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by inserting ‘‘and’’ after subparagraph (E); and

(3) after subparagraph (A) the following:

‘‘(F) conduct public education activities in plain language to raise awareness of the requirements of and the protections provided under—

‘‘(i) the essential health benefits package (as defined in section 1332(a)); and

(ii) section 2726 of the Public Health Service Act (relating to parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits).’’

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 17 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT NO. 116-61

OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH OF FLORIDA

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

Page 45, line 24, strike ‘‘and’’.

In section 202(a)(2)—

(1) redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) insert after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’;

(E) after line 24, insert the following: (B) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

‘‘(F) conduct public education activities in plain language to raise awareness of the requirements of and the protections provided under—

‘‘(i) the essential health benefits package (as defined in section 1332(a)); and

(ii) section 2726 of the Public Health Service Act (relating to parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits).’’;

and

Page 46, line 1, strike ‘‘(ii)’’ and insert ‘‘(iv)’’.

Mr. DEUTCH. (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.
of the Affordable Care Act in 2010 through the first years of enrollment in 2014. Mental health parity means insurance companies can’t discriminate against Americans battling addiction in the same way that they have been able to arbitrarily reduce levels of care, her family was able to use the parity law to fight for their daughter’s life in the courts.

While it is clear that parity has made improvements, we still have so much more to do. This week, I heard from another family in my district about their daughter’s struggle to get coverage and treatment. In the cycle of denials and arbitrarily reduced levels of care, her family was able to use the parity law to fight for their daughter’s life in the courts.

But that is not enough. Parity protections have opened doors to better mental health and addiction treatment for so many Americans. As we observe Mental Health Awareness Month, it is important to acknowledge how far we have to go.

My amendment will help more Americans understand the benefits and protections available to them and help them get the care they need. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment so that every American knows that mental health is health and that we need to care as much about the health of our bodies from our shoulders up as we do from our shoulders down. That is what people need to be made aware of so they have the ability to fight for that access to mental healthcare.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
Health Insurance Program a little over a year ago. The parity language was, in fact, included at the request of a Democratic member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The parity language was included in the rewriting of the re-authorizing State Children’s Health Insurance Program.

But my recollection was, in the navigator program, this should have been part of the basic information offered by the navigators.

If I recollect it, I do not understand why it would now take an act of Congress to get them to do what they were required to do upon the signing of the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just come to the point that I appreciate the gentleman’s comments.

As I look at a bunch of amendments coming up, to my colleague from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), there are a whole bunch of these that they are saying, oh, we have to order the navigators do this, do that, and do that.

You wonder what our current training is that we have to pass laws telling them to learn about these things and then talk to look at practice.

This is part of my argument that we are pumping a lot of money into a program that we know there has been—I don’t know if I can say fraud, but if you got $200,000 to enroll one person or $2.7 million to enroll 314, some of the Nation’s leading editorial writers have had some pretty strong words to say about corruption and scam artists and that sort of thing.

We are having to pass laws that tell them how to do their job, by the way, talk about mental health, talk about substance abuse, talk about referrals to community-based organizations, the navigator system, vulnerable populations, all these things. Holy smokes, what don’t they know when they left out?

We should have a hearing on this issue in the committee as well as the Medicare for All proposal.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LYNCH). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in the Record at page 47.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, line 21, strike the period and insert ‘‘and shall be provided to populations residing in high health disparity areas (as defined in subparagraph (E) thereof) served by the Exchange, in addition to other populations served by the Exchange.’’.

Page 48, line 18, strike the end quotes and the semicolon and insert the following:

‘‘(E) HIGH HEALTH DISPARITY AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘high health disparity area’ means a contiguous geographic area that—

(i) is located in one census tract or ZIP code;

(ii) has measurable and documented racial, ethnic, or geographic health disparities;

(iii) has a low-income population, as demonstrated by—

(I) average income below 138 percent of the Federal poverty line; or

(II) a rate of participation in the special supplemental nutrition program under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) that is higher than the national average rate of participation in such program;

(iv) has poor health outcomes, as demonstrated by—

(I) lower life expectancy than the national average; or

(II) a higher percentage of instances of low birth weight than the national average; and

(v) is part of a Metropolitan Statistical Area identified by the Office of Management and Budget.’’.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment and the underlying legislative effort that would lower the cost of prescription drugs, crack down on junk insurance plans being encouraged by the Trump administration, and reverse the administration’s irresponsible sabotage of the Affordable Care Act.

Specifically, my amendment would require the HHS Secretary to conduct educational outreach to communities with high health disparities and who would thereby expand outreach efforts to increase coverage among African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, low-income families, and rural communities.

Our effort to help more Americans get access to affordable healthcare continues as we are seeing the impact of the Trump administration’s effort to undermine our healthcare system.

This week, we learned that more than 1 million Americans lost their health insurance in the past year, and the number of Americans in high-deductible plans reached an all-time high.

Black and Latino Americans and families living at or near the poverty line are particularly impacted by President Trump’s sabotage.

These communities are the most at risk of being uninsured, and these communities have always faced the greatest barriers to obtaining care and have reported the poorest health outcomes.

Before the Trump administration, we saw large gains in coverage for low-income individuals and people of color under the Affordable Care Act.

Finally having that health insurance made a key difference in determining when people got care, where they got their care, and, ultimately, how healthy they could be. However, this progress has been rapidly reversed over the last 2 years.

My amendment would ensure that we aren’t leaving behind those with pre-existing conditions, poor health outcomes, like those with lower life expectancy or children born with lower birthweight.

Families in high-disparity areas suffer from low levels of healthcare, literacy, language barriers, and limited awareness of the Affordable Care Act’s coverage options.

In this uncertain environment, in our complicated healthcare system, in this constant fight for access to healthcare in this country, knowledge is half the battle.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. Help all Americans attain the knowledge they need and win their healthcare battles.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of amendment No. 18 to H.R. 987.

I want to thank my friend, Representative Brown for his partnership on this amendment, which will ensure that we conduct thorough outreach to inform consumers in areas with high health disparities about their insurance options. The underlying legislation restores assistance to help Americans enroll in affordable, high-quality health insurance, and this amendment makes sure those efforts include a particular focus on low-income areas most in need not only of health insurance, but also of improve health outcomes.

In addition to reversing the Trump administration’s sabotage of the Affordable Care Act, this bill is a huge step forward in our efforts to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

For families in my district and across the country, the high cost of prescription drugs is more than a health issue; it is an economic issue. Increasing competition and improving access to safe, lower cost generics can save American families thousands of dollars each year at the pharmacy counter.

Mr. Chair, working families are counting on this body to help strengthen access to high-quality health insurance. For this reason, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.
Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chair, I am proud to join my colleague, Congresswoman Brown, in cosponsoring an amendment. She and I have worked on outreach and educational activities in areas with high health disparities.

I know about this all too well. I represent one of these districts, a district that has a minority. It is 88 percent Latino and African American, combined. These are the types of districts where you have higher health disparities happening, where Latinos and African Americans have more diabetes than anybody else.

My district also happens to be 357 out of 435. That is where we land as far as income of all the congressional districts in Congress, where people need this information. They need the outreach so that they know what kind of access they get to healthcare so that they have those options.

Providing opportunities to underserved communities to learn about their healthcare coverage options will result in more people signing up for affordable healthcare. Some people will get treated when they become sick, and more people will be able to live healthy and productive lives.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GOMEZ of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say a couple of things. One, I represent a very rural district in Oregon. It is two-thirds of the landmass of the State. We suffer a lot of these same issues: low income, high levels of poverty, and the need for basic services.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I worry a lot about making sure our community health centers get funded. I think you know this. They run out of funding in just a matter of months. The National Health Service Corps, same thing. By the end of September, I think they run out of money. I have a number of Indian reservations. Native Americans. Their Special Diabetes Program runs out of money. The teaching health centers run out of money.

Yes, today we are pouring money into a program that some of our Nation’s leading editorial writers have called susceptible to scam artists and corruption and that spends $2.7 million to sign up 314 people. That doesn’t seem like a very good expenditure to me. I would rather put that money into our community health centers and into some of these other proven programs that work.

I think it is fine to do outreach, certainly, and to expand education. I do wish it were more fulsome. I wish there weren’t a gag restriction on our navigators so that they can talk about other insurance alternatives that our States have pioneered and regulate, that even the Obama administration approved these short-term plans; yet derided today, these were approved, in many cases, under the last administration.

This one said: If they work good for 3 months, let’s see if States want them for 6 or 9 or pretty close to 12.

That is what the President did. President Trump, too, if you think about the economy—all we ever hear on the other side is kind of all the negative. It is sort of Debbie Downer day here.

Actually, the economy is doing really well, and, as a result, people are getting jobs. When they are getting jobs, they are getting bigger paychecks. They are also getting insurance. And 2.5 million people now have insurance who didn’t have it before, through their employer, during the Trump administration.

I realize they are not going to go bragging on the Trump administration, my friends to the left, but I do think it is important to get the facts out there because facts matter, and I believe in facts.

Mr. Chair, 2.5 million more people now have insurance who didn’t have it before, and they have it through their employer. That is the direction we should go: jobs, income, insurance through your employer.

Then what we really should focus on—and I think there is bipartisan support for this—is how do we get at the costs for healthcare.

By the way, who knows what anything costs, right? We are paying more and more out of pocket through our deductibles and our copays, yet what does an MRI cost here versus there versus there?

I was at the White House with the President on Thursday, Mr. Chair, and he is going after surprise billing. My friend from New Jersey and I are joined on this effort to pass bipartisan legislation so that the consumer doesn’t get stuck with a bill because somebody showed up to care for him at a hospital that, it turns out, wasn’t in their plan. They played by the rules, the consumer did.

We had one example there of a doctor whose daughter got care and then was stuck with a bill because somebody showed up to care for him at a hospital that, it turns out, wasn’t in their plan. They played by the rules, the consumer did.

I was at the White House with the President on Thursday, Mr. Chair, and he is going after surprise billing. My friend from New Jersey and I are joined on this effort to pass bipartisan legislation so that the consumer doesn’t get stuck with a bill because somebody showed up to care for him at a hospital that, it turns out, wasn’t in their plan. They played by the rules, the consumer did.

... We had one example there of a doctor whose daughter got care and then was asked to do a urine test because of some medication. They wanted to do just a quick test. The doctor said: Hey, will you do it? She did it on the spot.

It turned out the lab, I think it was, was not in the network of her insurance plan. She didn’t know that. She just followed the doctor’s orders. Do you know what that bill was? It was $767. She didn’t know that. She just followed the doctor’s orders. Do you know what that bill was? It was $767. She didn’t know that. She just followed the doctor’s orders. Do you know what that bill was? It was $767.

She brought a copy of the bill. I don’t have it here, but he brought it to the White House.

And President Trump is full-throttle ready to solve this. Just as he and his administration—don’t think we have ever had a President, not in my lifetime, that has leaned in more to get prescription drug prices down for consumers.

That is what is going on there in the real world. And the President and Secretary Azar and the team at CMS, they are leading on this now.

There are things you might like or dislike in terms of their proposals, but when we have never had a President and an administration try and drive out the unnecessary costs that consumers are being forced to pay.

That is where they are making the decision of whether they can afford to actually take the drugs from the pharmacist and go home or leave them on the counter.

So we have got a lot of issues, and some of them we are going to work out. I just so regret that we are here today with these for funding the navigator program with another $25 million on top of the $68 so they can spend $2.7 million and sign up 314 people. We can do that much more efficiently. We have proven that.

CMS says that others can do it for much less money, much less money. Not $767 per enrollee, but $2.40. Who wouldn’t take that deal, $2.40 per enrollee or $767?

So I just think there is a better way to operate. This amendment is fine in theory; I don’t get it, and so I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Brown).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. GOMEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 45, line 24, strike "and".

Page 45, after line 24, insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking "and" at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and";

and (D) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) provide referrals to community-based organizations that address social needs related to health outcomes;"

and Page 46, line 1, strike "(B)" and insert "(E)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. GOMEZ.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chair, I believe that the American people are well aware that this administration, the Trump administration, has taken steps to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, and now my party, the Democrats, are taking major steps to reverse it. But, as we do so, we should also address health equity.

My amendment will ensure that the ACA navigators can and should refer
Americans to community-based organizations that also address social needs tied to health outcomes.

Social factors like your ZIP Code, income, race, ethnicity, and language ability all play a major role in one’s health. A good example in the community is housing and homelessness. Without adequate housing, it is hard to address people’s healthcare needs.

At a recent roundtable I had with hospital community health centers, and other medical professionals, they made clear that homelessness profoundly impacts people’s and their patients’ health. Hospitals like L.A. County-USC are looking at homelessness as a health risk factor.

What does that mean? That means, when you get checked into L.A. County-USC, they not only determine do you have a family history of pre-existing conditions like heart disease and hypertension, have you suffered from addiction, they not only consider that, but now they put on the board, right above the patient, “Homeless.”

The reason why is that you might be able to take care of their underlying health care condition, but, if they end up back on the street days later, then their health outcomes will be negatively impacted.

So organizations in our communities that are not necessarily healthcare related can play a critical role in addressing healthcare outcomes.

Navigators must understand what our constituents are facing. They can meet people where they are and are well positioned to refer them to organizations that can improve that individual’s long-term healthcare outcome and also reduce costs.

We know that the Trump administration is undermining ObamaCare, and we need to reverse it with this legislation. At the same time, we must improve health equity to ensure all Americans have meaningful access to care. My amendment would do just that: improve health equity, lower costs, and help Americans from all backgrounds get and stay healthy.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I seek the time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I will try and make this fairly quick.

I actually am going to oppose this amendment for this reason. Here we are going through trying to say to the health navigators, in amendment after amendment: Your job is to enroll people in health insurance. That is your job. And, by the way, we are going to have a panel of a law that tells you to be sure and in layman’s discussion about mental health, be sure and include and get educated on substance use disorder benefits.

One after another, we are going through and putting in the statute all the things that ought to be, A, common sense and, B, ought to be part of an overall educational program for the navigators.

And now, recognizing, well, first of all, they are very expensive; second, there has been at least some level of questionable activity in the use of the taxpayer dollars; and, third, they don’t know what they are doing, so we have got to instruct them via statute; now we have a one-page way: By the way, so do all these other things, too, that have nothing to do directly with enrolling people in the Affordable Care Act.

So you are going to say, on the one hand: We don’t think you are getting it right; we have got to give you more money. Now we are going to give you new duties that are kind of loosely described, if you ask me, to provide referrals to community-based organizations and address social needs related to health outcomes.

That is all going to be in law now? Really?

I think this whole program, the more I sit and listen to all the amendments that need to be put into law to change it—if we should change ObamaCare creation, so I guess we are—I don’t know. I wouldn’t say you are sabotaging ObamaCare with this, but, certainly, you are changing ObamaCare and the navigators.

We are looking at the costs, and, gosh, there is a lot we could do.

I think the gentleman has 40 health centers in his district. And I assume he knows that I have got about 63 locations; and I assume the gentleman knows the money for those health centers runs out at the end of the fiscal year, and we have got to find a way to pay for that. I would rather put the money into that than into this program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 116-116, MS. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows: Page 45, strike lines 20 through 24 and insert the following: (A) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows: “(C) facilitate enrollment, including with respect to individuals with limited English proficiency and individuals with chronic illness, in qualified health plans, State medical plans under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and State child health plans under title XXI of such Act; and”.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form that I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk reads as follows: MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 PRINTED IN HOUSE REPORT NO. 116-61

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: (A) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows: “(C) facilitate enrollment, including with respect to individuals with limited English proficiency and individuals with chronic illness, in qualified health plans, State medical plans under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and State child health plans under title XXI of such Act; and”,

Ms. ESCOBAR (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized on his reservation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I guess this is what I would say to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. I have 16 Republican amendments on this bill alone. We got one amendment. Democrats got 25, and two of them we have had to edit amendments on the House floor, if I understand what is happening.

There were a lot of amendments offered in the Rules Committee. We were promised by the Democrats at the beginning of this legislative session that there would be an open House where our amendments would be considered. I know 92 percent of the amendments the Democrats have allowed to come to the floor have been Democrat amendments. Imagine that.

We had 16 Republican amendments on this bill alone. We got one amendment. Democrats got 25, and two of them we have had to edit here on the floor. And then we had one that was a bipartisan, just technical change amendment.

I sure hope we are not going to see that for the rest of this Congress under Democratic control, that we are shut out of the amendment process.

When Republicans were in charge and had the Rules Committee, 45 percent, something like that, of the amendments were minority amendments, Democrat amendments. We opened the floor to that, and now it has been shut down.

Mr. Chair, I won’t object to this change. It needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.
The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Without objection, the reading of the modification is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

The navigator program is crucial to communities like El Paso, where we have one of the highest uninsured rates in the state of Texas.

Navigators provide free assistance to my constituents as they maneuver through the marketplace to find a healthcare plan that is right for them. When funded adequately, these programs help decrease the uninsured population across the country.

However, the Trump administration has sought to cut funding for the navigator program in its plan to systematically undermine the Affordable Care Act.

By slashing the program’s funding by 84 percent over the last 2 years, the total funds allotted for it now stands at $10 million.

To exemplify these draconian cuts, consider this:

In 2017, there were nine navigator programs funded in Texas and two operating in El Paso County.

In 2018, the number of navigator programs in Texas dropped to just two, with only one now operating in El Paso County. This presents a challenge to States and districts like mine that have seen their populations increase over the past decade.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has coupled these deep cuts with a rule overturning a requirement for navigator programs to train their assistants to help individuals with chronic illnesses and limited English proficiency.

While the Trump administration claims this will give navigators more flexibility to tailor their training for the populations they serve, it is really another attempt to scale back what has proven to be a successful program.

By cutting funds and reversing this requirement, navigator programs will be forced to choose between extra training for their assistants or hiring more of them to cover counties now lacking operational programs.

Navigator programs that do not provide proper training could result in their assistants being underprepared when a consumer from a vulnerable population comes to them for assistance. Enrolling in the marketplace can be complex for anyone, especially for those whose primary language is not English.

While H.R. 987 restores funding to the navigator program, we must ensure these programs continue to train their assistants to help underserved populations.

My amendment does just that by requiring Navigators to provide training for their assistants to serve vulnerable populations, including individuals with chronic illnesses and limited English proficiency.

In my home county of El Paso, there are almost 25,600 uninsured individuals who are 65 years or older. This critical amendment will ensure navigator programs are able to help all El Pasoans find suitable healthcare plans.

Simply put, Mr. Chair, access to affordable healthcare is a right, and my amendment ensures we make every attempt to leave no one behind.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank Representatives Torres and Porter for their co-sponsorship.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentlewoman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I know it has been a long day here on the floor, and we are covering a lot of ground. We have got a few more amendments to go.

Again, I think we go through these amendments, and the gentlewoman is spot on, we have got to make sure people are trying to help people get access to insurance; can speak the language, can assist in each one of our districts.

But it is kind of an indictment to the existing program, if you think about it, that you have got to come here and legislate this. To me, whether it is about mental health, or substance abuse, or this, or the one before, this should be commonsense management of a program, and it tells me we have got a problem with the underlying navigator program.

We know that it is very, very expensive. We know that they enroll less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent. Everything we are arguing about this afternoon with all the amendments on the navigator program, both, are shining the light on the shortcomings of the program itself, which I think the administration has pointed to and said, This thing isn’t working very well, and it is at the least very expensive: $767 per enrollee, it appears. In the private sector they do it for much, much, much, much less.

So it is not that this amendment is bad or misguided. I don’t think it is. But it has never, never been fair, it is like a bright light on the underlying program that must be fraught with all kinds of problems, because we have got 16—no, wait. We have got 25 amendments from my friends on the other side of the aisle, most of which are to tell the navigator how to do a better job and to put in Federal statute how to, basically have common sense.

I have never, never thought, by the way, you could legislate common sense. I don’t know what my colleagues think of that. I never thought you could.

But I do know we need to fund community health centers, and the National Health Service Corps, and special diabetes programs, and teaching hospitals. And we have got this issue of the—this will be one that will be interesting.

If you don’t want to change ObamaCare, are you going to let the Cadillac tax hit insurance plans of union workers and people working in business?

Or are you going to put off the big cuts that are coming right at our hospitals?

I had my hospitals in the other day, and they are saying, Boy, I sure hope you are going to turn off those DSH cuts that are headed our way. We did that last Congress. I helped lead the effort on that.

But that is actually called for in the underlying ObamaCare which, by the way, a disproportionate share of hospitals are those in our rural areas, in many cases, have a high portion of Medicaid, and they were supposed to—agreed to as part of the grand bargain with the Obama administration and Democrats, take these cuts. And now they are coming back to us saying, We can’t afford to take these cuts.

So I don’t know if you will describe that as sabotaging ObamaCare, but I will bet you are going to join us in trying to hold off those DSH cuts that are coming at our community hospitals.

So it just strikes me, again, that this navigator program must be a mini-dрасон. He is making everybody, has to come to the floor with an amendment to tell them how to do their job, and to reach out and serve the people this whole thing was intended to serve.

So it is not that I am opposed to the amendment. I just think the underlying program is pretty darn expensive. But you have heard me say that before today, Mr. Chairman, a time or two.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. WEXTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider an amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 116–61.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 204, strike “The Secretary” and insert the following:
Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment includes findings about how short-term, limited-duration insurance weakens protection for the millions of Americans living with preexisting health conditions, including children with complex medical needs and disabilities.

Last year, the Trump administration greatly expanded the sale and marketing of short-term, limited-duration insurance, also known as junk insurance, plans. And these plans are junk because they don't provide critical protections laid out by the Affordable Care Act.

As my amendment points out, these plans lack important financial protections, may discriminate against individuals living with preexisting conditions, and may exclude coverage of essential health benefits such as prescription drugs and hospitalization.

The protections afforded by the Affordable Care Act are literally lifesaving for children with complex medical needs and disabilities. These children require specialized treatment and cause financial hardship to those requiring medical care, including children with complex medical needs and disabilities and their families; and (C) excludes coverage of essential health benefits including hospitalization, prescription drugs, and other lifesaving care.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, junk plans are for the up to 130 million Americans living with preexisting health conditions, and they jeopardize Americans' access to quality, affordable health insurance.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.
trying to make a decision. Because, look, why is someone looking at buying a limited-duration plan? They are looking at buying a limited-duration plan because they can't afford what is being sold on healthcare.gov or there perhaps a small business situation, a job transition or something that they are trying to cover.

The fact of the matter remains that the child described in the previous discussion would likely be better covered in one of the plans sold at healthcare.gov, but if, for whatever reason, the family decided that they wanted to investigate a less expensive plan and a limited-duration plan, that is certainly their right to do so. Probably not the best advice for them to buy that limited-duration plan, but certainly they should be free to do so, but they should also receive the information.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, back to the issue of the gentlewoman's amendment, the chair of the Subcommittee on Health, her amendment, the short summary here says:

Require short-term, limited-duration insurance plans to prominently carry a disclosure that they do not provide coverage for limited medical conditions and benefits.

That amendment was not made in order. It should have been made in order, because then we could get to the other question here, which I think we all agree on, is that there needs to be complete transparency of these things, because they don't cover everything. We all buy lots of insurance products for cars, houses, life insurance, disability, and all these things, and I want it to be easy to understand, full disclosure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question was taken; and the Act-
ing CHAIR recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleagues for introducing this legislation that works to improve our healthcare system and lower the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. This bill will bring much needed relief to the millions of Americans who are struggling to afford the care that they need.

The people from my home State of New Hampshire know that we must move beyond a political debate over the ACA to bipartisan action that will improve coverage and lower costs.

Just last week, I was proud to vote to protect Americans with preexisting conditions and introduce an amendment to safeguard coverage for those suffering from substance use disorder. The amendment I am offering today strengthens this legislation and the ACA by ensuring the administration is actively working to expand Americans' access to affordable coverage.

Specifically, my amendment requires the Department of Health and Human Services to set enrollment targets, goals that can be tracked and pursued with smart investments of resources. This commonsense practice was employed by the previous administration, yet the Trump administration has failed to do so.

While they should be promoting enrollment for affordable coverage, Health and Human Services has slashed the advertisement and outreach budget by 90 percent and it cut in-person enrollment assistance funding nearly in half.

These actions have very real consequences. Recent reports indicate that more than 1.1 million Americans lost healthcare coverage in 2018. In my State of New Hampshire, more than 10,000 individuals lost coverage over the past 3 years.

These cuts have undermined organizations such as the Bi-State Primary Care Association in New Hampshire.

The organization is responsible for helping nearly 110,000 underserved Granite Staters navigate the complexities of our healthcare system and find coverage in the enrollment period, which lasts only 6 weeks.

In the words of Executive Director Tess Kuening:

The loss in funding means a loss of a trusted impartial adviser educating and providing information so people can make an informed decision about health insurance coverage.

Without collecting and monitoring enrollment numbers, it is impossible to hold the department accountable or track how they are deploying resources to support enrollment.

In fact, the nonpartisan GAO slammed the administration for refusing to set targets and having no way to evaluate overall performance.

Mr. Chair, I can't fathom how leaders can work towards success without clearly defined goals. How do you measure progress? How do you know how to best utilize your resources? How do you know if you need to make a course correction?

American people reserve to know their government is working to expand access to care, not seeking to limit it.

In the greatest Nation on Earth, no American should miss the opportunity to have healthcare, economic security, quality of life, and the peace of mind that comes with it.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I am all about setting targets and holding people accountable for their goals, it turns out the navigators already tried that, and it didn't work very well. So I don't know that having Secretary Azar set a goal for each of the exchanges and all is going to work any better.

Navigators enrolled less than 1 percent of total enrollees. And according to one report, in fact, the navigator's program had an annual goal of 2,000, but, well, he kind of fell short. He only enrolled one person. So that is a bit of a problem.

I think goals are a good thing, but I don't know that that is going to help here. We know how many people get enrolled. We know information around this.

I don't know. Once again, here we are trying to micromanage a program that clearly has a lot of flaws, or we would be putting all these things into statute.

I mean, I don't think we are giving these amendments to 25 Democrats just because they are freshmen. I think they have substantive issues they are trying to bring to the floor here. But it seems to me that this is really odd to micromanage a program to this level, and so I am going to end up opposing this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).
The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, after line 18, insert the following:

(b) Promote Transparency and Accountability in the Administration's Expenditures to Support User Fees.

For each plan year and of the amount of such user fees collected pursuant to section 1321(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-13) during such plan year shall include a detailed accounting of the amount of such user fees collected during such plan year and of the amount of such expenditures used during such plan year for the federally facilitated Exchange operated pursuant to section 1321(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-13) outreach and enrollment activities, navigators, maintenance of Healthcare.gov, and operation of call centers.

Page 47, line 19, strike ``(B)'' and insert ``(C)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chair, I am honored to be here today to introduce my amendment to H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

My amendment promotes transparency and accountability to how the Trump administration is spending Affordable Care Act user fees.

For nearly 2 years now, the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have tried and failed to repeal the ACA. Had they been successful, 23 million hardworking Americans would have lost their health insurance and be left with nothing, no health security for themselves, their children, or their families.

When those efforts didn't pan out, the already failed administration and our friends across the aisle turned their attention to sabotaging the ACA, dismantling the law piece by piece.

First on the chopping block, they shortened the ACA enrollment periods by over half, from 42 days to 15. Less time to make a decision means less participation.

Next up was cutting funding for consumer education and outreach, not just a small cut, but a reduction of 90 percent from $100 million to just $10 million.

The goals are clear: let's keep public healthcare options a secret and let's make it as difficult as possible to insure yourself and your family.

Funding for vital navigator programs was slashed by 40 percent. This was a move the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, has self-described as "problematic." But it is much more than problematic; it is detrimental.

It is clear their goal is and always has been to drive ACA enrollment down to zero.

Last year, the administration began allowing insurance companies to promote junk plans. For plans that, for one, don't protect consumers with preexisting conditions.

Now the administration is pushing the ACA navigators to promote these junk plans, advertising these plans as somehow comparable to qualified ACA plans that provide full protections.

Obviously, consumers are going to be confused by this.

The GAO found that the drastic reduction in outreach and advertising, "Likely detracted from the 2018 enrollment."

That is not likely. That is a fact.

This is unacceptable, and it works directly against the intent of the law, which is to get more people healthcare coverage.

For some reason, this administration thinks that having uninsured Americans is a good thing.

My Democratic colleagues, the American public, and I believe differently.

In my home State of California, we saw the value of investing in ACA consumer education outreach. The way to get people covered and reduce uninsured rates is to educate consumers about their healthcare coverage options and make sure they know that healthcare insurance is affordable and within reach.

Having strong consumer outreach and enrollment activities can, in fact, lower premiums. This is exactly what we found in California.

Our State program covering California estimates that its outreach activities lowered premiums by up to 8 percent for all consumers.

This is basic economics. More participants equal lower costs for everyone. That 8 percent reduction amounts to some $576 million in my State alone.

That, my friends, is a great investment.

There is a clear intent by this administration and the Republican Members to undermine the Affordable Care Act by drastically reducing vital funding for a fully functioning marketplace.

And who does that hurt? Everyone.

This administration intends to jam the spokes on the progress the ACA has made to increase the number of people with healthcare coverage. Congress and the American people deserve answers to their attomption to revert the ACA.

First, we need to know what the administration has been spending ACA user fees on if they are not using these funds for education and outreach. We need to know why you are still charging States a 3½ percent user fee to access a Federal platform if those fees aren't being used for the purposes they were collected. And, naturally, we need to know why there was a recent 50 percent increase in user fees for State-based marketplaces. Talk about a tax rate hike.

My amendment seeks answers. It requires an annual report to be submitted to Congress that includes a detailed breakdown on spending for, one, outreach and enrollment; two, the navigator program; and, three, the maintenance of healthcare.gov and the call centers.

No one should be denied or dropped healthcare coverage because they are a senior, pregnant, or get sick.

Healthcare is a right, not a privilege, and everyone deserves access to quality, affordable care. It is critical now, more than ever, for us to get answers on how the ACA user fees have been spent over the last 2 years by this administration.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me that 17 navigators, according to CMS, during the grant year 2016 to 2017, 17 of these navigators that my friends on the other side of the aisle are such big fans of enrolled fewer than 100 people at an average cost of $5,000 per enrollee. That doesn't seem to be very cost efficient to me.

As I have said before, today, The Wall Street Journal investigation found one grantee got 200 grand and enrolled one person. This is a great program.

You can't understand why the Trump administration wants to cut back and put some boundaries around? I can't imagine why you would embrace that. I just don't get it.

The top 10 most expensive navigators collected $2.77 million, and they signed up 314 people. Let that one sink in. I mean, if you all want to embrace that, that is up to you. Not the way I would do business.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal editorialized: "The navigator scheme is a make-work government jobs program rife with corruption and highly susceptible to scam artists. It's a slush fund for progressive constituent groups."

That is a respected newspaper. The journalist who is writing this, Wall Street Journal's investigation.

We figure out $62.5 million in grants enrolled 81,426 individuals. That is less than 1 percent. That is your navigators. Mr. Chairman, that some are even enthralled with; that is their body of work: $62.5 million, 1 percent.

Now, if you just run a simple calculation, that means about $767 was spent...
per individual that was enrolled. That is a lot of money.

By contrast, agents and brokers assisted with 42 percent of the federally facilitated exchange enrollment for plan year 2018, which cost the FFE only $2.40 per person to provide training and technical assistance.

So we have before us this opportunity to either fund a program that appears to be susceptible to scam, according to one paper: One person gets enrolled and one person gets paid $200,000 to enroll that one person. That is the outcome. That doesn’t seem to make a lot of sense to me.

So I would say to my colleague from California that where we really need the transparency and accountability is on the navigators themselves. That is where we ought to be investigating.

And on the short-term duration plans, it is unfortunate that Ms. Eshoo’s amendment was not made in order, because I agree that we need more transparency on those plans so people know what they are buying. I don’t want anybody to get a plan that doesn’t cover what they need. I don’t think any of us do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman’s amendment, and unless any of us think any of us do.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 116-61.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 20, after “populations,” insert “individuals residing in areas where the unemployment rate exceeds the national average unemployment rate.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chair, I am honored to be here today to introduce my amendment to H.R. 987, The Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

My amendment would ensure that communities with high unemployment numbers are prioritized in the navigator outreach program.

The Affordable Care Act created navigator programs to provide outreach, education, and enrollment assistance to consumers shopping for healthcare coverage. Robust marketing and outreach programs through the navigator program have been very successful throughout the country and have demonstrated meaningful benefits to our consumers.

In my home State of California, we have been making these necessary investments to ensure people throughout our State get the information they need to obtain coverage, and it works. Our State-based marketplace, Covered California, has demonstrated meaningful benefit in the marketing and outreach in 2015 and 2016 increased enrollment, which reduced premiums by up to 8 percent for all of our enrolled members. That is savings to all enrolled members of some $376 million. Based on a small budget of $56 million, that is a great investment. That is a 1,000 percent return on investment. That is a great deal by anyone’s measure.

That is the goal: to reduce the number of uninsured Americans. We all know that, when we have insurance, we stay healthy, and this strengthens our overall healthcare system, our communities, and our Nation.

That is why the navigator program is so important. The Trump administration’s 84 percent cut to the program since 2016 is just unacceptable. It is imperative that funding be restored to navigator programs.

Navigator programs help those without insurance obtain health insurance through small companies, sole proprietors, contractors, and every one of those entrepreneurs who are staking their claim to the American Dream.

The fact is many people who are eligible for financial assistance through the ACA, which would help them obtain coverage, don’t even know they can get help, and this administration wants to keep them in the dark. Some 40 percent of consumers today don’t even know there are options available.

My congressional district has an unemployment rate of almost 17 percent, and this is made up of rural communities that face unique challenges and barriers with respect to education, communication, and transportation. This makes it very difficult for my constituents to receive information on their healthcare insurance options.

This is so similar to many of our rural communities across our Nation. For many of those communities, the navigator program is the only way they can access this vital information.

Everyone should have health insurance and know their healthcare options. Healthcare is a right, not a privilege. Oh, you ZIP Code should not dictate your ability to obtain health insurance.

My amendment would help distressed communities like those in my district and so many more across our Nation that may not have the resources to access the full healthcare options. By fully funding the navigator program and by focusing our efforts on areas that have high unemployment, we can get more people covered. And that is the goal.

Here in America, the building blocks for success are quality education, dedication to hard work, and good health. A healthy workforce is vital for America’s success. We must fund the navigator program to help educate those who are difficult to reach geographically or who have limited access to ACA resources.

This is a critical and necessary investment that will build stronger, healthier, and more productive communities and an America that demonstrates that its best investments are its people.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just make a couple of points.

First of all, of course we want navigators to work in areas where there is high unemployment. My district, over the years, has had some of the highest unemployment in the State of Oregon. Then I go down the list of future amendments here, and it is like, oh, we have got another one coming up that ensures rural areas are included in the navigator outreach. Well, that is a good idea.

And then there is another one that ensures that State healthcare exchange outreach activities also target our veteran population. Yes, that is a good idea.

Why are we having to put all this in statute? Who the heck is running this program, and why is it such a mess that it requires amendment after amendment after amendment? My point is: Where does this stop?

Of course we want them to work with veterans. Of course we want them to work with seniors and the young. Are we going to go to age segments here, 18 to 29, 31 to—I mean, come on. Really? We are going to put all this in statute?

How do they not have common sense? Who are these navigators that we have to direct them from the floor of the House into statute? Oh, by the way, be sure and work in an unemployed area. Be sure to mention that there are services for mental health and substance abuse. Oh, don’t forget this, that, and the other thing.

I mean, I think we only ran out of amendments because we ran out of ideas of things to put into the statute, but that is no way to run a program.

And if it costs $767 for everyone they can access this vital information. I was in the radio business for 20 years. Our job was to get information out to consumers, so I am all about that.
It is just amazing, though, when you see the inefficiency of a Federal system versus the efficiency of a private-sector initiative.

And here we just passed an amendment, $25 million more into this program, and yet we know in some cases there is an enormous cost, and there appears to be, you know—I don’t know—malfeasance. I don’t know what it is.

But if the top 10 most expensive navigators collected $2.77 million to sign up 314 people, I think we are in the wrong business. We ought to go be navigators at that rate. That is a pretty good rate of return for them, but not for the people and the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCarthy), the Republican leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend 1 minute and thank my friend, Congressman WALDEN. I know the work that he puts in when it comes to healthcare for America.

Mr. Chairman, I know of a bill that Mr. WALDEN has in to protect pre-existing conditions. We have asked many times to mark it up or bring it to the floor—no, not brought. It is talked about a lot. Mr. Chairman, but no bill to bring it here.

I know your care when it comes to not just healthcare, but the type of treatment one is able to get, the quality of care out there, because, Mr. Chairman, I have seen people out there who will run health facilities for the seniors but don’t do a very good job. The quality is not there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCarthy), the Republican leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend 1 minute and thank my friend, Congressman WALDEN. I know the work that he puts in when it comes to healthcare for America.

Mr. Chairman, I know of a bill that Mr. WALDEN has in to protect pre-existing conditions. We have asked many times to mark it up or bring it to the floor—no, not brought. It is talked about a lot. Mr. Chairman, but no bill to bring it here.

I know your care when it comes to not just healthcare, but the type of treatment one is able to get, the quality of care out there, because, Mr. Chairman, I have seen people out there who will run health facilities for the seniors but don’t do a very good job. The quality is not there.

People have lost their own healthcare within there. People have been fined by the way they have treated individuals and seniors. People have lost eyes just because the treatment had been poor.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today on this floor because we all know that drug prices are too high. That is why the Energy and Commerce Committee worked tirelessly to pass three healthcare bills unanimously to address that.

Now, how often is that said on this floor? Not very often. It was a moment that I heard from almost every member on that committee, a moment of pride.

We have legislation passed in a bipartisan fashion today. We could take it from that committee and bring it to the floor, and we would have the exact same thing happen. We could have the Republicans and the Democrats coming together to lower the price of drugs.

You know who wins? All of America. Sadly, however, these good faith efforts have been unnecessarily thrown into a partisan and senseless attempt to bail out pieces of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I don’t say that—but I guess I just did. Mr. Chairman. I knew it because I happen to be a Member of Congress. I watched it because I watched the committee work together, find common ground in a place where it is really difficult.

But when I looked at The Washington Post, it was very interesting. This is what the CBO actually put it best. Democrats are putting a “political pothole”—yeah, that is what they said—a “political pothole” in the way of real drug pricing reform.

You know, if you ever spend time back in your district or across this country, I would promise you one of the top three issues you will get is the price of drugs. I think everybody in this body was looking forward to this day, prior to the Democrats playing with political potholes.

Make no mistake, the drug pricing component of H.R. 987 is very strong. The three drug pricing bills in this legislation get to the heart of the problem, the lack of competition in the generic drug market. Increased competition for generic drugs would lead to lower prices and make medication more accessible. Two things, I think, anybody in America would desire.

Just think for a moment. You would get more competition, more choice, and lower prices.

We were so close. We got out of committee. The Members on both sides said yes. The only step you had left: Go to the Rules Committee and come to the floor.

But as you pass through that committee to get to the Rules Committee and get to the floor, I guess it had to go through leadership. Leadership made a choice: Politics before people.

These reforms would have removed barriers to generic drugs entering the market, making healthcare more affordable for patients. It is a real change.

That would have been a positive moment we all could have celebrated. But you know what is going to happen here? It is going to be a partisan vote and a bill that goes nowhere.

It is going to be a moment that most people will say elected officials are supposed to fix, not create. It is the opposite of what elected officials are supposed to do. They are supposed to fill in the potholes, not dig them.

But if you read The Washington Post, they will tell you exactly who created them—the Democrats.

There are a lot of things that happen on this floor that at times are reckless, irresponsible, and just downright embarrassing. Mr. Chairman, this is one of them. Why at a time when both sides say they want to lower the prices of drugs and give people more options?

It goes to the core of the individual, of these prices. It goes to the core of what the Democrats want to do. They don’t want to make law. They love playing politics.

You know what happens when they play politics? Not only do keep drug prices high, but they break another promise.

I happen to have been in this body, Mr. Chairman, when I heard those words, that if you like your healthcare, you could keep it.

I thought those millions of Americans who lost their healthcare that time, that that would be the end. But no. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats took the majority again. I thought that was embarrassing.

Had you taken enough health policies away from millions of Americans? The answer was no. They had a few more to go. Mr. Chairman, 1.5 million, the Congressional Budget Office says.

So think, tomorrow when Americans wake up, there was a moment the prices could be lower. But, no. Would they ever think that not only are you not going to lower them, but you are going to take my healthcare away?

That is exactly what is going to happen here today. That is the poison pill they added to the bills.

Mr. Chairman, 1.5 million Americans will lose their plans. Now, if you listen to the other side, they say, no, no, it is not practical. You know what it is? The CBO says, no, it goes down to 500,000.

I have heard them use the Congressional Budget Office thousands of times, Mr. Chairman, on the floor. I haven’t heard them use it today.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today on this floor because we all know that drug prices are too high. That is why the Energy and Commerce Committee worked tirelessly to pass three healthcare bills unanimously to address that.

Now, how often is that said on this floor? Not very often. It was a moment that I heard from almost every member on that committee, a moment of pride.

We have legislation passed in a bipartisan fashion today. We could take it from that committee and bring it to the floor, and we would have the exact same thing happen. We could have the Republicans and the Democrats coming together to lower the price of drugs.

You know who wins? All of America. Sadly, however, these good faith efforts have been unnecessarily thrown into a partisan and senseless attempt to bail out pieces of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I don’t say that—but I guess I just did. Mr. Chairman. I knew it because I happen to be a Member of Congress. I watched it because I watched the committee work together, find common ground in a place where it is really difficult.

But when I looked at The Washington Post, it was very interesting. This is what the CBO actually put it best. Democrats are putting a “political pothole”—yeah, that is what they said—a “political pothole” in the way of real drug pricing reform.

You know, if you ever spend time back in your district or across this country, I would promise you one of the top three issues you will get is the price of drugs. I think everybody in this body was looking forward to this day, prior to the Democrats playing with political potholes.

Make no mistake, the drug pricing component of H.R. 987 is very strong. The three drug pricing bills in this legislation get to the heart of the problem, the lack of competition in the generic drug market. Increased competition for generic drugs would lead to lower prices and make medication more accessible. Two things, I think, anybody in America would desire.

Just think for a moment. You would get more competition, more choice, and lower prices.

We were so close. We got out of committee. The Members on both sides said yes. The only step you had left: Go to the Rules Committee and come to the floor.

But as you pass through that committee to get to the Rules Committee and get to the floor, I guess it had to go through leadership. Leadership made a choice: Politics before people.

These reforms would have removed barriers to generic drugs entering the market, making healthcare more affordable for patients. It is a real change.

That would have been a positive moment we all could have celebrated. But you know what is going to happen here? It is going to be a partisan vote and a bill that goes nowhere.

It is going to be a moment that most people will say elected officials are supposed to fix, not create. It is the opposite of what elected officials are supposed to do. They are supposed to fill in the potholes, not dig them.

But if you read The Washington Post, they will tell you exactly who created them—the Democrats.

There are a lot of things that happen on this floor that at times are reckless, irresponsible, and just downright embarrassing. Mr. Chairman, this is one of them. Why at a time when both sides say they want to lower the prices of drugs and give people more options?

It goes to the core of the individual, of these prices. It goes to the core of what the Democrats want to do. They don’t want to make law. They love playing politics.

You know what happens when they play politics? Not only do keep drug prices high, but they break another promise.

I happen to have been in this body, Mr. Chairman, when I heard those
When you study history, and they talk about elected officials, they will tell you even from the most local places you get elected, the jobs you are going to have are filling in potholes. I never heard someone say your job as elected officials is to create potholes, but that is what we witnessed today.

It is a sad day for this House. We could do so much better. We did in committee.

Is it not, Mr. Chairman, that the majority doesn’t want to solve a problem? Because, Mr. Chairman, I have searched. They have been in power for quite some time, and I have not found one problem they have solved yet. I found a few potholes they created. I think we have enough problems.

When we have that moment that we can come together inside of a committee, could we just keep it a little longer so it can get to the floor?

Mr. Chairman, that is an option. There will be an amendment in this body that gives you an opportunity. If you were in that Committee on Energy and Commerce and you voted on these bills without the poison pill, I will tell you that moment of truth. It will tell a lot to America, Mr. Chairman, whether you serve your constituents or you serve your leadership.

That is what we will be watching. That is what America will be wondering. That is what we all hope will happen.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. AGUILAR). The gentleman has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the Republican leader of the U.S. House for not only his leadership on this issue but for so many others, and for giving us clarity on what is really going on here.

It is unfortunate. As The Washington Post and other news media organizations reported, it didn’t have to be this way. It didn’t have to be this way.

We did pass the three drug reform bills unanimously out of the committee. I was a big supporter of them.

Every Republican was. I think every Republican on the floor will be if they get a chance to vote for those.

In the past, when I was chairman of the committee, we moved over 143 bills out of the committee. Ninety-three percent of them had bipartisan votes on them. Fifty-seven became bills unanimously out of the committee. Ninety-three percent of them had bipartisan votes outside of the committee. Fifty-seven became bills unanimously out of the committee.

I was a big supporter of them.
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The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I come to this, the Provision of rural communities with navigators serving them is critical, because from 2016 to 2018, Oklahoma lost 78 percent of its navigator funding. The very communities that are in the most need, where the least access to services and understanding, including broadband, so that they can access the services they need, are the very ones that are suffering most.

These closures and the lack of access not only have an effect in the communities that directly impact them, but ripple across my State and this Nation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am outraged that these navigators are not reaching out to people in rural areas. What we have learned today on the House floor is that apparently this program doesn’t reach people in rural areas. That is why the gentlewoman from Oklahoma has this amendment. These navigators, what do they do?

We have had amendments to say you have got to have navigators reach out to people on Medicaid. You have got to have navigators reach out to people on the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We have to tell them that! What have they been doing?

We are going to have an amendment coming up saying, Navigators, we are going to put into Federal law that you have to talk to people in rural areas. That is why our money should go, not into a program like this, apparently, that we have to have these amendments from Democrat Members. I think we had 25 amendments from Democrat Members telling navigators we are going to go to rural areas, we are going to go to veterans. Who are they serving today? It is a mess.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116–61.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 20, after “populations,” insert “veterans.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my straightforward, commonsense amendment which will ensure that our Nation’s veterans have access to quality, affordable health insurance coverage.

While people often think that everyone who has served in the military immediately has access to VA healthcare, that is not the case. In fact, only three out of five veterans under the age of 65 are eligible for healthcare through the VA, and only a quarter of those who are eligible for VA healthcare rely on the VA as their sole source of insurance.

Younger veterans who served for 24 consecutive months are eligible for VA coverage for 5 years after their discharge, and veterans over the age of 65 qualify for Medicare. This leaves a potential one of the highest concentrations of veterans in the entire country.

It has the highest concentrations in the entire State of South Carolina, and I want to make sure that each of them are aware of their coverage options so that they can make the best choices for themselves and for their families.

Mr. Chair, I want to ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting my amendment as well as the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, as I said in the last amendment debate, it is astonishing to me that apparently these navigators aren’t talking to people in rural areas, and now I find out that they are apparently not serving our veteran population effectively as well.

I am going to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, in closing, I would like to thank Chairman PALLONE and Chairman SCOTT for their work in constructing this important legislation which will lower drug prices, stabilize the insurance market, and increase premiums for hard-working families across this country.

I also want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and my colleagues on the
Rules Committee for allowing my amendment to come to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment as well as the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his service to the country and all of our veterans, men and women, who wear our uniform and deserve our undying appreciation and thanks.

But it is astonishing, once again, it is appalling that these navigators apparently aren’t serving our veterans. We have to come to the floor with amendments to Federal law to order them to take care of our veterans. What kind of program is this?

We know it is expensive. We know some in the news media, some of the editorial writers in our country said it is open to fraud—and let me read it.

And I had a local paper out West said, “In reality, the navigator scheme is a make-work government jobs program rife with corruption and highly susceptible to scam artists. It’s a slush fund for progressive constituent groups.”

That is how one editorial came out. I am sure good people are there somewhere doing good work, but we know that according to CMS, 17 navigators enrolled less than 100 people at an average cost of $5,000 per enrollee.

What kind of program is this? We know it is expensive.

One grantee took in $200,000 and enrolled one person. The top ten most expensive collected $2.77 million and signed up 314 people. So it is inefficient, but at least it is really expensive. What a waste.

I am sure they enroll people, but only 1 percent of those enrolled in the exchange were helped by navigators. And then today, we find out that we have to tell them what to do, which makes you wonder what they are doing, because we have had amendments to say, you have got to have them educate people about Medicaid, or CHIP, or veterans, rural areas, mental health, substance abuse—one thing after another. We are putting all of our money into a program that apparently wasn’t taking care of veterans, nor people in rural areas.

It is astonishing. So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fine. It makes sense. It is just outrageous we have to put in Federal law that these navigators have to actually help veterans because they ought to be doing that day in and day out. Veterans are the ones who give us our freedom. We need to investigate the navigators.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY). The amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HARDER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Harder) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The recorded vote is as follows:

Voting on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Harder) to demand a recorded vote: Ayes 243, Nays 174, not voting 20.

[Roll No. 211]

AVES-243

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. PORTER, Messrs. BRINDISI, GREEN of Texas, MCADAMS, MCEACHIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, BASS, and SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. YOHO, BABIN, KING of Iowa, NORMAN, STEWART, ROGERS of Alabama, GROTHMAN, WALBERG, RUTHERFORD, and KATKO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

[1900] NOES—174

So the agreement was made to:

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The recording vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 185, not voting 20, as follows:

(No Roll No. 212)

AYES—232

Adams, Troy (NY) 
Agullar, Laura (CA) 
Aguilera, Annette R. (CO) 
Alexander, Jason (TN) 
Allred, Justin (TX) 
Allegretti, Donald (MS) 
Allred, Robert (TX) 
Allred,规划建设 (TX) 
Amaro, Coachella (CA) 
Amodei, Peter (NV) 
Amash, AO (MI) 
Aderholt, Mooney (AL) 
Allen, Kevin (NY) 
Allen, Mark (AR) 
Allen, Matthew (NC) 
Alonso, Gonzalo (PR) 
Alston, James B. (GA) 
Alves, Abigail (SC) 
Alvarez, Xochitl (CA)

ADHERHOLT

NOES—185

Abram, Zach (TX) 
Abañades, Anselm (CA) 
Abdo, Steve (SD) 
Abraham, knob (IL) 
Abigail, Jennifer (IA) 
Abigail, Mary (NE) 
Abigail, Richard (CT) 
Abigail, Thomas (RI) 
Abigail, William (OH) 
Abigail, Yvette (CA) 
Abigail, Adam (NY) 
Abigail, Frank (PA) 
Abigail, George (VA) 
Abigail, Gary (IL) 
Abigail, Graziano (NJ) 
Abigail, John (PA) 
Abigail, Joseph (CA) 
Abigail, Justin (WI) 
Abigail, Kent (CA) 
Abigail, Lindsey (IA) 
Abigail, Marsha (AZ) 
Abigail, Michael (CA) 
Abigail, Michael (NJ) 
Abigail, Michelle (NJ) 
Abigail, Morgan (MN) 
Abigail, Nancy (TX) 
Abigail, Rosa (CA) 
Abigail, Thomas (NH) 
Abigail, Tom (MS) 
Abigail, Walter (RI) 
Abigail, William (NY)
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Allred,规划建设 (TX) 
Amaro, Coachella (CA) 
Amodei, Peter (NV) 
Amash, AO (MI) 
Aderholt, Mooney (AL) 
Allen, Kevin (NY) 
Allen, Mark (AR) 
Allen, Matthew (NC) 
Alonso, Gonzalo (PR) 
Alston, James B. (GA) 
Alves, Abigail (SC) 
Alvarez, Xochitl (CA)

ADHERHOLT

NOES—185

Abram, Zach (TX) 
Abañades, Anselm (CA) 
Abdo, Steve (SD) 
Abraham, knob (IL) 
Abigail, Jennifer (IA) 
Abigail, Michael (NY) 
Abigail, Robert (PA) 
Abigail, Richard (CT) 
Abigail, Thomas (RI) 
Abigail, William (OH) 
Abigail, George (VA) 
Abigail, Gary (IL) 
Abigail, John (PA) 
Abigail, Joseph (CA) 
Abigail, Lindsey (IA) 
Abigail, Morgan (MN) 
Abigail, Nancy (TX) 
Abigail, Thomas (NH) 
Abigail, Tom (MS) 
Abigail, Walter (RI) 
Abigail, William (NY) 

Abigail, Adam (NY) 
Abigail, Frank (PA) 
Abigail, George (VA) 
Abigail, Gary (IL) 
Abigail, John (PA) 
Abigail, Joseph (CA) 
Abigail, John (VT) 
Abigail, Michael (CA) 
Abigail, Michael (NJ) 
Abigail, Michelle (NJ) 
Abigail, Morgan (MN) 
Abigail, Nancy (TX) 
Abigail, Robert (PA) 
Abigail, Rosa (CA) 
Abigail, Thomas (NH) 
Abigail, Tom (MS) 
Abigail, Walter (RI) 
Abigail, William (NY)
Subtitle B—Protecting Consumer Access to Generics Drugs

SEC. 111. UNLAWFUL AGREEMENTS.

(a) AGREEMENTS PROHIBITED.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), it shall be unlawful for an NDA or BLA holder and a subsequent filer or for two subsequent filers that are—

(1) a subsequent filer directly or indirectly receives from such holder (or in the case of such an agreement between two subsequent filers, the other subsequent filer) anything of value, including a license; and

(2) the subsequent filer agrees to limit or forego research on, or development, manufacture, patented patent infringement claim in into, or carry out, an agreement resolving or settling a covered patent infringement claim on a final or interim basis if such agreement—

(i) is compensation solely for other goods or services not to exceed $7,500,000 in the aggregate; or

(ii) any NDA or BLA holder or subsequent filer that violates this section. Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, or otherwise affect the right of a subsequent filer to assert claims or counterclaims in such a proceeding.”

(b) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Commission to the extent that the Commission, by Federal law.

(c) EFERENCE TO PUBLIC HEALTH ACT.—Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, or otherwise affect the right of a subsequent filer to assert claims or counterclaims in such a proceeding.”

(d) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, or otherwise affect the right of a subsequent filer to assert claims or counterclaims in such a proceeding.”

(e) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, or otherwise affect the right of a subsequent filer to assert claims or counterclaims in such a proceeding.”

"(aa) 3 times the value received by such NDA or BLA holder (or subsequent filer) that is reasonably attributable to the violation of this section;

(bb) 3 times the value given to the subsequent filer (or to the holder) that is reasonably attributable to the violation of this section; and

(bb) the value described in subsection (a), the United States courts are empowered to grant injunctive relief and such other and further equitable relief as the court may deem appropriate.

(II) in such civil action, the findings of the court not later than 30 days after such order is served on the party seeking review.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—In the case of a cease and desist order issued by the Commission under any other provision of law.

(ii) any NDA or BLA holder or subsequent filer (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who gave the value described in subsection (a)(1)), compensation received by the subsequent filer (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who received the value described in subsection (a)(1)), and the amount of commerce affected; and

(iii) other matters that justice requires.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF THIS SECTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.
(A) resolves or settles a covered patent infringement claim; or
(B) is contingent upon, provides for a contingent condition for, or is otherwise related to the settlement of a covered patent infringement claim.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL CLAIM.—The term "environmental claim" means an action for damages or injunctive relief brought or threatened to enforce a statute, regulation, or common law duty under Federal or State environmental laws.

(4) COVERED PRODUCT.—The term "covered product" means any drug, device, biological product, or medical device.

(5) NDA OR BLA HOLDER.—The term "NDA or BLA holder" means—

(1) the holder of an NDA or BLA; or
(2) any successor to such person who is the holder of an NDA or BLA.

(6) PATENT.—The term "patent" means a patent that is issued, reissued, or provisionally allowed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(7) STATUTORY EXCLUSIVE.—The term "statutory exclusivity" means those prohibitions on the submission or approval of drug applications under clauses (ii) through (iv) of section 505(j)(5)(B)(iv) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(5)(B)(iv)) for new drug applications under section 505(b)(1) (interchangeable biological product exclusivity) or section 505(b)(2) (biological product reference product exclusivity) of the Federal Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(e)(6), (7)).

(8) SUBSEQUENT FILER.—The term "subsequent filer" means—

(A) in the case of an approved new drug application filed with the Food and Drug Administration under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) or a biological product application filed with the Public Health Service under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)) for the covered product; or
(B) in the case of a subsequent filer, the term "subsequent filer" means—

(i) any person who, in the case of an application described in subparagraph (A)(i) of such section (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) or (section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i))), respectively, has the exclusive rights to distribute the covered product that is the subject of such application; or
(ii) in the case of a biological product, a party that owns or controls an abbreviated new drug application submitted pursuant to section 505(f)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(f)(2)) (qualified infectious disease product exclusivity), a license application submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(2)) and filed under section 505(b)(1) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) or has the exclusive rights to distribute the covered product that is the subject of such application; or
(iii) in the case of a biological product, a party that owns or controls an application filed with the Food and Drug Administration under section 351(k)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)(1)) or has the exclusive rights to distribute the biological product that is the subject of such application.

(9) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies with respect to agreements described in section 351(a)(1) entered into or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(10) NOTICE OF ALL AGREEMENTS.—Section 11117(a) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (21 U.S.C. 355 note) is amended by inserting "or (F) under subsection (a) or (b) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 and the proceeding for the issuance of such order was commenced within the period required by subsection (a) of this section, such subsection does not prohibit the commencement, after such period, of a civil action under subsection (d)(3)(A) against a party to such order or a civil action under subsection (i) of such section 5 for violation of such order."

(i) that, as of the date on which the civil action is filed, the product developer has not obtained sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(ii) that the eligible product developer has submitted a written request to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product to the license holder; and

(iii) the eligible product developer has specified an individual as the point of contact for the license holder to direct communications related to the sale of the covered product to the eligible product developer and a means and written communications with that individual; and

(IV) specified an address to which the covered product was to be shipped upon reaching the quantity ordered.

And

(iv) that the license holder has not delivered to the eligible product developer sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms—

(c) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), it shall be an affirmative defense for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 31 days after the date on which the eligible product developer requested the covered product under paragraph (1), the court shall—

(1) find in favor of the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms, if the eligible product developer prevails in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 7 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder; or

(ii) award to the eligible product developer sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(3) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), it shall be an affirmative defense for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 14 days after the date on which the eligible product developer requested the covered product under paragraph (1), the court shall—

(1) find in favor of the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms, if the eligible product developer prevails in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 7 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder; or

(ii) award to the eligible product developer sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(4) REMEDIES.—(A) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible product developer prevails in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the court shall—

(i) order the license holder to provide to the eligible product developer without delay sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(ii) award to the eligible product developer reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of the civil action; and

(iii) award to the eligible product developer a monetary amount sufficient to deter the license holder from facilitating eligible product developers with sufficient quantities of a covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms, if the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence—

(I) that the license holder delayed providing sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer without a legitimate business justification; or

(II) that the license holder failed to comply with an order issued under clause (I).

(B) MAXIMUM MONETARY AMOUNT.—A monetary amount awarded under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not be greater than the revenue from the sale of the covered product to supply to the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms.
(I) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received sufficient quantities of the covered product.

(II) when the Secretary determines that no different, comparable approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy or other application under subsection (f) that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) that uses different methods or operational means than the strategy or application under subsection (a) for a covered listed drug, or other application under section 505(j) with the same listed drug, but achieves the same level of safety as such strategy.

(a) In General.—Nothing in this subtitle, or in section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1), shall be construed as—

(A) prohibiting a license holder from providing an eligible product developer access to a covered product in the absence of an authorization under this subtitle; or

(B) in any way negating the applicability of a REMS with ETASU, as otherwise required under section 505(j), the Secretary may require that a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the later of—

(1) for a drug that is subject to an application under section 505(j) and the listed drug to use a single, shared system under subsection (f), if the Secretary determines that no different, comparable approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy or application under subsection (f) for a drug that is the subject of an abbreviated new drug application under section 505(j), the Secretary may require that such different comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use can be used with respect to any other drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) or 505(b) that references the same listed drug; and

(2) in any way negating the applicability of a REMS with ETASU, as otherwise required under section 505(j), the Secretary may require that such different comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use can be used with respect to any other drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) or 505(b) that references the same listed drug, but achieves the same level of safety as such strategy.

(b) Definition.—In this subsection, the terms ‘different, comparable risk evaluation and mitigation strategy’ mean a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) that uses different methods or operational means than the strategy or application under subsection (a) for a covered listed drug, or other application under section 505(j) with the same such listed drug, but achieves the same level of safety as such strategy.

(c) Limitation of Liability.—A license holder for a covered product shall not be liable for any claim under Federal, State, or local law arising out of the failure of an eligible product developer to follow adequate safeguards to assure safe use of the covered product during development or testing activities described in this section, including transportation, handling, use, or disposal of the covered product by the eligible product developer.

(d) No Violation of REMS.—Section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(f) REMS APPROVAL PROCESS FOR SUBSEQUENT FILING.—Section 505–1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) in subsection (g)(4)(B),—

(A) in clause (i) by striking ‘or’ after the semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘; or’;

and

(C) by adding at the end the following:—

‘‘(iii) accommodate different, comparable aspects of the elements to assure safe use for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j), and the applicable listed drug.’’;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(E) For pediatric cancer research, not to exceed a total of $4,963,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.’’;

Mr. WALDEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats worked together on provisions to bring generic drugs to market faster and to stop abusive practices. We did that on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we brought this House multiple bills to achieve that goal. We did it unanimously.

We believe our bipartisan work will increase competition and ultimately help lower the cost of prescription drugs.

These policies passed unanimously out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. They help consumers, and they have the added benefit of helping the Federal Government by producing $4 billion in savings.

Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle, Democrats, decided to pair these bipartisan bills to lower drug costs with what they knew were very partisan bills that I, frankly, think waste taxpayer money in many cases.

We ought to be working together on this, not descending ‘‘into partisan politics on a seemingly bipartisan issue.’’

Those are the words of STAT News as reported today.

The fact is, when we do work together, we can achieve real results. In the last Congress, we reauthorized the Food and Drug Administration, and we gave that agency the tools and resources to get generic drugs into market faster.

It is already working. Our work produced, with the FDA’s efforts, a record number of generic drugs coming to market, driving competition, and giving consumers more choices.

We did the same thing in the prior Congress when Fred Upton and Diana DeGette led the effort on 21st Century Cures. That was bipartisan. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle, Democrats, decided to pair these bipartisan bills to lower drug costs with what they knew were very partisan bills that I, frankly, think waste taxpayer money in many cases.

Let me just talk briefly about navigators.

They cost you an average of $767 every time they sign up an individual. In the private sector, it is $2.40. And they just added another $25 million to that.

The Wall Street Journal reported one grantee took in $200,000 to enroll a grand total of one person.
Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered to be recorded for the House, and, upon announcement of the result, theChair announced that there was a majority for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in standing for ensuring Americans have access to affordable healthcare and prescription drugs. I stand in opposition to this MTR. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the political ploy that would hurt American families, those with pre-existing conditions, and those who are trying to afford their healthcare and prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
So the motion to recommit was re-jected.

The vote was taken as above recorded.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

VOTE—19

Not voting—15

Mr. Johnson (SC) for Mr. Johnson (GA).

Mr. Thompson (CA) for Mr. Thompson (MS).

Mr. Young for Mr. Tipton.

Mr. Dorgan for Mr. Timmons.

Mr. Steube for Mr. Soto.

Mr..Spanberger for Mr. Moulton.

Mr. Escobar for Mr. Vela.

Mr. Davis, Danny K. for Mr. Davis, Danny K.

Mr. Aderholt for Mr. Aderholt.
So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING EACH MEMBER, OFFICER, AND EMPLOYEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES EACH SESSION OF EACH CONGRESS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 30, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House. The Clerk read the title of the resolution. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection. The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 30

Resolved, SECTION 1. MANDATORY COMPLETION OF PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) REQUIRING TRAINING FOR ALL MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on House Administration shall issue regulations to provide that, during each session of each Congress, each Member (including each Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress), officer, and employee of the House of Representatives shall complete a program of training in the workplace rights and responsibilities applicable to offices and employees of the House under part A of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 2051 et seq.), including anti-discrimination and anti-harassment training.

(2) INCLUSION OF INTERNS, FELLOWS, AND DETAILLEES.—For purposes of this resolution, an individual serving in an office of the House of Representatives as an intern (including an unpaid intern), a participant in a fellowship program, or a detailee from an individual in an office of the Federal Government shall be considered an employee of the House.

(b) DEADLINE.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the regulations issued by the Committee on House Administration, an individual shall complete the program of training required under subsection (a) and file a certificate of completion of such training not later than—

(A) in the case of an individual who is serving as a Member, officer, or employee of the House as of the first day of a session of Congress, not later than 90 days after the session begins; or

(B) in the case of any other individual, not later than 90 days after the individual first becomes a Member, officer, or employee of the House during the session.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR FIRST SESSION OF ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS.—In the case of the first session of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, an individual described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall complete the program required under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

(c) ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS.—The Committee on House Administration shall consider additional mechanisms to ensure compliance with the training requirement under subsection (a).

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE PAY UNDER PUBLIC LAW 110-279

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 1436) to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110-279, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection. The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1436

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE PAY UNDER PUBLIC LAW 110-279.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 110-279 (2 U.S.C. 2051(c)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “For purposes of” and all that follows through “(i) any period” and inserting the following:

“(i) TREATMENT OF PAY.—For purposes of chapters 67 and 87 of title 5, United States Code, any period’’;

(2) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and”;

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The regulations promulgated under paragraph (1) shall take effect not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms “contractor”, “covered individual”, and “food services contract” have the meanings given those terms in section 1(a) of Public Law 110-279 (2 U.S.C. 2051(a)).

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to—

(A) a covered individual who separates from service as an employee of a contractor performing services under the food services contract before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) each payment to a covered individual under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, made on or after the effective date of the regulations promulgated under subsection (a).

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 965, CREATING AND RESTORING EQUAL ACCESS TO EQUIVALENT SAMPLES ACT OF 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 965. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 987, STRENGTHENING HEALTH CARE AND LOWERING PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 987, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? There was no objection.

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

Mr. LATTA. 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. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

FIGHTING FOR ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY HEALTHCARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, Democrats continue to fight for access to healthcare in our work to deliver progress for the people because it is essential to daily life. You cannot work, you cannot care for your children, you cannot do anything without your health.
I was recently blessed to come through a health challenge myself, and I believe more strongly than ever that, whether it is cancer therapy or prescription medication, access to the best treatment cannot be reserved for only the wealthy.

Last week, I secured funding in the Appropriations Committee to study the impact of prior authorization policies on patient health. People are dying because insurance companies want to see lower cost treatments, see them fail before they will cover more expensive ones, even if your healthcare provider specifically recommends it.

Whether you have cancer like I did or you are dealing with a chronic illness, you shouldn’t have to endure extra pain or wonder if you can survive long enough to get to the treatment that will work for you.

I will continue to fight for access to high-quality healthcare for all Americans.

☐ 1945

IN RECOGNITION OF ALEX KUNDA
(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 Mr. Alex Kunda for becoming the first student in the history of the Glynn County School System to have perfect attendance from kindergarten through 12th grade.

When Mr. Kunda was 4 years old, his sister, Miranda, passed away from a rare illness. At that time, her sister had maintained perfect attendance through her time in elementary school and during her medical treatment.

Receiving an award on stage on her behalf before her passing, Mr. Kunda pledged to his sister that he would continue her streak for as long as possible.

Madam Speaker, 13 years later, he has done it. He hasn’t been tardy. He hasn’t been absent. He hasn’t checked out one single time during his entire primary and secondary education.

He and his family plan trips and appointments all around his ability to go to school, while fighting the urge to occasionally skip or use a sick day.

Keeping a promise as difficult as this one should be an inspiration to us all.

Congratulations, Mr. Kunda. Good luck at the College of Coastal Georgia.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK
(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, this week, my community and communities across our Nation are paying tribute to law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifices in our defense.

National Police Week is a moment to reflect on those sacrifices and the men and women who put their lives on the line for ours.

It is a moment to recognize the families who live with this immeasurable sacrifice, and it is a moment to reaffirm our commitment to working with local and State leaders to support these families.

We owe it to the memory of fallen officers and to the majority of men and women in uniform who carry out their responsibilities with skill and professionalism every day to make sure that officers are safe.

We all need to do our part to ensure that the communities they serve are safe as well.

In this same spirit of progress, let’s commit to working to shape a more secure future for officers and for the communities they serve.

EXTEND THE SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND
(Mr. ZELDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, during this National Police Week, I encourage all my colleagues to cosponsor Never Forget the Heroes Act, H.R. 1327, introduced by Congress Members MALONEY, KING, and NADLER, which would fully fund and extend the Victim Compensation Fund authorization through 2090.

There are currently 279 cosponsors, but we need more, and we need action on this important legislation.

This should not be a partisan issue. It is not a partisan issue. This needs to be an American issue.

September 11th first responders came from at least 433 out of 435 congressional districts. We lost thousands of Americans on 9/11. We have lost more Americans since 9/11 due to toxic exposure than we did on 9/11 itself.

Any colleagues out there who haven’t cosponsored yet, I encourage you to look at H.R. 1327.

Chairman NADLER has scheduled it for a hearing on July 11. Please do what you can to get this passed and signed into law.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS
(Mr. O’HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today during National Police Week to honor law enforcement officers across Arizona and the Nation.

As a former investigator and officer, I know what the brave men and women and their families go through every day to protect their communities.

This week brings back the memories of the friends and partners I have served alongside during my time on the force. We remember the officers who have been killed in the line of duty, many of them friends of mine, including DPS Officer Tyler Edenhofe and Jesus Cordova.

We will never forget their service to our State and our country.

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues this week in thanking the men and women who serve our communities, protect our families, and allow us to continue to be a free society.

IN RECOGNITION OF FIRST LIEUTENANT HOPE KIRKENDALL
(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 to honor First Lieutenant Hope Kirkendall, a distinguished veteran from Lakeland, Florida, who served in World War II.

Lieutenant Kirkendall heard the call to serve after seeing the bombing of Pearl Harbor when she was only 18 years old.

She joined the Army as a nurse, where she was one of the first women deployed to Normandy after D-Day. During her deployment, she routinely worked 12- to 16-hour days near the front lines of many major battles, including the Battle of the Bulge.

She treated both wounded American and German soldiers. In 2004, she received the French Legion of Honor award for her service in saving France from German occupiers.

Lieutenant Kirkendall provided hope to many on the battlefield, and her legacy continues to provide hope to us at home.

Lieutenant Kirkendall represents our very best, and I thank her for all that she has done to defend and serve our great Nation.

ADDRESS SKYROCKETING COST OF COLLEGE
(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, right now, we are in the season where folks are deciding where to go to college. A big factor in that decision is their financial aid package.

The skyrocketing cost of college is saddling many with outrageous student loans. The crippling debt of student loans is reaching $1.56 trillion among 45 million borrowers. It is causing people to delay homeownership, raising a family, and moving comfortably into the middle class.

I have introduced the Understanding the True Cost of College Act. It is to help students and families make informed decisions about financing their education and their future by requiring the standardization of communications and the definitions of financial aid terms.

It is in the best interest of our country to start addressing this issue in a bipartisan way.
TACKLE ISSUES AFFECTING BLACK MEN AND BOYS

(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, from their health outcomes to their unemployment income, from their education rate to their incarceration rate, Black men and boys are disproportionately impacted by government policies.

It is not that Black men and boys are falling behind. It is that they have never been ahead.

For centuries, government policies have redlined Black men and boys into a lower social status than their White counterparts. This is an institutional problem.

Yesterday, I joined with many of my colleagues at the House Triangle to stand in support of Congresswoman Frederica Wilson's bill to create the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys.

We were joined by young men who want nothing more than to live the American Dream free of discrimination. This country owes them that.

H.R. 1636 will bring together experts to tackle the wide range of issues that have kept Black men and boys behind for hundreds of years. It will mark the beginning of the end of racial disparities that have kept communities across the country down.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support it.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAURICE A. FERRE

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the life of a hero of mine, Maurice A. Ferre. He is a Puerto Rican-born public servant who is a former six-term mayor of the city of Miami and the first Hispanic mayor of any major American city, serving from 1973 to 1985.

He has served as the chair of the Miami-Dade County Expressway Authority and served for 8 years on the Florida Transportation Commission.

As mayor, Ferre provided leadership and vision when Miami took its place as one of the world's most vibrant cities, eclectic and diverse and international in nature.

Throughout his years in office, he focused on economic development, job creation, and a visionary approach to improving south Florida's transportation and public infrastructure, as well as transforming the area into a center of inter-American trade, banking, and commerce.

He remains active in business, community, current events, teaching, and public service.

In 2006, he explored issues concerning Puerto Rico in a book on political status, “Where is Puerto Rico Headed?”—“Hacia Donde Va Puerto Rico?”

His career has been marked by a style of public service that encourages people from widely different views and philosophies to work together in the name of common good and progress.

Ferre embarked on that journey early on as a Florida House member, then a commissioner, later the mayor of the city of Miami, and as vice chairman of the Dade County Board of Commissioners.

Ferre has served on numerous boards, as well as on President Ford's commission on immigration and President Carter's ambassadorial nominating commission.

Ferre credits his wife of 64 years, Mercedes Malausena Ferre, as his north star, and his loving family, including 6 children and 13 grandchildren, as his anchor.

BREAK THE CORPORATE STRANGLEHOLD ON OUR HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, we must have a moral awakening, a spiritual revolution on how we treat a person's health in this country.

We must understand that every single human has a right to be healthy and comfortable, to live with dignity, and to receive the healthcare they need to flourish.

At present, this understanding is in conflict with a sinister, unjust force in our society: corporate greed.

Why are people forced to skip insulin injections so they can pay their rent?

Why are my residents charged $70 for a PrEP, a pill that could dramatically reduce HIV transmission, when the same pill costs $7 abroad?

Corporate greed has replaced the moral imperative that everyone live in health and dignity. There is more wealth in this country than any other in human history, and millions go without health insurance and prescription drugs, people condemned to live with pain and suffering because we have chosen corporate profits over our dignity as a nation.

We are watching a crisis unfold in real time. It is time we break the corporate stranglehold on our health and well-being, lost profits of the insanely wealthy be damned.

We have much more important things to protect. We have the soul of this country to rescue.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. CORREA, California
Mr. GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. JACKSON LEE, Texas
Ms. ESCOBAR, Texas
Ms. LOFGREN, California
Mr. CARRAJAL, California

COMMENORATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 104(a) of House Resolution 6, 116th Congress, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership:

Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Ms. TITUS, Nebraska
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia
Mr. TED LIEU, California
Mrs. TORRES, California
Ms. KELLY, Illinois
Ms. SEWELL, Alabama
Ms. DEGETTE, Colorado
Ms. PLASKETT, Virgin Islands
Ms. LEE, California

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, this week, thousands of law enforcement officers, their families, and their supporters from around the country gathered in Washington, D.C., to commemorate National Police Week.

We are here tonight to thank those who put on the uniform every day to protect our communities and put their lives in the breach between the criminal element and the public they protect.

We are also here to recognize those who have completed their service and now enjoy a well-deserved thank-you for their selfless service to their communities.

But, most importantly, we are here to honor the fallen.

Last year, 158 police officers gave their last measure of devotion to their communities. Among these heroes, you will find every gender, every creed, every race, every religion. They hail from every corner of America.
One of those 158 officers was not only from my district, but served at the Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office with me, where I spent a 41-year career.

Officer Lance Whitaker began his career with the Atlantic Beach Police Department and then served 17 dedicated years at Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office. He was tragically killed while responding to a call in the early morning hours of May 15, 2018, almost 1 year ago today.

He left behind his son, Cade; his mother, Lannie; and his sister, Angela. He also left behind a memory and a legacy that will live on in the hearts and minds of those who knew him.

Many of us are here today to honor friends, family, and loved ones like Officer Whitaker, who gave his last full measure of devotion to a community he loved and a community that loved him back.

I now ask that we observe a moment of silence for Officer Whitaker and all of the 158 law enforcement officers who lost their lives protecting our community.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, in a very bipartisan fashion, we will hear from Members on both sides of the aisle and from all across the country as we join together to show our unity in supporting our police officers.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL), my friend who is from a law enforcement family and knows what it means to lose a police officer in uniform.

Officer Tanner proudly served the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and then served 17 dedicated years at Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office with me, where I spent a 41-year career. Today, in honor of Police Week and in honor of all of the members of our law enforcement, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for joining forces with me this evening to host this bipartisan Special Order hour in honor of National Police Week.

As you are about to see, supporting our law enforcement is an issue that unifies us across geography and political party, bringing together diverse perspectives and deep gratitude. I am so proud to rise in support of our law enforcement and the professional peace officers who work tirelessly every single day for the safety and security of our communities.

I represent California’s 25th Congressional District, which is home to many of the police officers who serve all of Los Angeles County. My community is rooted in service. It is a value that I grew up with, and one of the reasons that has to do with my community by running for office.

My dad is an Air Force veteran and has spent three decades in law enforcement. In fact, he was here with us this week as part of a large group from our district who flew out for Police Week. As a little girl, I remember what it was like to wonder if my dad would make it home at night. I remember being so scared for his life because he was on the front lines protecting mine and all of the other members of our community who put on their uniforms and others in development, we can keep our communities and officers safe.

Most importantly, I am standing here today to honor the life of Officer Matthew Rittner. He is a true public servant from the Antelope Valley in my district, who passed away, tragically, at the age of 28 years old after battling cancer. He will be remembered for his steadfast devotion to his community, his church, and his family.

Officer Tanner proudly served the California Highway Patrol with a dedication to the safety of the Antelope Valley. In just his first year out of training, he received the Mothers Against Drunk Driving Award for Excellence in removing impaired drivers from the road, and he was known for his efforts to build public trust in law enforcement.

Out of uniform, Officer Tanner served his community by volunteering his time at Lancaster Baptist Church, where he was a lifelong member. He taught youth ministry classes, coached sports teams, and led a bus route that gives children rides to church.

Officer Tanner leaves behind his wife, Jessie, their two young sons, and a baby girl who is expected to arrive later this month. He is also survived by his parents, two older brothers, and a younger sister.

I am proud to have represented Officer Tanner, and I know that his loved ones and the community will carry on the legacy of his light in the world.

Today, in the Week and in honor of all of the members of our law enforcement community, I am proud to stand in support of the men and women who put their lives on the line every single day like Officer Tanner and like so many others.

Thank you for all you do.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HILL, and I look forward to working with her on some of the bills she just highlighted. I know that her law enforcement family is proud, so I thank her.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my good friend, who is from Wisconsin’s First District.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. RUTHERFORD putting together tonight’s Special Order.

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Riverside County Sheriff Deputy Eric Schneider for his heroic actions on March 18.

While on duty, Deputy Schneider rushed to the scene of a house fire. He knocked on all of the doors and windows, yelling to see if anyone was inside.

A man came out of the house, but without regard for his own safety, Deputy Schneider entered the burning house to check if there were more people inside. Risking his life, he found a man who was unconscious. Deputy Schneider dragged him out of the house and saved his life.

Deputy Schneider is a hero. We are fortunate to have brave men and women like Deputy Schneider protect our communities.

Madam Speaker, I thank Deputy Schneider. I commend him for his actions.

Madam Speaker, when law enforcement officers put on their uniforms and badges, they do not know if they will return home after their shift. Their job is dangerous. Too often, they sacrifice their lives to strangers.

Over the past year, Wisconsin has lost three police officers in the line of duty. Those heroes died while protecting us from harm.

We will never forget them. We will not forget their service. We will not forget their bravery.

I yield: Office Charles Irvine, end of watch, June 7, 2018; Office Michael Michalski, end of watch, July 25, 2018; and Officer Matthew Rittner, end of watch, February 6, 2019.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and the great State of Wisconsin for their support of law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL), a colleague from New Mexico’s Second District. She serves on the Armed Services Committee and the Homeland Security Committee, and, actually, after law school, worked for a U.S. district judge in New Mexico, so she got that law enforcement background, also.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as Americans to address this issue and to recognize National Police Week, to support the brave men and women who protect and serve our communities every day, and to honor those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

The work you do is extraordinary, and it makes me proud to be the granddaughter of a former Las Cruces police sergeant, Angel Torres. He didn’t talk much about his work on the beat, but
throughout my life, I have been stopped by people who have told me the difference he made in their life because he showed they cared by holding people accountable. He was the true embodiment of what it means to be a selfless public servant, just like so many in New Mexico and across the country.

It means something, something I will never fully understand, to know that every day you risk your life because of what you do.

It means something, something I will never understand, to know that every day and every time you enforce the law, you could lose your life because you signed up to serve.

As you risk your life to treat people with humanity, dignity, and respect, that is superhuman. That is why, during National Police Week and every day, we support our law enforcement officers and work to ensure they have the resources they need to protect and serve our communities.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the kind words of support for our law enforcement community, and I thank her for her service earlier, as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska’s Second District. He serves on our Agriculture Committee and Armed Services Committee. He is a retired brigadier general and did his deployment in Iraq, and we thank him for that service.

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. RUTHERFORD, a great friend and colleague, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize a bipartisan issue that threatens the safety of our law enforcement officers and our communities in which they serve, and we have a solution for it.

Enacted in 2004, the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act, known as LEOSA, established clear guidelines allowing experienced retired or off-duty officers to maintain proper training to obtain certification allowing him or her to carry concealed firearms. The desired purpose was to create a shared national policy between States allowing off-duty and retired officers to carry their firearms wherever they are, granted they are qualified and received appropriate credentials.

As many of my colleagues know, LEOSA has enjoyed a long history of support from both sides of the aisle. When it was first proposed by a Republican, LEOSA was cosponsored by more than half of the House.

Subsequent amendments signed into law in 2010 and 2013 under Democratic President Barack Obama expanded LEOSA’s coverage to include law enforcement officers in most Federal agencies as well as military police. In both instances, reforms were sponsored by Democratic Senators.

The LEOSA Reform Act seeks to correct a number of unintended gaps and inconsistencies in the original LEOSA bill. These gaps and weaknesses are not due to intentional restrictions in the original statute. Rather, they are areas in which the original statute is silent, resulting in conflicting interpretations and unintended restrictions which effectively limit the ability of off-duty and retired officers to carry their firearms, and we want them to do it in a manner that is safest for them and the public.

This lack of specific language defeats the original intent of the law, which is to allow off-duty and retired officers to carry their firearms wherever they go. Granted, they have to be qualified and have to have received appropriate credentials. That is a given.

It also creates an inconsistent implementation across States, leaving many officers to either assume intended restriction or carrying firearms in accord with LEOSA or decide not to carry at all.

The LEOSA Reform Act adds specific language to remove unintended weaknesses, and in doing so will make existing law stronger and more workable for those who seek its benefit while maintaining the rigorous standards that currently apply.

The bill does not put more guns into our communities. Individuals affected by this legislation already have the authority to carry concealed weapons in most locations. Rather, H.R. 1156 will help ensure guns that are already in the hands of trained and certified law enforcement officers and retired officers can safely and legally be carried wherever they may be.

In fact, the LEOSA Reform Act will help ensure firearms do not end up in the hands of criminals by allowing law enforcement officers and retired officers to keep their firearms safely on their person, rather than being forced to leave them unattended in vehicles in parking lots of locations that are currently restricted.

The public’s need for rapid intervention by off-duty and retired officers is made clear by the recent incident in California, where the heroic actions of an off-duty Federal officer who ran and shot at the gunman saved countless lives. It is an example that we see repeatedly. With the rise of tragic shootings in our Nation, empowering trained professionals to carry will allow them to respond more quickly to emergencies and provide years of expertise to these situations.

I have heard from law enforcement officials throughout Nebraska’s Second District and the Nation on the importance these changes will have on the lives of our community’s heroes and their ability to protect themselves and others. In fact, the LEOSA Reform Act has been endorsed by 20 professional law enforcement organizations whose membership, when combined, is representative of well over half of all law enforcement in our country.

On National Police Week, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in providing greater public safety for law enforcement and our communities at home by cosponsoring the LEOSA Reform Act. Officer safety and public safety is a bipartisan issue, and together we must and can do better.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this: If I am in a situation where I am being victimized, who do I want near me?

I would love to have a retired or off-duty policeman who is armed, and this bill makes that more likely.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the gentleman’s LEOSA bill, and having been a law enforcement officer, I understand exactly what the gentleman is trying to accomplish. I support him 110 percent in that effort, and I appreciate the words.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia, Ms. SPANBERGER, who serves on the Foreign Affairs and Agriculture Committees. She is also—I think we can say this—a former CIA case officer.

Is it safe to say that now? Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I got my deployment declassified. It is.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman’s father was a career law enforcement officer also.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for the opportunity to stand here in solidarity with our colleagues across the aisle in honor of Police Week and in honor of our police officers and peace officers across this country.

I rise today to remember the remarkable lives of two Virginia State police officers, one from our district in Midlothian and one from nearby New Kent County. They were both killed in the line of duty.

On August 12, 2017, Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen and Trooper-Pilot Berke M.M. Bates were not responding to an ordinary call. Instead, they were flying via helicopter to an event that became infamous as one of the darkest days in modern Virginia history.

Cullen and Bates were en route to Charlottesville to monitor the events transpiring around the Unite the Right white nationalist rally. Forces of hate had gathered, and law enforcement was called in to help end the chaos.

After police had canceled the event as an unlawful assembly, Cullen and Bates were instructed to assist their fellow officers. They were to circle over Charlottesville, and the operation aimed to provide surveillance of the violence, restore order, and help the community end the nightmare that had transpired. However, mid-flight, their helicopter crashed on the outskirts of Charlottesville. Both Cullen and Bates were killed in action.

In the wake of the tragedy and the stress of the Charlottesville protests,
Executive Director Wayne Huggins of the Virginia State Police Association said: ‘I don’t know if State police, in its 85 years, has had a more excruciating time.”

The pain of the families of Lieutenant Cullen and Trooper-Pilot Bates is unimaginable, and the loss experienced by the Virginia State Police and their fellow brothers and sisters in the law enforcement community is still felt to this day.

This is National Police Week. We remember the brave and dedicated service of Lieutenant Cullen and Trooper-Pilot Bates. They died in an effort to protect their fellow Virginians, and their sacrifice will always be remembered.

As a former Federal agent, the daughter of a career law enforcement officer, and, most respectfully, as a grateful American and Virginian, I thank the law enforcement officers and peace officers who dedicate their lives to keeping us safe. This week we stand with our law enforcement officers, and we will never forget those who laid down their lives for their neighbors.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Virginia and just know that our condolences go to those two officers’ families, those heroes that you lost this last year. God bless.

Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce a member from the great State of Minnesota’s Eighth District, PETE STAUBER. He serves on the Transportation and Infrastructure and Small Business Committees and was a police officer in Duluth, Minnesota, for 23 years. I thank the gentleman for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman RUTHERFORD for yielding to me to speak today.

This week is Police Week, a time to honor our brothers and sisters in the blue and brown. Every day law enforcement officers—local, county, State, and Federal—walk out of their homes leaving their loved ones behind and put their own lives on the line for the safety and security of others. They are our last line of defense, the protectors of our communities, and I am so honored to have served alongside some of these brave men and women.

As a local law enforcement officer with the Duluth, Minnesota, Police Department for 22 years, I have seen and experienced firsthand the violence committed against law enforcement officers, those who are only there to uphold the law and improve the safety of our communities. That is why I have cosponsored legislation like the Thin Blue Line Act and the Protect and Serve Act, which hold the perpetrators of these heinous crimes accountable.

So, now, more than ever, we must show our support for our law enforcement officers. We must make a commitment to them as they have committed to our friends, our families, and our communities. I am happy to stand here today with so many of my colleagues to show our support for the men and women in the blue and brown. I look forward to working with them in the House Committee to advance legislation that will support them, both when they are in and out of uniform.

The men and women in law enforcement deserve our respect, our admiration, and our prayers and love every single day, 365 days a year, 24 hours every day.

I stand before you, Madam Speaker, having done a total of 23 years in law enforcement. I can tell you that the men and women whom I served alongside with, I would go into any dangerous situation with them. We love our law enforcement officers, and we love their families.

This Congress stands ready to defend them and their needs, their requests, and any help they need from this Congress.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the gentleman’s 23 years of service. I know what commitment that is, and God bless him for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTTHEIMER), who is my good friend.

JOSH GOTTHEIMER is from New Jersey’s Fifth District who serves on the Financial Services Committee and worked for many years in the private sector as a White House speechwriter and in the private industry for Ford and Microsoft. I thank the gentleman for being here this evening.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congressman RUTHERFORD, my good friend, and Congresswoman HILL of California for co-hosting this bipartisan Special Order hour in honor of our law enforcement officers. I am proud to serve with you both on the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, co-chaired by our friend, Congressman BILL Pascrell.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to commemorate Police Week and to honor all the brave law enforcement officers in New Jersey and across the country who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities. They get our backs, and we should always get theirs. There is nothing partisan about that.

In 1962 President John F. Kennedy declared May 15 to be Police Officers Memorial Day and this week to be Police Week. Established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962, National Police Week pays special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others. Already this year, 43 police officers have died in the line of duty across the United States. We will never forget their bravery, service, and sacrifice.

May God bless them and their families.

Madam Speaker, law enforcement officers are America’s heroes, and I am so deeply grateful to all law enforcement officers, Federal, State, and local, for what they do day in and day out, especially those in New Jersey’s Fifth District, my district, and across our State.

That is why, in Congress, I am committed to fighting for our law enforcement officers and first responders by making sure that our municipalities and police departments have the resources, equipment, and training they need to do their jobs safely and effectively. That is why I supported legislation like the COPS and JAG grants, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership program, and the Law Enforcement Support Office excess equipment program.

We should also support the Thin Blue Line Act, which was referenced, because our officers rely on us to get their backs and to make sure we give them the resources they need to protect our families from violent crimes, drug trafficking, domestic violence, homegrown terrorism, and countless other threats.

I especially want to recognize all the men and women who took part in the annual Police Unity Tour, riding some 300 miles to Washington of our fallen officers, and all of New Jersey’s finest who are here in Washington this week, including friends from the New Jersey PBA, the New Jersey State Troopers, the Port Authority PBA, and many, many others.

Just yesterday I was glad to spend some time with my friends, the Port Authority Police and members of the Fair Lawn Police Department Honor Guard who came to remember those whose names are forever inscribed at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here on the Mall. Others from the State PBA and PBA police officers were here this week as well. Together we are all fighting to fully fund and reauthorize the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund in memory of the 37 Port Authority police officers and countless others whom we lost that day and for all the injured and ill 9/11 responders and survivors whom we must do right by today.

Madam Speaker, I thank, again, my colleagues across the aisle who have the backs of our first responders. But most of all, I am grateful for every law enforcement officer for their solemn commitment to protect and serve. We live in the greatest country in the world. With our brave law enforcement protecting our communities, we are ensuring always that our best days are ahead of us.

God bless our law enforcement officers and first responders, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for having the backs of police officers who have our back, and I thank the gentleman very much for being here tonight to show that support for law enforcement that is so important across the country.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE). Representative BEN CLINE serves on the
In this body, we stand within the people’s House. We serve within the parameters of our ability. We wear a small pin upon our lapel to designate our status as Congressmen and Congresswomen.

In humble service and an honor, yes, it is. But forget not, America, the men and women of community, unseen, unheard, far too frequently unappreciated and unrecognized, who patrol your streets, your neighborhoods, your counties, your States, and the parishes in my State of Louisiana. For they serve unknowingly if they shall return home. They do so willingly. They are great faith in their Lord. The Word tells us that the Lord is my strength and my shield.

In many ways, we should recall that this small shield that we wear begins with faith, that this Chamber began with faith, and that the shield that officers wear from sea to shining sea maintains itself by faith.

This week, we honor the Thin Blue Line. You are known. You are loved. You are recognized. We honor you.

Madam Speaker, I thank the sheriff for allowing me to speak.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Louisiana for all his service those many years. I would like to recognize, again, my cohost for tonight, Representative KATIE HILL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL).

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, I wanted to finish out by thanking the 2,200 Capitol Police officers here who protect us and the 3 to 5 million people who visit the U.S. Capitol every single year.

They do the job that often goes unnoticed, but we are ensured our safety and protection, and that of every single person who comes to visit us, because of their hard work and service.

To every single law enforcement professional who dedicates their life every day, we are eternally grateful. I am so proud to be working with my colleagues to continue to fight for recognizing our officers and to take this forward for many years to come.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, it has been an honor to be here with the gentlewoman tonight to recognize our law enforcement community.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this. It is from Ralph Waldo Emerson. He said:

“The purpose in life is not to be happy. It is to be useful, to be honorable, to be compassionate, to have it make some difference that you have lived and lived well.”

Madam Speaker, the 158 lives that we honor tonight, all the thousands of law enforcement officers serving this moment, they live well. For that, we are grateful.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
Madam Speaker, in this Chamber, and I am so glad we can change the fact that LGBTQ folks are being denied housing, services, and employment in the majority of our States.

I am so glad to be part of ensuring that the American people have full protection in our civil rights laws, regardless of who they are and whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my colleague.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I rise on behalf of non-cisgender Americans, on behalf of QPOC Americans, on behalf of drag kings and drag queens, on behalf of all non-heteronormative Americans.

I rise today to let you know that you are seen and you are heard, and I am proud to stand in solidarity with you.

It is our duty as legislators to protect all Americans, yet we are failing entire communities. In my home State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a leader in marriage equality, we have the second largest LGBTQ population of any State in the country. Even with our queer pride extending far and wide, 61 percent of transgender Bay Staters experienced housing discrimination and 65 percent of LGBTQ Bay Staters experienced discrimination in public spaces, from public transportation to retail establishments, places of worship, restaurants, and healthcare settings.

As we consider H.R. 5, we must remind ourselves of our values. My former President Barack Obama once said: ‘When all Americans are treated as equal, no matter who they are or whom they love, we are all more free.’

That, to me, is pretty historic as we are debating and putting forward the Equality Act who has worked tirelessly for years to affirm the rights and responsibilities of every individual. So I support H.R. 5 and I do so proudly because of a debt I owe.

I haven’t always had the privileges that I enjoy now. Someone stood and suffered so that I could come in the front door of, perhaps, this very facility. Someone suffered so that I would have the opportunity to go to some of the schools that I attended.

I believe that there is reciprocity in life and that you don’t get where you are and fail to appreciate those who have suffered so that you could have the opportunities that you enjoy.

I support H.R. 5 for a multiplicity of reasons, the least of which is not the fact that I am repaying a debt. I am going to help make sure that others don’t endure the pain and suffering that I endured and that my predecessors endured. No one should be punished or treated with disrespect because of how you look or who you are.
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Every person’s dignity is given to them from a higher authority, and we all should respect and humanity of every individual. So I support H.R. 5, and I do so proudly because of a debt I owe.

I thank my friends for bringing this to my attention. It was not to be a part of my message this evening, but it is a part of my life, to make sure others are treated properly.

Madam Speaker, and still I rise tonight to address a crisis that our country finds itself engulfed in, a crisis that, if we are not careful, will cause the Congress of the United States to be seen as a “less than” when it comes to the coequal that it is supposed to be on the same plane with.

This crisis is a constitutional crisis. And when I say constitutional crisis, this is a constitutional crisis, remember this: There is no hard and fast definition of what a constitutional crisis is, so whenever I give my thoughts or someone else gives their thoughts, we are giving opinions.

Tonight, I would like to share my opinion about this constitutional crisis. Remember, all of these thoughts are opinions; just as the thoughts of persons who hold themselves out to be constitutional scholars, they are opinions.

There are some who say that you don’t have a constitutional crisis in the instance that we are dealing with the President, who has refused to honor subpoenas by and through his various administrators.

There are some who say that this will not be a constitutional crisis until the case gets to the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court has to rule on whether or not the subpoena must be honored. And if the Supreme Court rules that the subpoena must be honored, then the members of the administration refuse to obey the Supreme Court, there are persons who conclude that this, now, is a constitutional crisis.

I would conclude that if the President of the United States fails to honor a subpoena, after having been so ordered by the Judiciary, that this is more than a constitutional crisis; you now have a constitutional collapse.

The crisis occurs when the President is at odds, meaning the executive branch, with the legislative branch; and currently, the legislative branch and the executive branch are at a stalemate.

The executive branch is declining to cooperate, declining to allow the legislative branch to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities associated with oversight and investigation. And, as such, there is a crisis, and that crisis, clearly, is rooted in the Constitution, because the legislative branch has this responsibility pursuant to the Constitution.

So this is a constitutional crisis, and we have a duty to address it, and we must do so, or we will have failed on our watch to take up our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

This is our watch, and we have a responsibility to make sure that this House takes its proper place in the annals of history, with reference to the question of impeachment.

Impeachment is something that we should not take lightly; but it is also something that we have to take seriously, and we have to take it seriously because if we fail to do so, we will have allowed this August body to become minimized.

You see, there are checks and balances in the system. The check on the executive branch is impeachment. That is the check. That is the sword of Damocles that hangs above the head of the executive. And if we fail to exercise this duty when it properly should be, we, then, do not provide the checks and balances to make sure the balance of power remains as it should be.

I fear for what is happening to this Congress. I am gravely concerned because I don’t see us aggressively pursuing the checks so as to make sure the balance of power remains in place.
Checks and balances are in place to make sure that there is no concentration of power in any branch of government. If we don’t become the last line of defense with reference to the President, if we fail to do so, we then say that there are no guardrails; that there are no rules that the President has to obey. He doesn’t become just another president. He metamorphoses into a monarch.

The Framers never intended for us to have a monarchy. The Framers intended for the President to be checked by the Congress.

My hope is that we, in this Congress, will take up our responsibilities, and we will provide the checks necessary to make sure that this President, and no other President, is above the law.

I hear many Members of Congress say that the President is not above the law. No one is above the law. And they go on to say, however, this President, notwithstanding his actions, we should not impeach.

How can we say that he has committed impeachable acts, and then conclude that he should not be impeached? We, literally, are saying he is above the law when we say that he has committed impeachable acts, but then decline to impeach.

Anyone else breaking the law will have to answer to the bar of justice, except the President. We know that he has done it. The Mueller report is replete with examples, yet we have not exercised our constitutional responsibilities and, as a result, we, the Congress of the United States of America, are allowing the President to be above the law.

This is unacceptable. I refuse to allow this to continue. And I say, as I have said, that the President will have to come before the bar of justice, which is the House of Representatives. If we fail to do so, we will have literally allowed him to be above the law. Not in this country, and not on my watch.

I take my oath seriously, and I assure you that this will not be the final word; that the President is not impeachable, because he is, and we will have to have a vote on it.

Tomorrow will be the second anniversary of the date that we initially called for the President’s impeachment. I believe that we cannot have another anniversary without another vote.

Though my hope is that it will come through the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives. But, if not, it will come. And I don’t know that there will be others who will vote to impeach him, but I do know that I will.

And there are times when you may have to stand alone; but I know that it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the time that I have had. I thank you all for all the FOMO’s take place, and I assure you, I love my country, and I only speak these words because I see a country in peril because of a reckless, ruthless, lawless President that we are allowing to be above the law.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act. America must live up to its values by treating everyone as equals and ending discrimination once and for all.

The Equality Act is about making sure all Americans, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, can participate in our society without fear.

New Mexico is home to diverse religious and traditional communities and has stood up for its LGBTQ population for a very long time. The Equality Act allows us to adhere to our faiths, while prohibiting harmful and isolating acts of discrimination against the LGBTQ community.

No one should have to worry about being discriminated against when interviewing for a job or struggling to find a healthcare provider that will treat them.

Tomorrow morning, when I vote for the Equality Act, I will be proud to stand with my colleagues, with New Mexicans, and with my daughter, who is a proud LGBTQ American. The time for equality is now, and we must pass the Equality Act to live up to our values.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, despite the enactment of marriage equality in 2015, same-gender couples continue to experience persistent and pervasive discrimination when it comes to home ownership.

A recent study by Iowa State University found systematic discrimination against LGBTQ borrowers. The study found that, despite having a lower credit risk overall, same-sex borrowers are 73 percent more likely to be denied a mortgage loan. And when they are approved, they face mortgage interest rates that are 0.02 to 0.2 percent higher, on average, translating to tens of thousands of dollars in extra repayment.

Twenty-six States across the United States do not have statewide housing protections for the LGBTQ community, and the Fair Housing Act does not protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals. The Equality Act would change this.

This bill would not only improve the lives of members of the LGBTQ community, it would make neighborhoods across the country more diverse. And making our neighborhoods more diverse means more Americans get to know and understand their neighbors who are gay, trans, or queer; and with that understanding, the friendships and the neighbor relationships, we hope to get tolerance. This is how we magnify the wave of LGBTQ acceptance this country has experienced in the last decade.

Imagine growing up in a community where you never have any LGBTQ role models; where students in your school were harassed for even being perceived as gay.

Imagine growing up in a neighborhood where you never met someone who expressed themselves like you; where you were taught that your sexual orientation or gender identity was wrong or immoral.

Imagine what it would be like to have waited years for your country to recognize your loving relationship as legal and equal under the law. Now, you are finally able to get married, and if you choose to, start a family.

You have saved enough money for the downpayment on your first home. You find that dream house in an area with good schools, plenty of parks for your dogs, and friendly neighbors.

You and your spouse go together to fill out a loan application at the local bank and wait eagerly for it to be granted. However, despite doing everything right, you are outright denied for the loan without reason.

You go to another bank, assuming that this is a mistake, because both you and your spouse have great credit. You apply for a mortgage loan again.

This time you are approved, but the interest rate would amount to tens of thousands more dollars than you had anticipated; tens of thousands more dollars than your credit risk should have you pay.

You found your dream home, but now you can’t buy it because of an artificially, discriminatorily-inflated interest rate.

The Equality Act is vital. By amending existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity as protected characteristics, no person may be lawfully discriminated against for their sexual orientation and gender identity in housing, education, employment, public accommodations, and so much more.

Not only would it protect LGBTQ families who want to buy a home or take out a loan, but it would allow individuals who identify as gay or trans or queer to see people who look and love like them in their communities, and it would allow their neighbors to see that LGBTQ families are like them: They care about their neighborhoods; they care about their communities; they love and want the best for their children like anyone else; and they take the same pride in home ownership.

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and discrimination against the LGBTQ community is a deep injustice. Allowing that discrimination to continue in our country flies in the face of the principles of equality and opportunity that form the basis of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support the Equality Act, and I urge my
Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Detroit, Michigan, for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, you heard it just a moment ago, those words from the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.: “Injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere.” That is why I am so proud to support this historic legislation that will be on this floor tomorrow, H.R. 5, the Equality Act, that will truly provide equality for members of the LGBTQ community.

Now, many people might argue, Madam Speaker, that we have made important strides against prejudice over the last few years, and it has been amazing. We have had States pass legislation outlawing discrimination based on a person’s sexual orientation. Likewise, we have had Federal courts that have ruled that discrimination based on someone’s sexual orientation or gender identity is illegal under existing laws. Yet tens of millions of Americans live in areas where these laws have not been passed and Federal courts have not made the same determination.

H.R. 5 is the remedy for making sure that we don’t have this checkerboard of rights and checkerboard of discrimination among our LGBTQ community.

My district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the largest Metropolitan District of Wisconsin, is notable to mention here. LGBTQ youth, in particular, face significant obstacles and barriers because of their LGBTQ identification. We have 500 youth in my district who are homeless, and more than 40 percent of them identify as LGBTQ, many permanently homeless because they have been abandoned by their families and turned out onto the streets.

To add to their distress, the overly represented LGBTQ youth in the foster care system in Milwaukee and around the country face huge disparities in treatment and higher rates of harassment than their non-LGBTQ peers.

We have 500 youth in my district who are homeless, and more than 40 percent of them identify as LGBTQ, many permanently homeless because they have been abandoned by their families and turned out onto the streets.

To add to their distress, the overly represented LGBTQ youth in the foster care system in Milwaukee and around the country face huge disparities in treatment and higher rates of harassment than their non-LGBTQ peers.

Here is what we know. Every child wants a loving home. Trans people, disabled children as compared to heterosexual couples.

Here is what we know. Every child wants a loving home. Trans people, disabled children as compared to heterosexual couples.

We are all in this together, Madam Speaker. And in order to protect all of our rights, we ought to remember the oath that we take as we stand under this “e pluribus unum”—“out of many, one.”

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, who puts this Special Order together every week, has truly been committed to the rights of our LGBTQ neighbors, and I am very pleased that many of my colleagues tomorrow, in a very bipartisan way, are going to be supporting a historic, historic bill: the Equality Act.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
but about 20 percent of the current Federal spending is borrowed. When you are around $23 trillion in debt, the idea of providing generous public benefits to people who are not citizens is preposterous.

Secondly, insofar as efforts are made to increase our citizenship through things like DACA, we do want to make sure that we are not collecting immigrants who are eventually, themselves, going to become a public charge or coming here because of our generosity rather than the opportunities that take place for people who work hard.

I have introduced legislation which will say that any local unit of government that gives benefits to people who are not citizens will lose its ability to give those benefits, because we have to crack down on this. Otherwise, the future generations of Americans will no longer be like past generations who came here to take advantage of the opportunity to get through hard work, but we will begin to get some people here who will take advantage of the opportunities that are available from government benefits.

I hope President Trump, as he continues to discuss this immigration situation, talks about this.

The third thing I think he should talk about, and something that I don't think the mainstream media has highlighted enough, is what we are going to be spending money on in the next budget.

So the viewers back home are aware, when we pass our annual spending bills, we break it into 12 separate bills.

Now, right now, as we have 100,000 people a month crossing our border illegally, I would say that it is probably the number one concern for the future of the United States.

Sadly, the majority party, as they let us know where their priorities lie, told us the percentage of increases in each one of these 12 bills. For example, Labor and HHS was due for a 6 percent increase; Defense for a 3 percent increase; State and Foreign Ops, a 5 percent increase; the Legislative Branch, I think, about a 3 percent increase.

Who came along in last place at 1 percent? Homeland Security. In other words, a sign that the least priority in the next budget should be enforcing our borders, this at a time where groups estimate the cost of illegal immigration to our country to be between $50 billion and $100 billion.

Not to mention, when we talk about the moral fiber of America, which has kept us going for so long, we begin to have the next wave of immigrants, who will become the next wave of Americans, whose first action coming to this country is breaking the law.
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I want to point out that neither I nor President Trump is anti-immigrant. I think it is tremendous that every year in this country we swear in another 700,000 citizens. I think it is wonderful in this country that we have 4 million people here on work visas, and it is possible that number will go up in the future.

But there is a difference between people coming here on work visas; there is a difference between people going through the appropriate steps and getting sworn in legally and people who are crossing the border illegally.

These are three suggestions of things that I would think would be minimal requirements before an immigration compromise is reached.

Again, I emphasize we should get rid of birth right citizenship. The idea of people flying here from other countries or crossing the Rio Grande and saying "my child automatically becomes a citizen" must end.

I think the practice of having people who are here illegally or anybody who is here who is not a citizen getting public benefits—and frequently those public benefits, particularly in the area of healthcare, are superior benefits to those which the average working American has. As a matter of fact, frequently, public housing today is superior to some of the housing that people who have to pay their own rent can afford. But I hope we step up to the plate and make sure that, with regard to immigration, there are no public benefits.

And finally, with so many people flooding across the border, I hope we aggressively fight the idea that the least important part of our upcoming appropriations bills is Homeland Security.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASSIE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a U.S. Army Advanced Individual Training graduation ceremony.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1208. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2379. An act to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 17, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 987, AS AMENDED

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net increase or decrease (I) in the deficit

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McCaul (for himself and Mr. Burgess):
H.R. 2788. A bill to require the Secretary of State to develop and maintain an international diplomatic and assistance strategy to stigmatize opioids, including fentanyl, into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. Schakowsky (for herself and Mr. Burgess):
H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Smith of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. Diaz-Balart):
H.R. 2790. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the protection of aliens granted temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. Esch (for herself and Mr. Khanna, Mr. Thompson of California, and Ms. Pingree):
H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to preserve and protect the ability of States and local governments and public-private partnerships to provide broadband services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. Brooks of Indiana (for herself, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Upton, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Carper):
H.R. 2796. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to States that have in place laws that authorize law enforcement agencies to seize the products of certain farms taken from dangerous individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Lipinski:
H.R. 2787. A bill to mandate the monthly formulation and publication of a consumer price index specifically for senior citizens for purposes of establishing an accurate Social Security COLA for such citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. Smith of Nebraska (for himself, Mr.gt, Mrs.行情, Mr. Loebl, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Welch, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Peters, Mr. Wright, Mr. Reschenthaler, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Westervelt, Mr. Norton, and Mr. LaHood):
H.R. 2798. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to modify the limitations applicable to qualified conservation loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. Brownley of California:
H.R. 2799. A bill to amend title 34, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. Carson of Indiana:
H.R. 2800. A bill to implement recommendations related to the safety of amphibious passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. Slotkin (for herself, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Kildee, and Mr. Fitzpatrick):
H.R. 2801. A bill to provide temporary resident status and employment authorization for certain non-seasonal agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DeGette (for herself and Mr. Shimkus):
H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DeLauro (for herself, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Jackson Lee, Mr. Collin of New Jersey, and Ms. Pingree):
H.R. 2803. A bill to require health insurance coverage for the treatment of infertility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, and Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. Foster (for himself and Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee):
H.R. 2804. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to apportionments and payments with respect to the Interstate Corridors, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
By Mr. HOLLOWSWORTH (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 2805. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit uniformed law enforcement officers to carry agency-issued firearms andinquel federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORSEFORD:

H.R. 2806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain scholarships and fellowship grants as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. ESCH):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education that participate in programs under such title to distribute voter registration forms to students enrolled at the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2808. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to include data on animal abuse in the national clearinghouse for information relating to child abuse and neglect; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DUNSANY, Mr. ESPIELLAT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. McFadden, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BLUMENTAURER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. ESCH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal the particular work requirement that disqualifies able-bodied adults for eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. ESTES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Mrs. GARDENAL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CINNERES):

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain payments made by Indian tribal governments as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANTERA (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. HUCK, Ms. ESCH, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 2811. A bill to improve oversight of privatized military housing provided by the Department of Defense to members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. O’HALLERAN, and Mr. Fitzpatrick):

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to grants to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MCGOVERN, and Ms. OCAÑO-CORTÉZ):

H.R. 2813. A bill to permit aliens seeking asylum to be eligible for employment in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2814. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the basic allowance for housing for members of the uniformed services in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COOK, Mr. KOSMOSKI, Mr. ESPIELLAT, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 2815. A bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. RUPP, Mr. PEDOLO, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2816. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to increase access to hepatitis C testing for Vietnam-era veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2818. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTAURER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BALDNERSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 2819. A resolution expressing support for “Bike to Work Day” on May 17, 2019, to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. KAPUTR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GHIJALVA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GHIJALVA, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 386. A resolution honoring retired Representative John Conyers, Jr., and extending to him the best wishes of the House on the occasion of his 90th birthday; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Res. 387. A resolution condemning continued violence against civilians by armed groups in the Central African Republic and supporting efforts to achieve a lasting political solution to the conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 192, to express support for the enactment of legislation that requires all the meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors to be open to the public; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

52. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 61, urging the Congress of the United States to speedily approve the recently negotiated United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, to memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review and consider eliminating provisions of federal law which reduce Social Security benefits for those receiving pension benefits from federal, state, and local government retirement or pension systems, plans, or funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. McCaul:

H.R. 2782. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. Schakowsky:

H.R. 2783. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. Walorski:

H.R. 2784. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. Smith of New Jersey:

H.R. 2785. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. Espchoo:

H.R. 2786. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. Cicilline (for himself and Mr. Fortenberry):
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2786.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LIPINSKI:
H.R. 2787.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 2788.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 2789.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

Sec. 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

H.R. 2789.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:
H.R. 2800.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 2801.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:
H.R. 2802.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 2803.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article I, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 2804.
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 1, and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 2805.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 2806.
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, and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:
H.R. 2807.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:
H.R. 2808.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. CHISHOLM of Washington:
H.R. 2809.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 2810.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 2811.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 2812.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1

By Ms. PINGREE:
H.R. 2813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. PLASKETT:
H.R. 2814.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3. Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. RUZI:
H.R. 2815.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 2816.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H.R. 2817.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. YOUNG:
H.R. 2818.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18; and Article I, Section 9.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 6: Mr. MCDAMS.
H.R. 94: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 95: Mrs. MURPHY and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 96: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 117: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 230: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 303: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 333: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. CHISHOLM of Washington.
H.R. 336: Mr. STEIL, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 384: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 395: Mr. WILDER.
H.R. 487: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 500: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUILLAR, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SHERRELL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. COLLIN, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CORRIGAN, Mr. TEL LIEU of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms.
H.R. 2700: Mr. Marshall, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Hagedorn, and Mr. Diaz-Balart.

H.R. 2702: Mr. Moulton.

H.R. 2720: Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Lawson of Florida.

H.R. 2727: Mrs. Kirkpatrick.

H.R. 2748: Mr. Roua.

H.R. 2754: Mr. Johnson of Georgia.

H.R. 2777: Mr. Fitzpatrick.

H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. Demings.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. Cisneros.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. Visclosky.

H. Res. 33: Mrs. Fletcher and Mr. Butterfield.

H. Res. 66: Mrs. Napolitano.

H. Res. 134: Mr. Morelle and Mr. Espaillat.

H. Res. 137: Mr. Visclosky.

H. Res. 179: Mr. Roua.

H. Res. 230: Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mrs. Torres of California, and Mr. Levin of California.

H. Res. 246: Mr. Larson of Connecticut and Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico.

H. Res. 250: Mr. Roua.

H. Res. 285: Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Carrajal, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Crist, Ms. Stevens, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Vela, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. O’Halloran.

H. Res. 321: Ms. Omar and Ms. Lofgren.

H. Res. 326: Mr. McGovern, Mr. Courtney, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Cox of California, Mr. Espaillat, Mr.美克斯, and Mr. Cicilline.

H. Res. 350: Mr. Groatman, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Norman.

H. Res. 354: Ms. Matsui, Mr. Kind, Ms. Sherrill, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Escobar, Mrs. Luria, Ms. Porter, Mrs. Murphy, Ms. Castor of Florida, Ms. Finkenauer, and Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico.

H. Res. 371: Ms. Haaland.

H. Res. 374: Mr. Loudermilk, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Collens of New York, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Shinkus, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Mast, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Yoho.
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.
Redeemer and friend, the fountain of wisdom and strength, we borrow our heartbeats from You. Today, guide our Senators to new heights of achievement, providing them with robust health, faith for their perplexities, and light for the path ahead.

Lord, give them fulfillment as they strive to be instruments of Your providence. Supply their needs according to Your riches in glory, giving them the serenity to accept what can’t be changed, the courage to change what they can, and the wisdom to know one from the other. Bring them to the end of this day with satisfied hearts and clear consciences.

We pray in Your strong 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

PROTECTING AMERICA’S FIRST RESPONDERS ACT
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 83, S. 1208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1208) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Protecting America’s First Responders Act”.

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF DEATH AND DISABILITY BENEFITS UNDER THE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS’ DEATH BENEFITS PROGRAM.


(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the amount payable under that subsection (a), with respect to the death of a public safety officer, shall be the greater of—

(a) the amount payable under that subsection as of the date of the death of the public safety officer; or

(b) the amount that would be payable under that subsection if the death of the public safety officer occurred on the date on which the Bureau makes a final determination that the public safety officer is entitled to a benefit payment under that subsection.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “$3,000” and inserting “$6,000, adjusted in accordance with subsection (h)”;

(3) in subsection (h), by inserting “and the level of the interim benefit payable immediately before such October 1 under subsection (c)” after “subsection (a)”;

(4) by redesigning paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) ‘gainful work’—

(A) means any activity usually performed for pay or profit, regardless of whether a profit is realized; and

(B) does not include work performed in a situation in which, after an individual sustains an injury—

(i) the individual—

(II) leaves the workforce after less than 90 days because of the inability of the individual to overcome the injury;

(ii) because of the injury—

(I) the individual is permitted, in carrying out work, to—

(aa) perform at a lower standard of productivity or efficiency than other similarly situated employees;

(bb) work irregular hours; or

(cc) take frequent rest periods; or

(II) the individual is only able to work within a framework of specially arranged circumstances, such as a circumstance in which 1 or more other individuals are required to assist

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS’ DEATH BENEFITS PROGRAM.


(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(I) ‘catastrophic injury’ means an injury, the direct and proximate consequences of which—

(A) permanently prevent an individual from performing any gainful work; or

(B) cause an individual to become—

(i) paraplegic;

(ii) quadriplegic; or

(iii) blind;”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “at the time of the public safety officer’s fatal or catastrophic injury” and inserting “as of the date of the public safety officer’s death from a fatal injury or the date of determination of the public safety officer’s disability from a catastrophic injury”;”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including an individual who, in the capacity of the individual as such a member, engages in emergency security or traffic management as the primary or only duty of the individual during emergency response” before the semicolon;

(4) by redesigning paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) ‘gainful work’—

(A) means any activity usually performed for pay or profit, regardless of whether a profit is realized; and

(B) does not include work performed in a situation in which, after an individual sustains an injury—

(i) the individual—

(II) leaves the workforce after less than 90 days because of the inability of the individual to overcome the injury;

(ii) because of the injury—

(I) the individual is permitted, in carrying out work, to—

(aa) perform at a lower standard of productivity or efficiency than other similarly situated employees;

(bb) work irregular hours; or

(cc) take frequent rest periods; or

(II) the individual is only able to work within a framework of specially arranged circumstances, such as a circumstance in which 1 or more other individuals are required to assist
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the individual in preparing for work or traveling to and from work;

“(iii)(I) the individual practices a hobby usually performed for pay or profit, regardless of whether a profit is realized; and

“(II) the primary intent of the individual in practicing the hobby described in clause (I)—

“(aa) is physical, mental, or emotional rehabilitation of the individual from the injury; and

“(bb) is not realization of profit; or

“(iv) the individual is given the opportunity to work—

“(I) despite the injury of the individual; and

“(II) on the basis of—

“(aa) a family relationship of the individual;

“(bb) a past association of the individual with the employer giving the individual the opportunity to work; or

“(cc) any other altruistic reason.

SEC. 4. RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term “covered beneficiary” means an individual who—

(A) is, or was, a child or spouse of a covered individual described in paragraph (3)(B); and

(B) would have been eligible for educational assistance under part subpart 2 of part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) if the amendments made by section 3 of this Act had been in effect on the date on which the determination described in paragraph (3)(B)(i) of this subsection was made;

(2) the term “covered claimant” means an individual who is a claimant on the estate of a deceased covered individual—

(A) described in paragraph (3)(B); and

(B) who died on or before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the term “covered individual” means—

(A) a beneficiary of a benefit under the Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefit Program that was paid—

(i) with respect to a death or disability of a public safety officer sustained as the direct or proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty; and

(ii) during the covered period; or

(B) a public safety officer who—

(i) was determined during the covered period to be ineligible for a benefit payment under section 1201(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)); and

(ii) would have been eligible for a benefit payment under part L of that title due to the disability of the public safety officer if the amendments made by section 3 had been in effect on the date on which the determination described in clause (i) was made;

(4) the term “covered period” means the period—

(A) beginning on the date of enactment of title XIII of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647; 104 Stat. 4834); and

(B) ending on the day before the date of enactment of the Protecting America’s First Responders Act;

(5) the term “public safety officer” has the meaning given the term in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284); and


(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 shall apply to a death or disability of a public safety officer sustained as the direct or proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty;

(1) subject to subsection (c), during the covered period; or

(2) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) PAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), upon application of a covered individual, covered beneficiary, or covered claimant, the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall make a lump sum payment to the covered individual, covered beneficiary, or covered claimant in the amount equal to the difference, if any, between—

(A) in the case of a covered individual—

(i) the amount of the total benefit payment the covered individual would have received under the Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefit Program as of the date of the lump sum payment, if the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 had been in effect on the date on which the covered individual—

(I) received the final benefit payment under the Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefit Program; or

(II) was determined to be ineligible for a benefit payment under section 1201(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)); and

(ii) the amount of the total benefit payment the covered beneficiary would have received under the Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefit Program before the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) in the case of a covered beneficiary, the amount of the total benefit payment the covered beneficiary would have received under part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) based on the permanent and total disability of the covered individual;

(C) in the case of a covered claimant, the amount of the total benefit payment the covered claimant would have received under part 2 of part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) if the amendments made by section 3 of this Act had been in effect on the date on which the determination described in subsection (a)(3)(B)(i) of this section was made; and

(D) in the case of a covered claimant, the amount of the total benefit payment the covered claimant would have received under the Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefit Program as of the date of the lump sum payment, if the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 had been in effect on the date on which the determination described in subsection (a)(3)(B)(i) of this section was made.

(2) APPLICATION.—A covered individual, covered beneficiary, or covered claimant desiring a lump sum payment under paragraph (1) shall apply to the Bureau of Justice Assistance for such lump sum payment not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS UNDER THE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS’ DEATH BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Section 1206(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10288(b)) is amended by striking “the Bureau may not” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the Bureau—

“(1) shall use all available investigative tools, including subpoenas, to—

“(A) expedite the processing of the benefit claim; and

“(B) obtain necessary information or documentation from third parties, including public agencies; and

“(2) may not abandon the benefit claim unless the Bureau has used the investigative tools available to the Bureau to obtain the necessary information or documentation, including subpoenas.”.

SEC. 6. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO DEPENDENTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS KILLED OR DISABLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

Section 1216(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10296(b)) is amended, in the first sentence, by striking “may” and inserting “shall”.

SEC. 7. COLLECTION OF DATA ON KILLED OR DISABLED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

and by adding at the end the following:

“(5) operate a central clearinghouse for statistics on law enforcement officers under the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, including data on law enforcement officers who, while performing their duties, were—

“(A) feloniously killed;

“(B) accidentally killed;

“(C) feloniously assaulted; or

“(D) severely and permanently disabled.”.

SEC. 8. GAO REPORT ON MEDICAL COSTS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “disabled officer” means a public safety officer to whom a benefit is payable under part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) based on the permanent and total disability of the officer, as described in section 1201(b) of that part (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that estimates the average medical costs incurred by a disabled officer over the lifetime of the officer after sustaining the injury that caused the disability.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1208), as amended, was passed as follows:

(The bill (S. 1208) is printed in the RECORD of Monday, May 20, 2019.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Kenneth Lee of California to serve as a U.S. circuit court judge for the Ninth Circuit. Yet another well-qualified nominee will now bring impressive legal experience and fine academic credentials to the job of upholding the rule of law as a Federal judge.

Mr. Lee is far from the only nominee to an important position whom the Senate confirmed this week.

On Tuesday we confirmed Michael Truncale of Texas to the Federal bench in the Eastern District of Texas, and today we will consider three more of the President's abundantly qualified picks to fill vacancies in the executive branch and in the judiciary.

First, we will vote on Wendy Vitter of Louisiana, who has been nominated to be a U.S. district court judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Ms. Vitter's impressive legal career includes experience in private practice and a decade in the Orleans Parish District Attorney's Office, where she handled more than 100 felony jury trials.

Ms. Vitter has been favorably reported twice by our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. I would urge every one of our colleagues to vote to confirm her today.

Following the Vitter nomination, we will turn to Brian Bulatao, nominated to serve as Under Secretary of State for Management. As I have mentioned, the job description is essentially that of chief operating officer at the State Department, ensuring that tens of thousands of diplomats, civil servants, and staff are provided for and a host of important missions around the world can actually be carried out.

Fortunately, we have a strong nominee who is up to the task. Mr. Bulatao is a graduate of West Point and Harvard Business School. After service in the Army, he founded a business and worked in financial management before entering public service as chief operating officer at the CIA.

In Chairman Risch's assessment, he is "eminently qualified." Our colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee certainly agree, having favorably reported his nomination with no opposition.

It has been 11 long months since the Senate first received his nomination—11 months. I am glad that today we will finally be able to put partisan delay behind us and get the nominee confirmed.

Finally, the Senate will vote today on the nomination of Jeffrey Rosen to serve as Deputy Attorney General. As I have discussed earlier in the week, the President has chosen a nominee with a rock-solid legal reputation who served with distinction as the Deputy Secretary of Transportation and who would be a clear asset to the Department of Justice and to the Nation in this new capacity.

So I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm each of these three well-qualified nominees for Federal service.

ECOLOGIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, this week I have been discussing the stark contrast between the remarkable opportunity economy that Republican policies have helped to unlock for the middle class and my Democratic colleagues' hard turn toward far-left ideas that would stifle all the progress. Our colleagues across the aisle, particularly over in the House, have given top billing to the legislation that would end Medicare as seniors know it, eliminate every private healthcare plan American families have chosen to meet their needs, and replace all of it—all of it—with a one-size-fits-all, government-run insurance system while piling heavy taxes on the middle class. And, of course, they have touted a proposal to drop an anvil—an anvil—on a high-speed U.S. economy and shove a host of new Federal rules between American citizens and their everyday life choices—all in the name of going "green."

Now, most of my colleagues across the aisle know full well what would happen if the supposed Green New Deal actually became reality. They know what winding down our affordable forms of domestic energy and the millions of jobs that support their production would do to a U.S. economy that is currently firing on all cylinders. They know what turning families' own choices about where to live, what to drive, and how to make a living into Washington, DC's official business would mean for the historic levels of job opportunities and the wage growth that we have seen over the past 2 years. All of that would come to a screeching halt.

Remember, our Democratic colleagues tried to claim this outlandish proposal—this truly outlandish proposal—was just a conversation starter from the farthest left fringes. But, then, push came to shove. Then, the
American people really saw the score because we brought the thing up for a vote. Right here on this floor we had the vote, and only 4 out of 47 Senate Democrats actually voted no. Only 4 of the 47 voted against this plan to bring our economy to a screeching halt. Forty-three of the Democratic colleagues couldn’t bring themselves—couldn’t bring themselves—to vote even against this—not even as Republican policies, taking the exact opposite approach, have helped the U.S. job market to drive unemployment lower than it has been in half a century—lower than it has been in half a century. They want to bring all of that to a screeching halt—not even as 19 different States have hit new record low State unemployment rates in just the year and a half since Republicans passed comprehensive tax reform.

Well, I have good news for the American people. This Republican majority is going to keep fighting for you. We will not let these far-left dreams get in the way of more progress for middle-class families.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendey Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week is National Police Week—a chance to reflect on the sacrifices of our Nation’s police officers and to thank them for everything they do on our behalf.

Yesterday, I spoke on the floor about Military Appreciation Month. Like members of the military, police officers are a special breed. They willingly rush into danger and put their lives on the line for the rest of us. That is not a natural human instinct, to rush into danger. Most of us are inclined to run away from danger. But police officers do the opposite. They not only stand their ground in the face of danger; they walk into the midst of it to protect the rest of us.

A centerpiece of National Police Week is Peace Officers Memorial Day, which commemorate the sacrifices of all of those who have given their lives in the line of duty. Last year, more than 100 police officers were killed in the line of duty. It is a powerful reminder that being a police officer is a dangerous job. USA TODAY reports that 10 percent of police officers are assaulted every year—10 percent. Police officers never know what they are going to face when they respond to a call, but they go in anyway.

Serving in law enforcement can take a toll. Police officers—particularly those who specialize in investigating and responding to the worst crimes—have to see a lot of evil on a daily basis. It is yet another way they protect the rest of us. They face evil so that we don’t have to. Yet, despite all they do, they don’t line up to be thanked. The police officers I meet tend to minimize their contributions. “I am just doing my job” is a pretty frequent refrain. A lot of us don’t interact with the police very frequently. We don’t often see the work they do to keep our towns and our cities safe. But being in Congress has given me a chance to interact with police officers on a daily basis. The U.S. Capitol Building and the congressional office buildings, where I work, are protected by the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police. I see them every day, manning security checkpoints, directing traffic, standing in the blazing Sun or in the cold rain, responding to incidents, and protecting dignitaries and visitors. I know there is a lot they do that I don’t see, too—the countless things that go into keeping the Capitol Complex and the thousands of people who work and visit here safe from threats.

I was in the Longworth House Office Building on September 11, 2001, when the planes hit the Pentagon and the Twin Towers. Once it became clear that our Nation was, in fact, under attack, the entire Capitol Complex was evacuated. People were rushing, running out of the buildings. Do you know who wasn’t running? The Capitol Police. They weren’t going anywhere until they were sure that all of us had gotten out and were safe.

Since I became whip, I have gotten to know a number of the outstanding plainclothes police officers who protect Members of leadership. It was two members of the Capitol Police security detail who stepped into the line of fire at the Republicans’ baseball practice two summers ago and prevented a terrible day from becoming much worse. Many Members of Congress are safe today because of the actions of those two police officers.

Here in the United States, we are blessed with a peace and a safety that is denied to many around the world. It is important to remember that one of the reasons most of us are able to live free from fear is because of the countless police officers on duty around our country. They are there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, ready to step between us and danger. We owe these men and women a very great debt.

As we observe Police Week, I want to say thank you. Thank you to the police officers who serve across our country. Thank you to their families, who also sacrifice so that the rest of us can live in safety. A special thank-you to the Capitol Police and the police officers who keep the peace back home in South Dakota. May God bless each of you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I come to the floor again this morning to discuss several judicial nominations considered by the Senate this week.

Earlier this week, the Senate voted to confirm Michael Truncale to the Eastern District of Texas and Kenneth Lee to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals seat in California, and today we will be voting on the nomination of Wendy Vitter to the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The Senate is considering and confirming nominees whose records indicate they are far outside the mainstream. I have worked very hard over a number of years now—I guess we are in our eighth year—working with Senator TOOMEY, to fill district court vacancies in Pennsylvania with well-qualified and experienced judges whom I believe will be able to set aside their ideologies or personal beliefs and apply the law to the cases before them. But I do not have the same confidence in many of the nominees before this body today and especially the nominees we are considering.

I will go in the order that I mentioned before—first, Michael Truncale, then Kenneth Lee, and Wendy Vitter. I believe that in all three cases, all are not mainstream conservatives. Their backgrounds and records are very political, and they have long records of advocating for certain positions on issues that may come before them as either a U.S. district court judge or an appellate judge.

First of all, Mr. Truncale has advocated strongly for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which provided healthcare coverage and critical patient protections for 20 million people
in terms of coverage and tens of millions more in terms of protection.

He said that the Affordable Care Act would “lead to the rationing of healthcare.” He has personally advocated for abolishing the Department of Education and used false, unfounded claims of voter fraud to support voter ID laws that disproportionately affect low-income voters and communities of color.

Second, Kenneth Lee was confirmed over the objections of both California Senators, Senator Harris and Senator Feinstein. In this case, being the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the very committee that considers judges, Mr. Lee has a litany of writings that include offensive statements about immigrants, people of color, and LGBT Americans. He has strongly opposed affirmative action policies that help make our institutions of higher learning more diverse, and it is very possible that he may be voting on policies relating to the same type of policies as a member of the Ninth Circuit.

Finally, Wendy Vitter has virtually no Federal trial court experience, has a long record of opposing contraception, and has promoted false information about the safety of oral contraceptives. These views are not only outside of the mainstream—the judicial or legal mainstream—but they are also not supported by science.

I don’t believe these nominees will be able to sit aside their personal views and apply relevant precedent, and my concern is compounded by recent efforts by conservative jurists to overturn longstanding precedents. Most Americans thought that the Voting Rights Act, which for decades protected the franchise for Americans of color, particularly Black Americans, was a foundational, almost untouchable statute. But in 2013, the conservative majority of the Supreme Court, which has given only more conservative, moved to the right even more. That Court, the Supreme Court, gutted the protections of the Voting Rights Act in the Shelby County v. Holder case.

Just last year, in the Janus decision, the Supreme Court overturned a four-decades-old precedent in the Abood case that allowed public sector unions to collect nonpolitical, so-called fair share fees to cover the costs of negotiations that benefit all workers. So you have the union doing the work, and the law allowed them, for four decades, to charge other employees who benefit from the work of the union, and the Supreme Court struck that down.

Pennsylvania passed a similar law in the 1980s, which has been the law of the land in Pennsylvania for years. It was signed into law in the late 1980s by my father when he was serving as Governor, so that is an important issue in Pennsylvania for working men and women.

The conservative majority of the Supreme Court overturned the Abood case, evincing a precedent that was relied upon by public sector unions and their governmental employers all over the country. I believe the next step by the far right and by this court and maybe by the Supreme Court and maybe by another court would be to make illegal the very right to organize for wages and benefits. I hope I am wrong about that, but I believe that is the logical next step for the right.

Just this past recent majority of the Supreme Court overturned a 40-year precedent regarding States’ sovereign immunity in the courts of other States. In the last line of his dissent, Justice Breyer sounded alarm bells about this kind of judicial activism from the right, saying: “Today’s decision can only cause one to wonder which cases the court will overrule next.”

He is right. We no longer know what is civil law and what could be up for debate. We thought that Abood was settled law in the context of labor unions and the right to organize or an issue related to the right to organize. We thought the Voting Rights Act was settled law.

This week we mark the 65th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, a unanimous Supreme Court decision holding that segregation in our public school system, in addition to being a profound moral failure, was a violation of our Constitution. I would hope—we all would hope that Brown v. Board of Education would remain rock solid settled law. Yet what we have seen in the last couple of years with this Court, we must stay vigilant. We cannot let civil rights that Americans fought for and earned and have cherished for decades be chipped away by extreme judicial nominees who hold ininsuperable political and policy preferences.

I oppose the nominees that the Senate has considered this week, and I will continue to oppose extreme nominees to our Federal courts.

I yield the floor to the distinguished Democratic leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague Senator Casey for, as usual, his thoughtful, erudite, on-the-money remarks—this time about judges. I am going to talk about that in a minute.

We see something happening here. We see State after State trying to repeal Roe. When we ask our Republican colleagues directly “Do you want to appeal Roe?” they are usually silent. Their votes on judges say they do, and that is what they are doing. The voters should hold them accountable. We will get to that more in a minute, but I wanted to follow up on the remarks about judges by my good friend from Pennsylvania.

IMMIGRATION

Madam President, yesterday, the Trump administration released the outlines of its plan for immigration reform. Truth be told, the reported White House plan isn’t a serious attempt at immigration reform. If anything, it is a political document that is anti-immigration reform. It packages the same partisan, radical, anti-immigrant policies that the White House has pushed for 2 years, all of which have struggled to earn even a simple majority in the Senate, let alone 60 votes.

The hands of Stephen Miller are all over this plan, and, of course, he had a very effective eye when immigration officials came into the Republican lunch yesterday and talked about it.

The plan they put together holds immigration precisely at current levels, meaning that for every new immigrant the plan potentially lets in, it must kick one out. What kind of logic is that? What kind of harebrained logic is that—the idea that for every immigrant you help you have to hurt another? How arbitrary. How simplistic. How cruel. It is like the Procrustean bed of immigration reform.

We need immigrants in America. Our labor force is declining. If you go to businesses at the high end, the middle end, and the low end, they say their greatest problem is a lack of workers. And we come up with a policy like this? Make no mistake about it. It is cruel and inhumane, but it also hurts our economy significantly. If you don’t believe me, talk to business leaders—any business leader you know.

Shockingly, the White House’s immigration proposal fails to deal with Dreamers or the 11 million undocumented immigrants now living in the United States. The White House Press Secretary said Dreamers were “left out on purpose.” What does that say about the administration? That goes to the root of what is wrong with this administration’s approach to immigration. If they think they can repeat what they failed to do in the past, if they try to repeat it, saying “OK, we will let Dreamers in, but you accept a whole lot of bad things,” which is why immigration reform failed last time, last year, it ain’t happening. It ain’t happening.

I would say two things. If you are going to do major immigration reform through Congress, you are going to need bipartisan support. That means you sit down and talk to Democrats. Four of us on the Democratic side and four of us on the Republican side in the Gang of 8 spent hours and weeks and months together and carved together a bill that got overwhelming support from Democrats and Republicans in this Chamber and was overwhelmingly supported by the American people and still is. I think 68 percent still support comprehensive immigration reform.

But what does the White House do? Typically, they put together their own plan. Stephen Miller, chief of staff and bottle washer—and they say that Democrats should support this. Ain’t happening.
No consultation, no nothing—that is not the way you would go about putting together a bill that you really want to pass. That is not the way to go about things if you really want to solve our immigration problem.

What Stephen Miller, one of the President’s most virulently anti-immigrant advisers, is in the room crafting an immigration plan, it is a surefire failure. The fact that the President is announcing his bill today provides a further whiff of irony because, this afternoon, the new Statue of Liberty museum opens. There is no greater symbol of Americans’ openness to immigration, of the greatness of America, than the Statue of Liberty, which reaches out to people from every corner of the globe. It towers over nearby Ellis Island, where generations of hopeful strivers shuffled off boats into a new life and into a new country and helped build America into the greatest country in the world.

The Trump administration’s Iran policy is its lack of clarity and the lack of consultation with Congress and with the American people. We have learned, sadly, in Iraq, when things are done behind closed doors and the American people are not told, it can and it did lead to significant foreign policy blunders. So they should come up here—General Dunford, Acting Secretary Shanahan, as well as Secretary Pompeo—and I hope that request will be granted.

**HEALTHCARE**

Now, Madam President, on healthcare and our friends creating the Senate graveyard, as well as the abortion bill in Alabama, the House has passed over 100 pieces of legislation, but the Trump administration support is only to get buried in this graveyard of a Chamber. Leader McCONNELL, who controls the calendar, prefers to run it as a legislative graveyard.

Let’s take healthcare as an example, the No. 1 issue that the American people care about. Our colleagues in the House passed a modest bill to protect families from getting charged more if they have a preexisting condition. It should be bipartisan, and most Republicans—or many of the Senate Republicans say they agree with that policy when asked. Well, we have a bill that does it, and what does Leader McCONNELL do? He just deep-sixes it and sets aside another tombstone for his legislative graveyard.

What about today’s House vote on another set of healthcare bills to protect people with preexisting conditions and help them sign up for insurance? What is the fate of those bills in the Senate? Will Leader McCONNELL sentence them to the same legislative death as all of these other proposals or will Leader McCONNELL actually allow us to debate something of great importance to the American people, to amend it, and then vote on it? Hopefully it will pass. I believe it would.

What is Leader McCONNELL afraid of? Is he afraid the American people will get protection from preexisting conditions? Is he afraid he might anger some special interest? Is he afraid he might anger President Trump? We have a higher obligation here.

Instead of debating those crucial pieces of legislation, Leader McCONNELL has treated the Senate like a rubberstamped for the Trump administration’s often radical nominees. For 3 straight weeks, we have only processed nominations, including several judges who are merely unqualified ideologues or merely unqualified.

This matters. The judges we have heard them are narrow. Many have offered bigoted remarks in the past, really bigoted. They are not who a judge should be. A judge is supposed to walk in the plaintiff’s shoes and the defendant’s shoes, and then come up with a decision that is governed by existing law. These people are ideologues, many of them stooges and acolytes for the Federalist Society. Now we have in the Senate graveyard the abortation bill in the country, inviting a challenge to Roe v. Wade in the courts. So the effort by the Republican leader to remake the Federal judiciary into a conservative redoubt has a direct impact on these legal challenges. If you ask most of our Republican Members in this Chamber “Are you for repealing Roe v. Wade, hook, line, and sinker?” they would say, no, they are not or they would mostly be silent; they would be afraid to answer. Then they vote for judges who want to do it, either frontally or by various deep cuts. When our Republican friends vote for these radical, right-wing judges, they are saying they want to repeal Roe v. Wade, even if they will not say it publicly.

So I say to my colleagues, much as you prefer to remain silent on the Alabama Republican abortion bill, your votes for the right-hard-right, anti-Roe judges speak volumes—volumes. I would ask the whole impetus of the Alabama bill is now that we have very conservative, anti-Roe judges on the Supreme Court, supported universally by the Members of the other side, they feel they have the boldness to introduce a bill that actually repeals Roe instead of just curbing it.

**CHINESE TRADE POLICY**

Madam President, finally, something good that I think the administration has done. I was pleased for two reasons to see the administration issue an Executive order laying the groundwork for the Commerce Department to ban all purchases of telecommunications equipment from China’s State-controlled firms.

That was a good decision for our national security. We have long known the threat posed by foreign telecommunications companies, particularly Chinese firms like Huawei and ZTE. The tentacles of the Chinese Government are deep in these two companies. Our intelligence and defense communities, concerned about our own security here in America, have banned the use of Huawei products in the military and labeled its technology a national security threat. That is serious stuff.

So I applaud the decision to protect our networks from potential malware, foreign surveillance, and cyber espionage, and I applaud the administration. They backed off on ZTE 1 year ago, despite the strong bipartisanship in this Chamber for not letting ZTE sell products, but they are now doing the right thing on Huawei, which is even a greater danger than ZTE.

The other secret reason this is a good decision, aside from national security. It is called reciprocity. In America, we make great products, and time and again, when we make great

---
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products, the Chinese don’t let us sell them to China. They instead keep the product out, steal the technology, and then produce it themselves. Well, it is about time there was a little fair play—a little fair play. China, for years, has used technology obtained with stolen IP—here in the United States cheaply while denying America access to its markets.

Reciprocity matters. A lot of people say to get China to negotiate, tariffs aren’t the way. I have made my views on that clear, but reciprocity is another way to go. If China doesn’t let our best stuff in, we are not letting theirs in. Open up. Play fair. If we don’t do something about China today, our economy will be second-rate 10, 15 years from now, and our children and grandchildren will suffer economically, make no mistake about it.

Telecommunications, especially 5G technology, are already a major focus of American innovation. We shouldn’t let China or others make a cheap and put American businesses at a disadvantage. The United States, with our allies, should lead to the development of a safe, secure, and economically viable alternative to the 5G architecture of firms like Huawei that are subject to the infiltration by the Chinese Government, which has shown no qualms about stealing everything of our intellectual property that they can.

It would say to our European, Japanese, and Australian allies, stick with us on this; it will benefit everybody—everybody. China is our No. 1 global competitor, and it is about time they played fair. What was done yesterday with Huawei by Secretary Ross will help make that happen, and it is a very good decision.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott of Florida). The Senator from Missouri.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to be joined soon by my colleague and cochair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, Senator Coons, to honor the men and women who work for us every day to help protect us every day during Police Week. This is an annual event. It brings law enforcement officers to Washington from around the country and of course including my State of Missouri.

As the Missouri police centennial was recently a bad week to rob a store in Washington with a town full of policemen. Just last week, several would-be robbers came out of a robbery and almost ran into a group of St. Louis area policemen and a New Jersey policeman. They immediately chased down and arrested the perpetrators of that crime.

Criminals are often not very smart, but you have to be particularly not smart to decide you are going to rob a store in Washington during Police Week. Thank goodness for those who wear blue and work to serve us and protect us every day and even do that when they are off duty and hundreds of miles away from home. So congratulations to those officers for what they did while they are here, and nobody is more surprised by that.

When Senator Coons and I came to the Senate 10 years ago, we started trying to find a law enforcement caucus to join, and found out there wasn’t one, so Senator Coons said to me: Let’s just start one, and we did. This is the week.

I We get a lot every year to talk about, specifically, what happens this week. We look for opportunities through the year to, No. 1, honor the people who work here protecting us every day, and, No. 2, to talk about things happening in the country that affect the people who protect us and protect police and sheriff’s departments. This is the time of year, frankly, when the tragic loss of family is so evident as we add people to the police memorial.

Four Missourians were added to that list this year. Deputy Sheriff Aaron Paul Roberts of the Greene County Sheriff’s Office—the county I live in—died when his patrol car was swept into the Pomme de Terre River after he responded to a call. Deputy Roberts had served with the Sheriff’s Office for about 1 year, but he had previously served with the Willard Police Department for 4 years. He is survived by his wife, daughter, and by his parents.

In April of this year the Deputy Sheriff Casey Shoemate was killed when his vehicle collided with an oncoming vehicle while responding to a structure fire. He had served with that department for about 1 year as well, but he previously worked in two other Missouri police departments. He is survived by his two children, his fiancée, his parents, and his siblings.

In March of 2018, Clinton Police Department Officer Christopher Morton was shot and killed. When two other officers responded to a 911 call. As Officer Morton and his colleagues arrived at the scene, a man began shooting at them. The officers returned fire. They entered the building. The subject continued to fire. He fatally wounded Officer Morton and injured two of Officer Morton’s colleagues whom I had a chance to visit with at that department not long after this incident.

Officer Morton had been with the Clinton Police Department for 3 years. Prior to that, he served in the U.S. military through the Missouri Army National Guard. He had been deployed to Kosovo. He had been deployed to Afghanistan. His parents and siblings, I know, worried about him there but wouldn’t have, in their wildest imagination, thought he would be killed at home near his hometown when reacting to a 911 call from a house.

In March of last year, FBI Special Agent Melissa Morrow, of Kansas City, died from a brain cancer she developed following the 9/11 terrorist attack on the Pentagon. She had been assigned to the Evidence Response Team of the FBI Washington Field Office. She spent 10 weeks after that event recovering and processing evidence from the site in hazardous conditions. Melissa is survived by her parents, her sister, a niece, and a nephew. Three of these fallen men and women were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington and to the Wall of Honor at the Missouri Law Enforcement Memorial over the last month. They will be remembered by families and friends from and remember their bravery, their dedication, and their sacrifice.

This is a time when we honor those who serve us, particularly for lives which have been lost, but it is also the time to think about what we can do to serve them in a better way, to be sure they have the equipment they need, the resources they need, and the training they need.

I mentioned at an event earlier today that over the last 50 years, law enforcement and emergency rooms have also been, unfortunately for everybody involved, the de facto mental health delivery system in the country. Officers now take crisis intervention training and when they are dealing with someone whose intent is not criminal, but their activities are impacted by their mental health issues and what to do in that situation so everybody is better served.

I have worked to get the Regional Information Sharing System in our State, headquartered in Springfield, is properly funded. The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program has the center for our region in Kansas City. Those are things that Senator Coons and I have worked together on to do our best to fund.

Two different times now, we have worked together to extend the Victims of Child Abuse Program. Last year, we introduced the bill that the previous extension had been a 5-year extension, and we came to the end of that. This is the program where, at 23 centers in Missouri, people understand how to get the forensic information, the testimony they need from kids who have either been the victims of crime or witnesses of crimes.

Every law enforcement person I have talked to, Senator Coons, every prosecutor I have talked to believes that what happens at these victims of child abuse centers can’t be replaced anywhere else.

Now we are working together on the National Law Enforcement Museum Commemorative Coin Act, a bill that the Senate passed last year, and the House didn’t get to. We want to do that again. The Law Enforcement Museum in Washington would be the beneficiary of the proceeds from that coin after the cost of the coin is paid. We are going to be working together on that.

We have worked with other colleagues. I have worked with Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas on the Kelsey
Smith Act. It is named after 18-year-old Kelsey Smith, who was abducted and murdered in 2004.

I am glad to be joined today by my good friend Senator Coons from Delaware. The PRESIDING OFFICER, the Senator from Delaware.

As you just heard, he recited some of the many ways in which we have been able to work together. Senator BLUNT, as a seasoned senior appropriator, someone who has experience in the House of Representatives and in the private sector at home, leading an educational institution, and has worked in State and local government, along with my experience in local government and the private sector, I think that has allowed us to do really good and positive things for the men and women of law enforcement.

This is National Police Week. It is an opportunity for us—not just here in the Senate but all over the country—to thank the hundreds of thousands of men and women in State and local law enforcement, as well as in Federal law enforcement agencies, who make possible the opportunity we have to enjoy our freedom and basic safety. It is the law enforcement officers who are permanently disabled or lose their lives in the line of duty, and it was only because they came home at the end of their shift.

I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee. On a unanimous basis, we recently advanced a series of bills that will help advance officer safety, not the least of which is making permanent the Federal Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program that has literally saved lives across the country. The blueprint—the police who protect Delaware’s capitol and our courthouse—had a dramatic and personal experience with that when two law enforcement officers’ lives were saved when they were shot in the line of duty. It was only because they were wearing vests made possible by this Federal-State partnership that they survived.

I will also continue to work to support the COPS Program, which ensures that we have officers on the ground in communities large and small in Delaware, such as Cheswold, Delmar, Laurel, Ocean View, Smyrna, and my home city of Wilmington. They all have been able to hire new officers in recent years because of the COPS Program. We are also working together on reforms to the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits Program to ensure that families of officers who are permanently disabled or lose their lives in the line of duty receive the benefits they richly deserve.

Let me conclude by thanking and honoring a few specific officers from Delaware’s law enforcement community for their service this past year. We have added the names of those who have given their lives in the line of duty and maintained an amazing clearance rate of 84 percent in investigated burglaries, robberies, and attempted murders.

Let me briefly thank Sergeant Paul Doherty of the Delaware State Police, who was honored with the Robert J. Seinsoth Memorial Award as the 2018 Delaware Crime Stoppers Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. His investigative work following up on a robbery led to the apprehension of a serial, dangerous criminal who harmed other Delawareans.

Senators and Mr. CASEY, Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Senate’s failure to meet its constitutional obligation and conduct effective oversight of what seems to me and many others to be this administration’s inexcusable march toward war with Iran.

This week, the New York Times reported that the Trump administration is making plans to deploy 120,000 American troops to the Middle East in anticipation of a confrontation with Iran. It is no secret that some of the President’s closest advisers are focused on regime change and possibly military engagement with Iran.

I was encouraged by a story in the Washington Post that was posted last night. The headline of that story read as follows: “Trump, frustrated by advisers, is not convinced the time is right to attack Iran.” That was the headline in the version of the story reported by four Washington Post reporters. In pertinent part, the story indicated that the President thinks his advisers “could rush the U.S. into a military confrontation with Iran.”

The plans that I mentioned before referred to by the New York Times apparently were submitted by Acting Defense Secretary Shanahan. These are
the most recent in a string of actions this administration has taken, from withdrawing from the 2015 Iran nuclear agreement, to designating the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—the so-called IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization, to suspending waivers that allow partner countries to continue importing Iranian oil.

I have a long record of working to fight against Iranian aggression. We all know—and we have said it often, and we should say it again—Iran is and has been the leading state sponsor of terrorism. For years, many of us, in a bipartisan way, have led efforts to confront Iran, to hold Iran accountable for its malign activity and actions in the Middle East and its actions to support terrorist organizations, whether it is Hezbollah or any other terrorist organization. We will continue that regardless of this debate.

But when the New York Times talked about that military plan, they referred to a commitment, a prior military conflict—the conflict in Iraq. "Echoes of Iraq War" was what the Times said. These "echoes" trigger memories and reflections of a misguided period of this body's history in which Congress approved a declaration of war on Iran based upon faulty intelligence. By the end of that long war, thousands of Americans had been killed, and many more Americans had been wounded.

In Pennsylvania alone, 197 Pennsylvanians were killed in action in Afghanistan. Pennsylvania lost more than 90. The last number I saw was 91 Pennsylvanians had been wounded.

In 2001, the United States went to war in Afghanistan, where Pennsylvania lost more than 90. The last number I saw was 91 Pennsylvanians were killed in action in Afghanistan. Pennsylvania is well familiar with contributing fighting men and women to conflicts from the beginning of our Republic until this very day.

The administration's actions on Iran also anger me. The perception of a "stalemate" might be an understatement—regarding the authorization for use of military force—the so-called AUMF—against ISIS, for example.

If we don't debate and vote on an AUMF as it relates to Iran or any other country or any other conflict, we are not doing our job.

For 6 years, the United States has been engaged in the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. For many years, the executive branch has relied on the prior authorization for use of military force to justify its fight against ISIS, as well as to justify other military engagements.

I ask Majority Leader McCONNELL to set aside time for sustained debate and votes on a new authorization for use of military force.

Last month, Secretary of State Pompeo implied during testimony in front of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that the 2001 AUMF to go after al-Qaeda and its affiliates authorizes war with Iran. A lot of people would disagree with that. I believe that an 18-year-old authoriza-

I hope President Trump will reread this letter as he deliberates our next steps with regard to Iran and our next steps with regard to the authorization for the use of military force.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

REAUTHORIZING THE BULLET-PROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2379) to reauthorize the Bullet-proof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEAHY. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2379) was passed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

H.R. 2379

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this may seem like just a perfunctory thing, but I want to speak about what we just did.

The Senate passed legislation to permanently reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. This is the sixth time I have worked to reauthorize this lifesaving program since I and my Republican partner, Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, of Colorado, authored the legislation to establish it more than 20 years ago.

My role in authoring this program—and my commitment to it ever since as well as reauthorizing and reauthorizing it—was, in part, motivated by a horrific incident the year before Senator Nighthorse Campbell and I created it.

On August 19, 1997, a man named Carl Drega went on a killing spree along the Vermont and New Hampshire border. After hours of pursuit, Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in Vermont and New Hampshire cornered Drega, and in an ensuing exchange of gunfire, he was killed.

All of the Federal law enforcement officers involved were wearing bulletproof vests. This includes John Pfeifer, a Vermonter and a
longtime friend. His father was one of my favorite professors in college, and I remember John as a child. He was seriously wounded. In fact, at that time, then-FBI Director Louis Freeh and his family were staying with us at our home in Vermont.

We visited Officer Pfeifer, who was a U.S. Border Patrol agent, in the hospital. He was grievously wounded, but he survived and later became the Chief Patrol Agent of the sector. I have always feared—and I believe he agrees—that if he had chosen to fire his bulletproof vest, the outcome for John and his family may have been much worse.

Some of the state and local officers involved were not that fortunate. Two New Hampshire state troopers were killed. They were not wearing bulletproof vests. I don’t know whether vests would have saved their lives. Let us hope they would have.

One thing I do know is that no officer should have to serve without having the protection of a bulletproof vest. That is what this is all about. I am immensely proud of this program. It is the most tangible support that all of us in Congress—both parties—can provide to our Nation’s law enforcement officers.

To this day, for far too many jurisdictions, especially rural and smaller agencies, vests cost too much, and they wear out too soon. This program fills in the gap. It has provided more than 13,000 protective vests to agencies with 1.35 million vests. It has saved the lives of countless officers, several of whom have shared their stories with the Judiciary Committee, here in the Senate, during previous years. In fact, according to the Government Accountability Office, more than 3,000 officers’ lives have been saved by vests since 1997. It makes me very proud to know these officers can still be with their families and their departments.

Just yesterday, my office received a call from the Union City Police Department in Georgia. Last month, one of its officers, Jerome Turner, Jr.—shown in this photograph—was shot multiple times when he responded to a call. One round hit him directly in the chest, but it did not get through his bulletproof vest. When backup arrived, Officer Turner was lying on the ground from his other injuries. He went through 6 hours of surgery, but he lived. His department called yesterday to tell me that the vest he was wearing protected his life. He has chased through this program. Everybody in my office and I just applauded him.

My staff also had a chance to talk with Officer Turner. He is still recovering, but he said he is happy to be home with his family—his family he might never have seen again. He also said what we all know to be true—the bulletproof vest Pakistan Partnership Grant Program is critical to ensuring officers around the country can return home to their families after their shifts. Officer Turner knows a lot about this program. It turns out that he previously served as the chief of police in a small town in Florida, which is the Presiding Officer’s State. He used this program to outfit his officers with protective vests in order to keep his officers safe while they were protecting us. This year is Police Week. It is a time for the Nation to honor the many brave men and women in law enforcement who have lost their lives while having served their communities. That includes the 163 officers who were lost last year, 32 of them killed by gunshots. This fact that Congress has now passed legislation to permanently reauthorize this program places real meaning behind our words of tribute. The legislation also increases the funding for vests as, year after year, only a fraction of the need is met.

This program is not new, and never has been, partisan. When we started, I said that I and Ben Nighthorse Campbell, of Colorado—a Republican—started it. I am especially grateful to Senator Larson and the lead cosponsor of both this and the last reauthorization.

Last week, our bill was being considered by the Judiciary Committee. I have to admit I was a bit surprised and humbled when Senator ORRIN H. GRIEHR called up an amendment to name the program after me and when it then got a unanimous vote from Republicans and Democrats. I am always going to be thankful for the program is personal to me, and it is personal, certainly, to the officers who wear these vests.

I thank my many staff who have worked on this program for 22 years, including Dave Pendle, Erica Chabot, Ed Pagano, Bruce Cohen, Matt Virkstis, Kristine Luccis, Chan Park, David Carle, Jessica Berry, and many others.

I am also thankful to the entire law enforcement community, which has spoken with one voice on this issue—a single voice. In particular I would like to thank Chuck Canterbury, Jim Pasco, and Tim Richardson with the Fraternal Order of Police—all friends of mine. The POP has strongly supported this program from the beginning, and has been there for each of the six reauthorizations.

I would also like to thank for their support the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriffs’ Association, the Major County Sheriffs’ Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Tactical Officers Association, and the Sergeants Benevolent Association. Last, I would like to thank the sponsors of the House companion which the Senate just passed, Congressmen BILL PASCRELL and PETER KING.

With this legislation, the BulletinProof Vest Partnership Grant Program would expire next year. Once this legislation is signed into law, it will never expire. It has already saved the lives of so many, and placed vests on the backs of well over one million officers. Now we know that millions more officers will be protected, and millions of officers like Officer Turner will be able to go home to their families.

I hope that the Senate would allow me to tell a story.

When we were doing the reauthorization, I had asked a police officer from Pennsylvania to come and testify. He came. His parents, his wife, and his children sat behind him. He gave a very moving testimony. He said: The two most important things to him in life were his family and law enforcement. He told us about how, a short while before, he stopped a car at a routine traffic stop. He got out of his police car, and the person in the other car stepped out and fired four shots at him—point blank. He fell over. Others caught the person.

He said: As I was falling, I thought I would never see my family again. I had seen all of the damage. They came to visit me in the hospital. I went back home with them to their love and care. Then I went back to work. This is what saved me.

He reached under the table and held up his bulletproof vest, and you could still see three large caliber slugs embedded in it.

He said: Those would have been in my heart. I never would have seen my family, and I never would have gone back to law enforcement.

At that time, I was the chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee. After his testimony, I asked if we could have a unanimous vote to reauthorize. It was the fastest unanimous vote I can remember in that committee.

As I said then and as I say now, this is the least Congress can do on behalf of our Nation’s law enforcement officers. Obviously, I am proud to have had legislation named after me, but I am proud of all of us over the last 20-plus years—Republicans and Democrats—who have supported it. I am glad we have done it. Now it will head to the President for his signature, and I am sure the President will sign it without delay. I see nobody else who seeks recognition.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

VOTE ON VITTER NOMINATION

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

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient sec-
The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows: [Rollecall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander Gardner  Portman
Baldwin Grassley  Risch
Barrasso Grassley  Rounds
Blumenthal Hassan  Roberts
Blunt Heitkamp  Romney
Boozman Hoeven  Rounds
Braun Hyde-Smith  Rounds
Brown Inhofe  Rounds
Burr Johnson  Rounds
Canterbury Johnson  Rounds
Casey Jones  Rounds
Chambliss Johnson  Rounds
Collins Lankford  Rounds
Corker Kennedy  Rounds
Cotton Kennedy  Rounds
Crapo Lee  Rounds
Cramer McConnell  Rounds
Cruz McCaskill  Rounds
Daines Moran  Rounds
Emmi Markowski  Rounds
Ernst Paul  Rounds
Fischer Perdue  Rounds

NAYS—45

Baldwin  Heitkamp  Rounds
Bennet  Hirono  Sanders
Blumenthal  Jones  Schatz
Brown  Kaine  Schumer
Cantwell  King  Shaheen
Cardin  Klobuchar  Sinema
Carter  Leahy  Smith
Casey  Manchin  Sasse
Collins  Markley  Tester
Coons  Menendez  Udall
Cortez Masto  Merkley  Van Hollen
Duckworth  Murphy  Warner
Durbin  Murphy  Warner
Feinstein  Perea  Wyden
Fischer  Peters  Young

NOT VOTING—3

Booker  Gillibrand  Harris

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 Senator's action.

vote on bulatao nomination

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of Labor (Management).

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows: [Rollecall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander Gardner  Portman
Baldwin Grassley  Risch
Barrasso Grassley  Rounds
Blumenthal Hassan  Roberts
Blunt Heitkamp  Romney
Boozman Hoeven  Rounds
Braun Hyde-Smith  Rounds
Brown Inhofe  Rounds
Burr Johnson  Rounds
Canterbury Johnson  Rounds
Casey Jones  Rounds
Chambliss Johnson  Rounds
Collins Lankford  Rounds
Corker Kennedy  Rounds
Cotton Kennedy  Rounds
Crapo Lee  Rounds
Cramer McConnell  Rounds
Cruz McCaskill  Rounds
Daines Moran  Rounds
Emmi Markowski  Rounds
Ernst Paul  Rounds
Fischer Perdue  Rounds

NOT VOTING—3

Booker  Gillibrand  Harris

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I am on the floor to talk about the men and women in uniform, our police officers who protect us every day. They are here in the Capitol protecting us in the Chamber. They are in Ohio protecting the citizens of Ohio, and they do it every day. They put their lives on the line for us in many cases.

This is National Police Week, a week when tens of thousands of police officers come to Washington, DC. They come to the police memorial. It has been a wonderful week because I had the opportunity to meet with law enforcement officers from Ohio, today, yesterday, and the day before. We have been on the streets. We have seen them in uniform. Their opportunity to come here is to talk about the important issues that relate to our law enforcement but also to pay tribute to their fallen colleagues.

Sadly, Ohio has lost its share of officers recently. Officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty include two so far this year and four last year.

On February 2, Clermont County Detective Bill Brewer was shot and killed after responding to a call from a suicidal man who was armed at an apartment complex just east of Cincinnati, in Clermont County. Detective Brewer served at the sheriff's department for 20 years, and was widely respected.

The funeral was amazing. There was an overwhelming number of people. Grateful citizens showed up and law enforcement from our entire region and, in fact, law enforcement from even other States. At his service I had the honor of presenting his widow and young son with a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol, in honor of him and in gratitude to his family.

On that day, County Sheriff Steve Leahy said of Detective Brewer:

He was an outstanding man. He was a good father, a good husband, a good friend, a good employee. He’s what this country needs more of.

I agree with Sheriff Leahy.

On January 4, Colerain Township Police Officer Dale Woods was hit by a vehicle while working at the scene of an automobile accident, and he passed away 3 days later as a result of his injuries. Police Chief Mark Denney remembered Woods as a hero who once saved a baby inside a hot car and also into a burning building to save a blind woman. That is the type of selfless and courageous officer he was. He represented the best.

Last July, Cleveland Patrol Officer Vu Nguyen, a 25-year veteran of the department, collapsed while taking part in police training exercises. Vu was known as a people person, someone who cared a lot for his fellow citizens and always went the extra mile to help anyone who asked. His family said that was the reason he became a police officer, because he wanted a job where he could help people. That is what police officers do.

In June of last year, Mentor Police Officer Matthew Mazany was struck and killed by a hit-and-run driver while assisting another officer during a traffic stop. Officer Mazany had served with the Mentor Police Department for 14 years. He was beloved by his fellow officers, by his family and friends, and by his entire community.

This morning I had the opportunity to visit the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, here in Washington, DC. I was able to see the inscribed names on the wall there of thousands of law enforcement officers who have lost over the years. If you haven’t been down there, it is a powerful experience.

There were also beautiful memorials set up around those walls with wreaths, flowers, photographs, magazines, art, and any other information about officers whom we lost in the last year, including these two officers from Westerville, OH, who were...
tragically murdered last year while serving their community and all of us.

On February 10, 2018, Westerville Police Officers Anthony Morelli and Eric Joering were fatally shot while responding to a 911 call. Sadly, it was fatal. They had rushed to the scene. They were killed, shot under fire. Officer Morelli was killed at the scene. Officer Morelli died in surgery later that day.

I had the great honor of meeting the families of both of these fallen officers, the amazing women and amazing kids. Linda Morelli and Jami Joering are incredibly strong women and incredibly strong mothers. I was able to express condolences and gratitude from all Ohioans for their husbands’ service. The memorials I saw today were a moving tribute to those two police officers, two fallen officers who served their fellow Ohioans with honor. Soon their names will be inscribed on the police wall I talked about at the memorial. Their names will be inscribed there for the ages for all of us to see and so that we can all remember the ultimate sacrifice they and other officers have made for us.

We continue to hold up their families and the families of the fallen. We continue to hold them up in our prayers and to show our support and express our enduring gratitude.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

SUTHERLAND SPRINGS FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUTHERLAND SPRINGS FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this Sunday, I had the honor of attending some of the most courageous, faithful, and inspiring Texans whom I ever met for the grand opening and dedication of their new church.

These men and women are part of the congregation at the First Baptist Church of Sutherland Springs. For the vast majority of its 100-year history, this small church was adored by members of the community as a place of worship, but it didn’t get much attention on the national stage. On November 5, 2017, all of that changed when a deranged shooter opened fire on their Sunday service, killing 26 parishioners—adults, teenagers, children, and an unborn baby. The church became the site of the deadliest mass shooting in Texas history.

This violent attack rocked the entire small, tight-knit town to its core. Every home, every family, and every person felt the impact of the shooter’s actions, but what emerged wasn’t more of the hatred and anger displayed by the shooter. Instead, Sutherland Springs became a beacon of love and hope. The day of the attack I spoke with Wilson County Sheriff Joe Tackitt and offered my condolences and complete support. Sheriff Tackitt told me about the day’s events and said the bloody scene inside the First Baptist Church was horrific, but the response to the tragedy was instantaneously inspiring. We saw the surrounding area, as well as State and Federal law enforcement officials, inundated Sutherland Springs with resources and help.

In the days and weeks following the attack, the support continued. Folks from across the country made their way to this small town outside of San Antonio to pay their respects, leaving flowers outside the church, singing songs of worship, and extending a caring hand to those grieving. I joined the congregation 1 week after the shooting for their Sunday service, and it was an emotional experience, to be sure. I was there to offer what I could in terms of support and hope to the grieving community, but what happened was just the opposite. They were the ones giving me inspiration.

That day, as the associate pastor pointed out, the church smashed attendance records. It was remarkable to see not only the church community but also complete strangers embracing one another, offering a shoulder to cry on or a hand to hold.

There was perhaps no more moving occurrence than Pastor Frank Pomeroy. He and his wife lost their teenage daughter in the shooting.

One week after that occurred, he opened that service saying: “We have the freedom to choose, and rather than choose darkness like the young man did that day, we choose the light.”

Coming from a man who lost 26 beloved members of his congregation, including his own daughter, those words are tough to get your brain around. When offering for what I have no doubt was the toughest moment of his life, Pastor Pomeroy was comforting those of us in the audience and reminding us not to let evil triumph.

As more details about the shooter emerged, that message of hope was even more important to recall. We learned that the shooter had a long history of violence, and a number of red flags had been raised—school suspensions, a desire about wanting to kill his superiors, animal abuse, and violence toward those closest to him. He had choked his wife, fractured his stepson’s skull, and done time in military prison.

Under existing Federal laws, the shooter was prohibited from ever purchasing or possessing a firearm. It was illegal. So how did he get his hands on this weapon that he used to take 26 innocent lives?

Well, in short, it was because of a broken system. He was able to purchase four firearms because information about his criminal history was never uploaded into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, also known as NICS.

In the wake of the tragedy, you always wonder, how did this happen and, more importantly, what can we possibly do to prevent something like this from happening again? Well, in this instance, the answer is pretty clear. We have to fix the National Criminal Instant Background Check System so gun purchasers can’t lie and buy firearms that they are already legally disqualified from purchasing or possessing.

Eleven days after the shooting, it became clear to me how this system had broken down. The Air Force had simply failed to upload this information into the background check system so it wasn’t there when this shooter bought those guns. In response, I introduced the Fix NICS Act to reform the system and ensure that all Federal agencies accurately and correctly upload these required conviction records. This legislation also encourages States and local jurisdictions, to the extent possible under the Constitution, to do exactly the same. We can’t make them do it, but we can encourage them to do it and facilitate their doing so.

It has been estimated that some 7 million records, including at least 25 percent of felony convictions and a large number of convictions for misdemeanor domestic violence, are absent from NICS—7 million records, including 25 percent of felony convictions, and a large number of convictions for domestic violence were absent from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

How in the world can we expect that system to work to protect us and our communities if, in fact, the required information is not being uploaded? Each missing record is a unique opportunity for someone like the shooter at Sutherland Springs to slip through the cracks. So we knew what we had to do to change that.

I worked with my colleagues in the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, and encouraged them to support the Fix NICS Act. I was heartened and encouraged by the bipartisan support we got. This legislation passed with 77 Members of the Senate serving as cosponsors. When the President signed this bill into law, it marked a major achievement and step forward and delivered on the promise I made to myself following Pastor Pomeroy’s advice: focus on the light and not on the darkness.

I am grateful for the support of my colleagues who cosponsored and voted for this legislation, which has made our background check system stronger. It actually made it so it will work the way Congress originally intended when it created the National Instant Criminal Background Check System in the first place.

I have and will continue to work with the officials at the Department of Justice to ensure that this law is fully implemented as soon as possible.
I look forward to joining my friends at the First Baptist Church of Sutherland Springs this week to honor those they lost and to celebrate the grand opening of their new worship center and education building.

Tonight, I would like to extend my deepest condolences to the families of those lost and to the community that continues to grieve. They have my full support, and I vow to do everything in my power to prevent this type of senseless violence from becoming too common. No family, no congregation, no community should ever lose a loved one because of an entirely preventable crime. I hope because of this legislation, they never will.

I will just say, in conclusion on this topic, what consolation, what comfort can you give to someone grieving the loss of a loved one? I can only think of one thing: that as a result of their loss and their sacrifice, some good will come. I can only hope that the tragedy will reconcile your grief and your loss is knowing that out of your loss, something good will come out of it. I can genuinely say that as a result of the loss of these 26 parishioners at the First Baptist Church of Sutherland Springs, we will save lives in the future. There will be lives saved and lives lived as a result of their sacrifice and what we have done working together to try to prevent those types of acts of senseless, preventable violence from occurring in the future.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, throughout our country’s history, we welcomed men and women and children from other countries who are inspired by the freedoms and the prosperity made possible by our Constitution and by our democracy. Whether those immigrants crossed oceans generations ago or were more recently naturalized, we are glad they chose to bring their dreams and talents to the United States because, after all, is a proud nation of immigrants. I believe the contributions of those who have chosen to seek citizenship in our country have made us stronger, smarter, and the preeminent ship in our country have made us.

I also am proud of the fact that these immigrants, and I am proud of that fact. I believe the contributions of those who have chosen to seek citizenship and I am glad he and his administration have made this a priority. I look forward to reviewing the final text of the proposal once it is available.

For those who would criticize the proposal made by the Trump administration, I believe it is incumbent on them to say what they would do to fix our broken immigration system, to improve our immigration system, so we can continue to welcome immigrants from around the world who want to make America their home and truly become Americans.

I continue to be hopeful that we can work our way through this. I am glad the President is making this a priority, and I look forward to hearing more about the details of his plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENTIAL OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, some time ago, specifically February 28, I came to the Senate to visit with my colleagues about the more than two dozen tax provisions that expired at the end of 2017. That same day, I joined with Finance Committee Ranking Member Wyden of Oregon to introduce a bill entitled “Tax Extender Disaster Relief Act of 2019” to extend these two dozen tax provisions through 2019.

I very much thank Ranking Member Wyden for his cooperation on this effort. Actually, we have a lot of cooperation on a lot of different subjects within the Finance Committee.

Now, unfortunately, we are still waiting on House Democrats to send us a tax bill that includes those provisions so taxpayers who have relied on them can finish their 2018 tax returns. I have had some discussions with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and I don’t have any reason to believe he doesn’t believe some of these extenders should be extended. I suppose because they are new to run the House of Representatives, and they have assent within their own caucus, it is a group of people pushing for this particular legislation, but it ought to be easy to happen because these tax provisions have traditionally been extended every 2 or 3 years over the last 20 years—maybe longer than that in some cases.

I remind my colleagues in the House of Representatives that taxpayers have all but run out of time. Part of my purpose today is to introduce the Senator from Oregon and Disaster Relief Act way back in February was to provide additional certainty for the current year for those businesses that have made use of these tax credits in the past.

In recent years, Congress enacted those provisions to provide an incentive for taxpayers to engage in certain actions like investment and job creation.

In February, I also reminded my colleagues that these incentives are most effective when taxpayers can rely on them during the tax year. For the most part, over the last three decades, they have had that certainty by the renewal of these tax provisions.

Today, we are now on one-third of the way through 2019 with no certainty for affected taxpayers in sight. I also said, in my February remarks, that my broader objective of including an extension through 2019 was so we could have some maneuvering room to examine the temporary provisions overall and try to identify longer term solutions. Through efforts in the last Congress, we identified potential long-term solutions for two of them—the short-line railroad tax credit and the biodiesel tax credit—but we have the opportunity now to do more.

While we continue to try to help taxpayers who still need to resolve their 2018 tax returns, we need to press ahead on more permanent solutions so we can end Congress’ continual bad habit of waiting until the eleventh hour or months after to extend temporary tax policy.

Accordingly, today, I am announcing, along with Ranking Member Wyden, that the Finance Committee will form several bipartisan task forces to examine the temporary tax policies. These task forces will consist of members of the Finance Committee and will focus on provisions that expired or will expire between December 31, 2017, and December 31 of this year. That is a total of 42 expiring tax provisions.

Each task force will be charged with examining temporary tax policies within one of five identified issue areas: workforce and community development, health, taxes, energy, business cost recovery, and a combined group consisting of individual, excise taxes, and other temporary policies.

We will ask the task forces to work with the stakeholders, other Senate offices, and interested parties to consider the original purposes of the policies and whether the need for the provisions continues today. If so, we will ask the task force to identify possible solutions that would provide long-term certainty in these areas. That may mean the credit or deduction phases out over a period of years to provide an affected
industry a glide path to self-sufficiency. In other cases, it may mean the provision could be scaled back while still providing a sufficient benefit for the affected industry or taxpayers in exchange for long-term certainty. If there is little or no case for continuing the temporary policy, the task force should consider whether a continued short-term extension is sufficient to achieve the policy goals, whether a longer term extension is desirable to force a future Congress to reevaluate the provision down the road, or if permanency is warranted.

This is particularly relevant for the temporary tax policies relating to healthcare. For these, we will ask the task force to focus on whether the tax policies have been extended and for what duration. Of course, we will leave the evaluation of the underlying healthcare policy to the health experts.

In all, the task forces will work to identify reform proposals, like those identified for the short-term extension of the biodiesel tax credit and the biodiesel tax credit last year, so we can end the policy of having Congress always kick the can down the road each time, or, as is the case with 2018, an even worse policy of doing the kicking months after the year has ended.

If Congress is going to use temporary tax policy, taxpayers should be able to count on it for the intended period. Moreover, the intended policy should be clear so that taxpayers do not fall into the trap of relying on a provision simply because Congress has created the expectation that the provisions will be consistently extended even well after the fact.

Taxpayers who have been relying on these provisions have been doing what Congress has wanted them to do. That happens to be free-market investing in certain types of property, hiring new employees, or taking other types of action. We shouldn’t punish them for doing what Congress intended with these tax provisions.

Additionally, we will have a sixth task force to examine the related issue of temporary disaster tax relief. It will consider whether a taxpayer should have a core set of permanent proposals so taxpayers who have suffered through devastating disasters—like with the floods, most recently, in my home State of Iowa—don’t have to wait for Congress to act before they can start rebuilding their lives, their small businesses, or their farms.

We have asked the task forces to begin their work right away, and we expect them to complete their efforts by the end of June. This should provide adequate time to identify possible long-term solutions that could be enacted this year to end the annual extension drama and provide certainty to the taxpayers who utilize those provisions.

We will continue to work with the House of Representatives to resolve the situation with respect to the 2018 temporary policies and to provide relief for all of those affected by the disasters of 2018 and so far this year, but we shouldn’t wait any longer to start laying the groundwork to deal with all of these temporary tax policies as permanently as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. President, I come to the floor to honor the integrity, dignity, and bravery of the Federal, State, local, and Tribal police officers throughout our country who keep us safe every day. As officers from around the Nation gather here in Washington, DC, to honor their fallen brothers and sisters and to add their names to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, I take a moment to thank the officers for their service and to pay our tribute to those who have died in the line of duty.

In 2018, 159 officers nationwide were killed in the line of duty, and already this year, 41 officers throughout the United States have made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our communities and protect our loved ones. Two of these officers came from my home State of Washington.

Cowlitz County deputy sheriff Justin DeRoisier served the people of Washington for 7 years—3 in Cowlitz County and 3 in Whitman County. He was a graduate of Kelso High School and of Washington State University. He loved going to work every day to serve and protect the people of Cowlitz County.

My thoughts and the thoughts and prayers of all Washingtonians are with his wife, Katie, his new daughter, his entire family, and the entire Cowlitz County law enforcement community.

Kittitas County sheriff’s deputy Ryan McCartney from Pierce County served the people of Washington for 12 years. He was born in Walla Walla and graduated from Central Washington University. Whether it be with Kittitas County or in the police ranks of Central Washington University, he served his community with honor.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, his three children, his entire family, and the Kittitas County Sheriff’s Department as they work through this unbelievable tragedy.

Since 2017, four other officers from Washington State have also lost their lives in the line of duty: Diego Moreno from Kent, deputy sheriff Daniel McCartney from Pierce County, detective Derrick Focht from Kent, and chief of police Randall Scott Gibson from Kalama.

All of these men deserve a great deal of respect and gratitude for their service and for their sacrifice. All of the men and women of our enforcement deserve our respect and gratitude for their commitment and dedication to our country and for embodying the best of our Nation.

I have seen so many of the men and women of law enforcement who have come here to DC this week to participate in this memorial. It is right that we give them recognition, and it is right that we remember the sacrifice law enforcement officers make every single day on our behalf.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rosen nomination?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
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Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 0.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.
EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Mr. CarPER. Mr. President, years before President Trump moved to the White House, even before President Obama and his family lived there, our Nation had odds with an isolated country ruled by a repressive leader. It wasn’t long before it became clear to the United Nations and to our country’s own intelligence community that the country I am speaking of was enriching uranium for the purpose of obtaining a nuclear weapon, threatening to destabilize a region of great strategic importance.

As the world was winding down from a cold war, tensions between the United States and this country we were heating up. An administration that some would call naïve recently attempted to deescalate tensions, taking an unprecedented step to hold out an olive branch to an unpredictable regime in hopes of reaching a momentous agreement that would have continued to enrich uranium. Surprisingly, that President trusted and was willing to give unprecedented concessions, all without any reliable mechanism to verify whether the nuclear enrichment had indeed ended.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
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In August 1964, then-President Lyndon Johnson announced that the North Vietnamese had engaged the U.S. Navy in the Gulf of Tonkin, and he asked Congress to pass a resolution supporting retaliatory attacks. The following day, after he received his request, "The United States intends to respond with increased vigor, regardless of what happens."

Those were his words in August 1964.

His administration went on to justify a bloody, almost-decades-long war after that on the basis of that document—55,000 deaths, my shipmates, my fellow marines, our soldiers, our airmen—55,000—dead.

We had a similar situation in Iraq. It did not involve the Gulf of Tonkin. It did not involve ships. It really didn't involve the Vietnamese. But there were allegations and assertions that the Iraqis were developing weapons of mass destruction. The President, the Vice President—in that case, Bush and Cheney—the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State all asserted that the Iraqis were developing weapons of mass destruction and called on this Congress to give the President the power to respond appropriately.

There are 55,000 names on the Vietnam Memorial. There is no wall for the 4,100 men and women who died in Iraq after Congress provided President Bush the authority to respond to the alleged, perceived threat of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. While there is no wall on which to write those 4,100 names, those names are written in graveyards in every State in this country—4,100, men, women, some young and some old, who laid down their lives on what was really based on a lie—weapons of mass destruction.

I want to say that lie was chiefly perpetrated, if I am not mistaken, by a fellow named John Bolton and that administration.

Fast forward to today. We have seen this movie before. Thanks to John Bolton's rash actions in the Mideast, I can see it happening again.

I don't want to see it happen again. I have been to too many funerals of people, servicemembers from Delaware, who died in Iraq. I don't want to go to any more. I don't want to have to visit any more spouses, children, parents, brothers, and sisters, as we have done in recent years with families who have been crushed by sorrow flowing from our engagement in Iraq.

John Bolton is agitated for war with Iran for over a decade. He even wrote an op-ed about it. The op-ed was entitled: "To Stop Iran's Bomb, Bomb Iran."

Under Mr. Bolton's leadership, the Trump administration's Iran policy is becoming ever more dangerous and ever more isolated from our traditional allies. This strategy could very well plunge us into another foreign war, if not over.

This needless escalation is no way to conduct our foreign policy or to safeguard our national security. What is more, the administration's actions with respect to Iran haven't just increased the odds of an armed conflict. They have also damaged the credibility of our country around the world. If the United States cannot be trusted to uphold our commitments to those with whom we negotiate, there is little reason for any of our allies, let alone nuclear-armed ones like North Korea, would be willing to negotiate with us in good faith.

Now, there is another option here. Yesterday former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations in New York City—not the Ambassador to the United States but the Ambassador to the United Nations, a fellow name Javad Zarif. It turned out that when I met him, I was impressed with how well-spoken he was. It turns out he had gone to undergraduate school at San Francisco State, I believe, in California. He is a really smart guy. He is not only well spoken but knew a lot about America and spoke English as well as any of us in the room. He went to graduate school in Denver, CO, and he ended up here as the Iranian ambassador to the United Nations.

Later, in Ahmadinejaz left office—Ahmadinejaz was a bad guy, a really bad President of Iran before Ruhani—Ahmadinejaz sent Zarif back home, got him out of the United States, got him back to Iran, and he sort of disappeared until the new elections. Ruhani emerged as the more moderate—kind of a Gorbachev-type guy, really—leader in Iran and said: Zarif, I would like you to be my foreign minister. That is like being their Secretary of State, a position that he still holds.

Not long ago, about a couple of weeks ago, in that I suggested that we do a prisoner swap. We hold a number of people of Iranian descent who are in this country. They hold about a half dozen or so of our folks, I think mostly with dual citizenship, in their country. Foreign Minister Zarif said: Why don't we just do a straight-out prisoner swap?

That would actually be a good start to maybe tamping down the rhetoric and to see if we can't find common ground with Iran. I agree.

During the 8 years of previous administrations, our foreign policy was designed to strengthen the standing of the moderates in Iran and to under-

mine the power of the hard-liners in that country. Actually, it worked—not perfectly, but it worked. The elections that they conducted a couple of years ago—6 years ago—reflect that.

Sadly, this administration—I can't believe they did it intentionally, but their policy in the Middle East has just 2 years or a little over 2 years—what they have done is to undermine the effectiveness and the standing of the moderates in Iran, and they have rallied support of Iran around the extremists and around the hard-liners. It is just the opposite of what was done in the last administration.

We have to be smarter than that. We have to be smarter than this. When I think about the contrast between the Trump administration's actions in North Korea and Iran, I can't help but wonder why there is such a stark contrast? I would not trust the leader of North Korea any further than I could throw him, and for this President to want to embrace this guy and to trust him in ways that befuddle me—and, I think, a lot of other folks, including folks in his party—is beyond me.

But why has this administration been so determined to abrogate a careen—that drafted deal that keeps Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon? Why will President Trump not work to ensure the freedom of Americans held in Iran? Well, part of the answer is provided by Thomas Friedman, a highly regarded columnist whose column appears from time to time in national newspapers.

Tom Friedman wrote, a year or so ago, something called the "Trump Doctrine." I think it provides an answer to the question: Why has President Trump been so determined to get us out of the JCPOA and to embrace a leader like the one we have over in North Korea?

The "Trump Doctrine" from Tom Friedman goes something like this. He said: "Obama built it, I broke it"—"I," being Trump—"you"—including us here in this body—"fix it." That is it. "Obama built it. I"—Donald Trump—"broke it—you"—the rest of us—"fix it."

I think my colleagues would agree that it would be a travesty if the President's determination to destroy President Obama's achievement—an achievement shared by others in this chamber among other places, Britain, France, and Germany—but our President's determination to destroy Barack Obama's achievement, the achievements of his administration—in this case, the Iran nuclear deal—led us into another endless war in the Middle East. I urge President Trump, as he has done in the case of North Korea, to engage in diplomacy and ratchet down tensions with Iran, rather than engaging in needless provocation.
George W. Bush, in the same breath he talks about how he got us into a war that cost us thousands of lives and has cost literally tens of billions of dollars—the Iraq war. So that would suggest to me that the idea of drawing more troops and a whole lot more money into a war with Iran has to be something you do with care.

So on this 1-year anniversary of the Trump administration's pulling out of the Iran deal—I think, foolishly doing so—I would urge the President and his advisers to think carefully about what outcomes we really seek as a country. We should be prioritizing diplomacy at this time, not escalating tensions and risking war with American lives with no coherent strategy. It is my hope that cooler heads will prevail. It is also in America’s best interest that they do.

John Kennedy said a lot of things that are memorable, and one of my favorites is this: “Never negotiate out of fear, but never be afraid to negotiate.” I think we would be wise to remember those words with respect to Iran.

The last thing I would say to the President, who is former military, is that I finish speaking, you are going to be succeeded by a Marine colonel who serves here from Alaska. We know people we serve with people who have given their lives up in combat in wars far away around the world.

We have three marines, one of whom is from Delaware. The Dover Air Force Base may be the best airlift base in the world. There are 5,000 or 6,000 people who work there, mostly uniformed, and big planes, C-5s and C-17s. Maybe it is the best airlift base in the world.

Dover Air Force Base is also home to a mortuary. A month ago, the bodies of three marines, one of whom is from Delaware, were brought back to this country. In this case, their vehicle in Afghanistan was blown up by a roadside bomb, and we lost three of them just like that. They are not the first, and, sadly, they will not be the last members of our Armed Services to come home.

For one of the marines, Christopher Slutman, his body came home to his wife Shannon and to their three daughters, ages 4, 8, and 10. I have seen this movie before. I have seen it at Dover Air Force Base with countless bodies that are brought home from overseas. What would you think about those kids every day, and I am sure my colleagues think about the men and the women from their States who have served, in some cases, with great courage and valor. But the idea that 55,000 of those colleagues of mine are serving in Vietnam in a war that was premised on a lie and 4,000 are buried in gravestones all over this country—we have to be smarter than that. We owe it to not just the families of those men and women who have died but to the others who serve today and their families.

“Never negotiate out of fear, but never be afraid to negotiate.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am down here on the floor to do what I typically do on Thursday, which is talk about a message that is very important to me. There is a big difference in my State, somebody I refer to as the Alaskan of the Week.

But, you know, this is the Senate and we have debates, and we are respectful in our debates, and there is no one in the Senate I respect more than my friend from Delaware, Senator CARPER—his service in Vietnam and as a captain in the Navy. When he speaks, I listen, and I have respect. But I actually thought, very briefly—it wasn’t what I was planning on doing, but I was just listening to someone I respect—I thought I would offer a bit of a counter view for those watching in the Gallery or on TV on what he just talked about.

It is a really important issue, but I just happen to disagree with most—not everything, but most—of what my colleague just mentioned. So I am just going to touch on that before I talk about an Alaskan who is doing great work.

Just listened to my colleague talk about President Trump’s turning his back on Iran, the sanctions that we placed on Iran, which we all voted for here in the Senate, are antagonizing Iran. Foreign Minister Zarif is a moderate. Well, let me just touch on that. I think there is this new narrative that is starting to come out from my colleagues, and, again, I have a lot of respect for my good friend from Delaware, but about this kind of blame America first, blame Trump, as if the generals and admirals weren’t advising him, and that Iran is some kind of this new innocent moderate that we are turning our back on and we are sanctioning them and antagonizing them. With all due respect to my colleague on the Senate floor, that isn’t true. That isn’t true. Iran is innocent at all. Iran is the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world and has been for decades. As for the JCPOA, which my colleague is lamenting, I read that, I certainly dug into that. I have been involved in our broader Iran isolation policy for many years. That was the first major foreign policy national security agreement in U.S. history that had bipartisan support from allies and a bipartisan majority of House Members who were against it—against it, not for it. That did not have support in this body—certainly not in the Senate, not in the House, and not from the American people.

So as for the myth that somehow this was this great agreement, it wasn’t. It was a giveaway—billions to the largest state sponsor of terrorism, where in 10 years they are free to go develop nuclear weapons. This was not a good idea, and this body said so. A bipartisan majority in the House and the Senate disagreed with President Obama. A partisan minority in the House and Senate, for the first time in U.S. history, on a national security agreement of this magnitude, somehow passed it.

So there is this myth that this was supported by Congress. It wasn’t. Democrats and Republicans opposed it. It was the majority in both Houses. And by the American people, it certainly wasn’t.

Remember, this is the country that, after the deal and during the deal, continued to say we want Israel off the map. They continue to say that.

Here is the final thing. In my 4 years in the Senate, I have only heard one other U.S. Senator—Senator Corrnx from Arkansas—even talk about this issue.

Starting in 2004, 2005, I was a staff officer, as a marine, to the commander of U.S. Central Command, and there was top-secret information that started to show in the region—and we were out there a lot, the Middle East—that the Iranians were supplying the Iraqi Shia militia with very sophisticated improved explosive devices that were killing American soldiers and American marines and our sailors. The Iranians, of course, denied it. They were lying.

It all came out to be true. These were infrared triwires, explosively formed projectiles that could punch through tiles, concrete, and armored vehicles—and if you were an American soldier and you got hit by one of these, you were pretty much dead.

I asked the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in an open Armed Services Committee hearing how many American military members were killed by these Iranian IEDs, and over 2,000 was his answer—2,000. I have never heard any of my colleagues talk about that.

So the notion that Foreign Minister Zarif was a moderate when he was negotiating with Secretary Kerry is belied by the facts. This Foreign minister literally had the blood of American soldiers on his hands.

So I take these issues very seriously, like my colleague from Delaware does.

There is this notion that our allies were all for the JCPOA. They weren’t. Some of our most important allies—Israel, the Gulf Arab States, which we provide, solders and our marines and our sailors to reinforce our military presence in the region because they see threats.

So this notion that we are going to blame the administration—by the way, we keep talking about President Trump. He is getting advice from sea-trolling generals, Abrams tanks, to drub up a war. What about the generals? What about General Dunford, a very well respected marine and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs? Are they doing this?
I just came from reading some of the intel in the SCIF that is prompting this discussion. Of course, I can’t talk about it, but I support what the administration is doing with regard to reinforcing our military capabilities in the region, and this is the reason: It sends a message to whoever it is that is going to try to do what they did in 2004, 2005, and 2006, which is kill and wound thousands of our military members, we are going to have the capability to make them pay.

I do not like seeing anyone coming through Dover Air Force Base, either, but over 2,000 of our troops were killed and wounded by these leaders of the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. The notion that somehow they are some kind of innocent, country that we are antagonizing or “turning our back on” is not accurate. So watch out for the new narrative that the Iranians are the innocents and that somehow we are being provocative. What is provocative is killing our troops, which they have a long history of doing—in Lebanon, the marines—and we need to send a signal that if they are going to look at doing this again or trying to or trying to kill our diplomats, it is not going to be this time.

I support what is happening there, and I hope my colleagues will.

We are going to get a briefing by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the CIA next week on this, and I will talk about that if they are going to start to make this narrative that Iran is the innocent and somehow the Trump guys—John Bolton, for example—are some kind of evil people—come on. Come on, really? The largest state sponsor of terrorism, responsible for killing and maiming and wounding thousands of American soldiers, the best and the brightest in our country, and we are the bad guys? I don’t think so.

So watch out for that narrative. I certainly hope it is not going to be something my colleagues on the other side of the aisle start getting out there. It is already in the media. You have the former negotiator for President Obama making these statements that, somehow, poor Iran; all bad America. I am not a big “blame America first” member, and I think we need to be really careful when we talk about trying to demonize our generals, admirals, and national security advisers and make the Iranians look like they are some kind of innocents when they are not.

I wish more of my colleagues would talk about the number of dead military members killed and wounded by the Quds Force in Iran, because they never do. No one here ever talks about it. Amnesia.

(As upon, Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

TRIBUTE TO ANGIE FRAIZE

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, it is Thursday afternoon, and it is the time I get to talk about an Alaskan who has given of themselves in order to make my State the great place that it is. We call this person the Alaskan of the Week.

I like to come down to the floor—and I am not going to take a poll, but I think it is the pages’ favorite speech of the week—because I get to talk about Alaska and somebody who has really made a difference for the community, the State, or maybe even the country. I like to talk about what is going on in Alaska because I love to encourage people to come and visit our great State.

Right now, what is going on in Alaska? Well, sunset time is approaching midnight in many places across the State. In Anchorage, the Sun officially rose at 5:06 a.m. and will set at 10:42 p.m., but twilight starts at 4 a.m. and ends at midnight. So the Midnight Sun is burning bright all across Alaska. In the summer, we are hit with this frenetic, beautiful, beautiful Midnight Sun in the sky. You will find many of us up late playing softball, doing yard work, fishing, painting houses, talking to our neighbors. So it is a great time to be in Alaska. I urge everybody here in the Gallery to come on up.

The Presiding Officer also has a great State to visit, the State of Florida. So go down to Florida, and then you can take the 4,000-mile trip to Alaska. You will have a great time. Make your travel plans now.

As you know, what makes my State or your State truly great is not the hours of Sun it gets—and the Presiding Officer’s State does get a lot of Sun too—or its glorious mountains or sparkling seas, all of which we have in Alaska in spades; it is the people who help build strong families, strong communities, strong cities, and a strong State.

The person I want to honor today is Anchorage Police Officer Angie Fraize, our Alaskan of the Week.

I think it is very appropriate that we are celebrating our police forces across the country, all across America. There were many thousands in DC this week because they are a force for good in our communities who often go unappreciated.

I got to speak last Friday at the Anchorage police memorial ceremony, and I was very moved, and I gave a speech. We have a big memorial there of all the first responders and law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty in Alaska over the last 100-plus years.

As I mentioned, all jobs are important, no doubt about it, but there is something special, something noble, and something even sacred, I would say, about a job that entails protecting others and putting your life on the line to keep your fellow citizens safe.

This week, I thought it was fitting to honor Anchorage Police Officer Fraize. She is one of more than 400 sworn police officers, brave men and women who keep the 300,000 residents of Anchorage, AK—my hometown—safe. Let me tell you a little bit about Officer Fraize, what makes her so special, and why my friend and fellow marine, Anchorage Police Chief Justin Doll, recommended her.

Officer Fraize was raised in Butte, in Palmer, on 12 acres of land. She did not have an easy childhood. She grew up in a house with no running water and no electricity. Her father was an alcoholic who died in a motorcycle accident when just 12 years old, so her mom raised her and her brother by herself. Her mom was a tenacious, hard-working mother—a characteristic she clearly passed on to her daughter. She worked her way through college with her two young children to support and at the age of 40 got her degree in education from the University of Alaska in Anchorage.

This is Officer Fraize’s mom. You see where she gets her good genes. It was tight. They often had to shower at the university. Their car was always breaking down. They were always struggling to make it, but they always did make ends meet—a family struggling and but making it.

None of that dimmed Officer Fraize’s dream of catching the bad guys—a dream she had since seventh grade. She graduated with honors from high school and was able to attend the University of Washington when she was only 16 years old—very smart. Her first job out of college was as a residential youth counselor working with adolescent sex offenders who had mental health issues. So right away, she was in the law enforcement area.

When her husband was offered a job with the Anchorage PD, she decided at that time that she, too, wanted to be a police officer.

Officer Fraize has had various duties in the years she has worked as an Anchorage police officer. She has been a police officer, a coordinator for the academy, and now she is a recruiter particularly focused on recruiting young women and spreading the word about how great APD is. So if you want an adventure and you want to come to Alaska and you like law enforcement, give her a call.

All the jobs Officer Fraize has had require empathy. She said her life experiences, being a chronic alcoholic, she said, don’t wake up every day choosing to drink. People who act badly don’t wake up wanting to be bad people. The trick, she said, is to listen to people, to find a connection, and to see the humanity in each individual person.

She is also incredibly passionate about connecting police officers with the people they protect, so she chairs a group called Anchorage Cops for Community, where the police officers interact with the public in positive ways at coffee shops, community council meetings, and public events throughout Anchorage. This gives the community a
chance to interact with officers in a positive way. It also gives police officers a chance to get their fresh perspectives from community members.

On Tuesday, for instance, the cops and firefighters got together for an eating relay at a local barbecue restaurant in Anchorage. Members of the community came out to cheer their favorite police officer and firefighter. The proceeds went to Special Olympics Alaska, which is another passion of hers.

Officer Fraize is a great champion of advocating for those with special needs. She and her husband have two daughters: Italia, who is 14 years old, and Gianna, who is 10. Gianna has Down syndrome and, according to Officer Fraize, is the most popular girl in her fourth grade class. That is no surprise.

Officer Fraize is the chair of a local group that advocates for individuals with special needs, and she is also involved in Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, which is a great event that so many in our community get behind. She was one of 50 police officers in America chosen to carry the torch at the 2019 Special Olympics World Summer Games in Abu Dhabi. She brought the torch home to Alaska, and she is giving it to Special Olympics in Alaska this weekend at the 2019 Alaska Law Enforcement Torch Run and Pledge Drive. This is going to be a great event.

Anchorage Police Chief Justin Doll said:

We are so proud of Officer Fraize’s work at the APD, and I believe the rest of Anchorage should be as well. She is the epitome of the public servant ideal that is the foundation of our relationship with the Anchorage community. I am genuinely honored to have her at APD upholding our most cherished traditions of community service.

That is the Anchorage police chief. We are also proud of all our police officers and first responders in Alaska. We are so grateful for the work they do to keep us safe. We want them to know that we honor their jobs and their commitment to our community. We also honor their families. These are very tough jobs, and it is hard on supportive families when a wife or husband goes off every morning to a job that could involve risking their lives.

We want them to know, not just in Alaska but here in the Senate, we have their backs.

To Officer Fraize, thanks for all that you do. We are so lucky to have officers like you in Alaska, looking out for us. Thank you for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am going to take this time to speak about Russia. But if I might, following up on the point by the Senator from Alaska, first, I want to applaud the police officer you are honoring this week.

This is National Police Week. I think it is very appropriate that we recognize those who are serving our country and our community as first responders. I want to mention two police officers specifically, both of whom gave their lives in defense of our community. These law enforcement officers were very young, and they went into danger rather than running away from danger. We lost two of our officers last year.

Amy Sorrelles Caprio from Baltimore County, my home jurisdiction, a member of the Baltimore County Police Department, died before reaching the age of 30, pursuing a burglary suspect who struck and killed her with the vehicle being operated by the suspect. She leaves behind a husband, parents, and sister. Our prayers are with her.

The second police officer I would like to honor is Mujahid Abdul Mumin Ramziddin, a 51-year-old police officer from Prince George’s County, MD, who was off duty at the time but he had been notified that his sister was being attacked by the perpetrator. He leaves behind a wife and four children, and our prayers are also with him.

Russia

Mr. President, I rise today to address the continuously abusive nature of the Russian Government in impeding on the human rights of its own people across the globe. From interference in democratic processes around the globe to its malign influence in Syria, to its continued aggression against Ukraine, Mr. Putin’s regime must be held accountable for its crimes.

As we all know, Vladimir Putin has been openly and willfully attacking democratic institutions and processes to corrode good governance and our values. His latest threat came from a Soviet-era playbook but are constantly being updated with improvements. He is a pusher—constantly pushing the limits of acceptable international behavior and then going over the line. We cannot overlook the phenomenon that is unfolding across the European continent, the wider region, and now, yes, here in our Western Hemisphere.

Just a few weeks ago, Special Counsel Robert Mueller released to the public a redacted version of his report on the Russia’s interference in our 2016 Presidential election, revealing another one of Mr. Putin’s plots to interfere with and tarnish the democratic process of a strong nation. Special Counsel Mueller described the Russian effort as taking the form of “sweeping and systematic fashion,” a premeditated attack by the Kremlin.

Russia’s aggression on the international stage continues to grow and is deserving of global condemnation. The United States is just one of many nations targeted by the Putin regime whose democracy was and is systematically targeted and attacked.

It certainly was not the first nation to be targeted. Reflect back to its illegal invasion of Ukraine and subsequent annexation of Crimea. Look at Russia’s role in the ongoing hostilities in Eastern Europe. Consider Mr. Putin’s role in Syria’s civil war and support for dictator Bashar al-Assad. He ordered hundreds of thousands of citizens and assisted in the collapse the country’s infrastructure. Russia has shown us time and again its disdain for international laws and norms under Mr. Putin’s leadership.

After the trêflect of Russian interference in Ukraine, Syria, and our democratic Presidential election here, I partnered with nine bipartisan colleagues within the first week of the 115th Congress in January of 2017 to introduce the Countering Russian Hostilities Act. It is comprehensive sanctions legislation on Russia in response to its cyber intrusion, aggression, and destabilizing activities in the United States, Ukraine, Syria, and Worldwide. Over time, we learned that Mr. Putin’s increasing aggressive behavior abroad is directly related to his need to maintain power at home.

In January of 2018, I released a Foreign Relations Committee Democratic member report that documented Mr. Putin’s pattern of asymmetric warfare against democratic institutions, universal values, and the rule of law in Russia and across Europe over the last 20 years. The report details the tools the Russian Government has repeatedly deployed and perfected, as well as its techniques to attack democracies both internally and abroad.

Among many other takeaways, we learned that Mr. Putin will continue to simultaneously step up his attacks on democracies around the world while also acting to maintain power in Russia.

We have also learned that it is ultimately the Russian people who bear the brunt of Mr. Putin’s international decisions. We have an obligation to support human rights around the globe, both as individuals and as a nation. Part of that obligation is ensuring that violators of international human rights are held accountable for their actions and are not given the resources they need to continue their nefarious actions.

In an effort to address these obligations, it is fortunate to work closely with the late Senator from Arizona, John McCain, on the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012. As you may know, Sergei Magnitsky was a Moscow-based lawyer who bravely uncovered deep-rooted, high-level corruption in Russia over a decade ago. Like any good lawyer, he reported his discoveries to the authorities. For doing his job, he was arrested, jailed, tortured, and killed in prison. When I learned about Sergei’s life and work, I was shocked.

This is National Police Week. I think it is very appropriate that we recognize those who are serving our country and our community as first responders. I want to mention two police officers specifically, both of whom gave their lives in defense of our community. These law enforcement officers were very young, and they went into danger rather than running away from danger. We lost two of our officers last year.

Amy Sorrelles Caprio from Baltimore County, my home jurisdiction, a member of the Baltimore County Police Department, died before reaching the age of 30, pursuing a burglary suspect who struck and killed her with the vehicle being operated by the suspect. She leaves behind a husband, parents, and sister. Our prayers are with her.

The second police officer I would like to honor is Mujahid Abdul Mumin Ramziddin, a 51-year-old police officer from Prince George’s County, MD, who was off duty at the time but he had been notified that his sister was being attacked by the perpetrator. He leaves behind a wife and four children, and our prayers are also with him.

Russia

Mr. President, I rise today to address the continuously abusive nature of the Russian Government in impeding on the human rights of its own people across the globe. From interference in democratic processes around the globe to its malign influence in Syria, to its continued aggression against Ukraine, Mr. Putin’s regime must be held accountable for its crimes.

As we all know, Vladimir Putin has been openly and willfully attacking democratic institutions and processes to corrode good governance and our values. His latest threat came from a Soviet-era playbook but are constantly being updated with improvements. He is a pusher—constantly pushing the limits of acceptable international behavior and then going over the line. We cannot overlook the phenomenon that is unfolding across the European continent, the wider region, and now, yes, here in our Western Hemisphere.

Just a few weeks ago, Special Counsel Robert Mueller released to the public a redacted version of his report on the Russia’s interference in our 2016 Presidential election, revealing another one of Mr. Putin’s plots to interfere with and tarnish the democratic process of a strong nation. Special Counsel Mueller described the Russian effort as taking the form of “sweeping and systematic fashion,” a premeditated attack by the Kremlin.

Russia’s aggression on the international stage continues to grow and is deserving of global condemnation. The United States is just one of many nations targeted by the Putin regime whose democracy was and is systematically targeted and attacked.

It certainly was not the first nation to be targeted. Reflect back to its illegal invasion of Ukraine and subsequent annexation of Crimea. Look at Russia’s role in the ongoing hostilities in Eastern Europe. Consider Mr. Putin’s role in Syria’s civil war and support for dictator Bashar al-Assad. He ordered hundreds of thousands of citizens and assisted in the collapse the country’s infrastructure. Russia has shown us time and again its disdain for international laws and norms under Mr. Putin’s leadership.

After the trêflect of Russian interference in Ukraine, Syria, and our democratic Presidential election here, I partnered with nine bipartisan colleagues within the first week of the 115th Congress in January of 2017 to introduce the Countering Russian Hostilities Act. It is comprehensive sanctions legislation on Russia in response to its cyber intrusion, aggression, and destabilizing activities in the United States, Ukraine, Syria, and Worldwide. Over time, we learned that Mr. Putin’s increasing aggressive behavior abroad is directly related to his need to maintain power at home.

In January of 2018, I released a Foreign Relations Committee Democratic member report that documented Mr. Putin’s pattern of asymmetric warfare against democratic institutions, universal values, and the rule of law in Russia and across Europe over the last 20 years. The report details the tools the Russian Government has repeatedly deployed and perfected, as well as its techniques to attack democracies both internally and abroad.

Among many other takeaways, we learned that Mr. Putin will continue to simultaneously step up his attacks on democracies around the world while also acting to maintain power in Russia.

We have also learned that it is ultimately the Russian people who bear the brunt of Mr. Putin’s international decisions. We have an obligation to support human rights around the globe, both as individuals and as a nation. Part of that obligation is ensuring that violators of international human rights are held accountable for their actions and are not given the resources they need to continue their nefarious actions.

In an effort to address these obligations, it is fortunate to work closely with the late Senator from Arizona, John McCain, on the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012. As you may know, Sergei Magnitsky was a Moscow-based lawyer who bravely uncovered deep-rooted, high-level corruption in Russia over a decade ago. Like any good lawyer, he reported his discoveries to the authorities. For doing his job, he was arrested, jailed, tortured, and killed in prison. When I learned about Sergei’s life and work, I was shocked.
Originally, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act provides that anyone involved in Sergei’s imprisonment, torture, or death who has not been brought to justice in Russia would be denied access to our financial system, the ability to travel to the United States. The bill also targets those who have abused their power in the country to violate the human rights of anyone in Russia who disagrees with Mr. Putin’s corrupt regime.

Senator McCain and I wanted to send a signal to Mr. Putin and his co-conspirators that there will be consequences for their actions and their inactions. The Sergei Magnitsky Act was, is, and will continue to be an effective tool at doing just that.

The United States must lead the world by using the power of our financial and legal institutions to hold human rights abusers and corrupt individuals across the globe accountable for their crimes. That is why we continued to work together to author the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which was signed into law in 2016. Senator McCain and I shared the critically important belief that the value of American leadership in enforcing human rights worldwide transcends party lines.

I might point out that following the U.S. example, other countries have enacted similar laws to make sure we have a blanket protection against those who commit these human rights violations.

In the past year, Global Magnitsky designations have targeted individuals around the world responsible for acts of genocide, violence, and significant corruption. My colleagues and I have called for numerous sanctions under the Magnitsky Act. Our administration has acted, particularly following the death of Mr. Putin’s ally, Vladimir Kara-Murza.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, dominant in the news—in the news—which I have expected there to be more coverage—is a matter that I think is of great urgency to the country, global security, and peace—that being the tensions that are rising in the Middle East.

I have seen a few of my colleagues speak on the floor about it today, and I have seen a lot of press report on it, some of it absurd and some of it on point. I understand some of it. I thought there should have been more information provided to all of the Members. I am pleased to see that more will be available next week when Secretary Pompeo testifies. This is an item I have been talking about for a number of years—I of the urgent threat, potentially, that now exists from Iran against the United States, particularly in Iraq but throughout the Persian Gulf region.

The point is that we have to understand that. To understand the threat, it is important to understand how Iran operates.

Iran is an Islamic republic, meaning it has a political branch of its government—a President, a Foreign Minister, and a parliamentary body. Then it has a Supreme Leader, who ultimately governs the country. In essence, his commands overrule the political branches. That is why they call him the Supreme Leader. He is a religious figure. As part of that, it has an armed services—an army, a navy, and an air force—and that that protects the country, theoretically. Then it has an armed forces that is independent of the army, the navy, and the air force, and that is the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC. It is all of it. It does not report to the President; it doesn’t answer to the Foreign Minister; and it doesn’t answer to regular army forces. It answers directly to the Supreme Leader. A lot of times, people don’t understand this. It’s in their law, and it’s how they operate.

The President of Iran is not the commander in chief, in reality, of the IRGC. It operates completely separately. By the way, that means that the IRGC—the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps—can oftentimes operate and do things that the Foreign Minister, who is the spokesperson for the Iranian Government, may not even know about. Sometimes it does. It may be that we have to understand that dynamic. It is not the United States. Our attributes should not be assigned to them.

The IRGC has an organization within it. It has a unit called the Quds Force. The Quds Force, led by General Soleimani, is made up of experts and has developed expertise in unconventional warfare and in intelligence activities, primarily abroad. This is the organization, for example, that helped to build all of the IEDs that killed and maimed American servicemen in Iraq.

The point is that we have to understand that. This organization behind the Shia militias in Iraq today. This is the organization behind the Shia militias in Iraq today. This is the organization behind the Shia militias in Iraq today.

The IRGC's Quds Force is designed to do things that have some level of deniability. The IRGC Quds Force has developed an ability, in the case of conflict with the United States—and we have known this now for the better part of a decade—to conduct attacks using proxies, meaning other groups, in order to escape and have some level of deniability. It will get some group that
it has stood up, that it has equipped, and that it has trained to attack us in retaliation for something America has done, but it can deny it. It can say: That wasn’t our army. That wasn’t our air force. That was this other group that is purely Iranian.

This is a capability we know it has built not just in the Middle East, by the way, but all over the world. We have been aware of it for a long time. It is not a secret to anyone, and it is a capability that it has increasingly perfected.

What has happened here very recently is there has been a persistent and clear stream of information—a clear indication—that has arrived to American policymakers that the IRGC, the Quds Force, and their proxies in the region pose a serious and potentially imminent threat to U.S. forces and U.S. civilians in Iraq and in the broader Middle East.

The President and the United States and the administration are confronted with this information. What is the wholly appropriate thing for them to do? The appropriate thing for them to do is to reposition military assets to the region. No. 1, to protect the Americans who are there in case they come under attack and, No. 2, to be in a position to retaliate.

The reason this is important is you hope to deter this sort of attack. What you are hoping to do is to show them that America has capabilities in the region so that if we are attacked by their proxies at the direction of the Quds Force, we are going to respond to that forcefully. Whatever you hope that will do, along with public messaging, is get into their heads and make them decide “We are not going to do this.” That is what has happened here, and it is wholly appropriate.

For a moment, I want you to imagine. If, in fact, an attack such as this occurred, the first question everybody would have is, Why didn’t we have military assets in the region to protect them? Why couldn’t we get them out? That is the first question everyone around here is going to ask.

What the administration has done to pre-position military assets in the region for this potential contingency is entirely appropriate. Also appropriate is the threat they are not going to start a war, but if we are attacked by Iran’s proxies, we are going to respond against those proxies, and we are going to hold Iran responsible. It is going to pay a price for this as well. Who could disagree with the notion that if we see attack we have a right to defend ourselves and respond? That is the only thing that is happening here.

I am pleased that in the last day, more Members of the Senate have been made privy to this stream of information that we can be concerned that the actions the administration has taken up to this point are not just wholly justified but are appropriate.

Yet I am concerned about some of the reactions I have seen with regard to this because I think they bode ill both for this case and for the future.

One of the first reactions I have seen is that this is not true, that they are not building it up, that there is no such intelligence and that it is being exaggerated. There are even some leakers—I don’t know who these people are—who are lying to media outlets about the contents of this intelligence because they have axes to grind. I think that is wholly inappropriate.

This is a capability we know it has, and that is the one I am concerned about. If it is true, we pay a price for this as well. Who could disagree with the notion that if we are attacked, we have a right to defend ourselves and respond? That is the only thing that is happening here.

I encourage all Senators to read this information or access it through their offices and have a briefing with the appropriate officials, to attend that as well, and I believe you will agree with me.

The second thing I am hearing is “Oh, this is just a path to war”—equating this to a war we had over a decade ago. This is nothing like that. That was an offensive operation. That was an invasion of another country. This is not posturing for a military attack; this is military posturing for that purpose of defensive operations. As I have said repeatedly, it is very straight-forward: If Iran attacks, there will be a war. If Iran does not attack, there will not be a war.

I think the most disappointing is some insinuation, including by Members of this body—publicly and privately—that somehow, we are going to provoke an attack; that elements of the American Government are going to go out and do something to get Iran to hit us, but we have an excuse to go to war. I don’t know how you prove a negative, but I find that to be wholly unsubstantiated and dangerous.

Let me tell you why this is problematic. What encourages Iran to believe it can get away with this is that it believes if one of these groups—one of the Shia militias in Iraq—attacks us, it is going to be able to say that it is “not us,” that it is some rogue group that did it. “Don’t hold us responsible for it.” So we don’t have an excuse to go to war. I don’t know how you prove a negative, but I find that to be wholly unsubstantiated and dangerous.

The second thing Iran thinks it can get away with is it is thinking it believes it can exploit our political divisions. I think Iran reads these newspapers and watches the news and realizes that some percentage of Americans and, certainly, a significant percentage of Americans in politics is going to, in some way, take Iran’s side on this. People who are in the Senate, I’ve provoked it—that is our fault, that we did something that made Iran mad, that we created the tensions that led to this—or that the intelligence was flawed or that it wasn’t Iran but one of these other groups.

By the way, the more of that Iran reads, the likelier it is to do this. That doesn’t mean I don’t believe we can have a legitimate debate. I support designating the IRGC as a terrorist organization. We can have a legitimate debate about whether that should have been done but not right now. Right now, Americans potentially stand in harm’s way, and they need the United States and our military efforts to defend and to protect them.

Here is what I know none of us can disagree with. I hope: No. 1, that if there is any serious indication that Americans anywhere are threatened, we must position ourselves to protect them, defend them, extract them, and retaliate if they are attacked. The second thing we should all be able to agree on is that if Americans come under attack, even if it is from a proxy force directed by a terrorist agent like the IRGC, not only must we defend against that attack, but we must punish it with swift retaliation. That should unite us on a matter of incredible importance.

I hope all of the misinformation will stop because this matter is too important with which to play political games.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, across America, there are 130 million individuals who have a preexisting condition. This means individuals have a diagnosis, an illness, a medical condition that without the Affordable Care Act would likely mean they were priced out of insurance because the costs associated with their illness are so high that no insurer would provide them coverage or the cost of insurance is much higher than those who don’t have that illness or that condition.

These preexisting conditions don’t discriminate. They affect Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, people who watch FOX News, people who watch MSNBC. This isn’t a partisan issue; preexisting conditions affect everybody.

In my State, give or take, 522,000 people have preexisting conditions, and I talk to them every time I go back to Connecticut. I remember 2 years ago when I was walking across the State—something I do every year. I take about a week in the summer, and I walk from one end of the State to the other—end there were families who would find out on social media where I was going to be walking that day and pre-position
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themselves hours ahead of time by the side of the road so they could tell me about their diagnosis. One young woman was sobbing on the side of the road in Meriden, CT, as she explained to me her lupus diagnosis and how, without the Affordable Care Act and the protections it provides her, she would not have insurance; she would not be able to afford the medications that keep her well and alive; and her life would be ruined. Those individuals are freaking out today because they have watched this President—and frankly this Republican Congress—use every power at their disposal, every tool in their toolkit to try to take away these protections for people who are sick, for people who, through no fault of their own, just have higher medical bills than the rest of us. They don’t feel like they should be discriminated against or forsaken by the health insurance marketplace because of their unfortunate diagnosis.

The latest assault on people with preexisting conditions comes through an effort by the administration to allow States to sell insurance plans that don’t cover basic medical needs, plans that are allowed to be as skimpy as the benefits to be sold out on the insurance marketplaces. Now, admittedly, that might be good news for pretty healthy people who don’t want to pay for a full insurance product because they think they don’t need it.

The first problem with that is you are only healthy until you are not healthy. The second bigger problem is, when all the healthy people go to these skimpy plans—sometimes called junk plans—and all the people with preexisting conditions get left behind on the regulated plans, where insurance is real, where it covers everything you need, costs go down for the healthy people, and they go through the roof for the sick people, which is the entire purpose of trying to solve 2009 and 2010. It is, in fact, the problem the Republicans say repeatedly out on the campaign trail and back in their districts and States that they want to solve too. I don’t know that I have met a Republican Senator who doesn’t say that they don’t think people with preexisting conditions should be discriminated against. Yet this rule the administration is proposing is going to allow States to do just that. It will allow for a “junk” insurance system, in which people with preexisting conditions are charged more and people without preexisting conditions are charged less.

My intention was to come down to the floor today and offer a unanimous consent request to get us on the road to solving this latest assault on people with preexisting conditions. Let me explain to you what my request was going to be. I understand there are Republican objections, and there is not the will today to actually make this request, so I will reserve the right to make that request until early next week.

Here is the substance of the request I was planning to make today. Last week, the House of Representatives passed a piece of legislation called the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act, and what this legislation would have done—and will do, if passed and signed by the President—is to prevent HHS from taking any action to implement the administration’s waivers for States to set up these junk plans, these skimpy plans.

This is because the intent of the Affordable Care Act, which is to allow flexibility for States—there is an ability under the Affordable Care Act for States to innovate and to be flexible, but the Affordable Care Act says you can’t do that in a way that harms consumers. You can’t do that in a way that provides less coverage to consumers.

The rule the Trump administration is proposing, in many of our minds, is a rewriting of the Affordable Care Act in and of itself, which is still the law of the land, but this piece of legislation would clarify that you cannot allow for the development and widespread sale of these junk insurance plans without dramatically harming the healthcare of the 130 million Americans who have preexisting conditions. So my intent was to ask for an unanimous consent request to bring this bill for a vote in the Senate. I will do that next week.

At some point, we have to act like we actually are the U.S. Senate. It is not enough to just say over and over again that you support people with preexisting conditions and then do nothing as the administration launches a daily, nonstop, unending, unceasing, relentless effort to destroy healthcare for people with preexisting conditions.

This is the latest assault on people with preexisting conditions, but it stands in a very long, ongoing line of actions by this administration, backed up by Republicans in the Congress, to try to reduce coverage and increase costs for people with preexisting conditions.

It started, of course, with the whole repeal effort, which would not have replaced the Affordable Care Act with anything meaningful. The bill that passed the House of Representatives would have stripped healthcare away from 30 million Americans. The tax bill that included a portion of healthcare repeal that was passed and signed by the President eliminates healthcare for 13 million Americans, and many of those who have preexisting conditions.

As we speak today, the administration is readying to go to court with a whole bunch of Republican attorneys general and the general Federal judicial system to overturn protections for people with preexisting conditions. So having failed to get the entirety of the bill repealed through the Congress, the administration now is going to court to try to get these protections for people with preexisting conditions repealed.

Once again, this Congress, this Senate is silent on that case. We have offered another piece of legislation to stop that lawsuit from going forward. We don’t have any takers on the Republican side. This assault is real. I didn’t make it up. It is not imagined. If this court case that the Trump administration is pushing succeeds, over the entirety of the Affordable Care Act will be invalidated, and there is no plan to replace it.

If these junk plans go into effect—listen, maybe I will be wrong. I hope I am wrong. Maybe there will not be a flight of healthy people to these skimpy plans, but much of the analyses I have seen suggests that will happen. If it does, there is just no way, other than for the cost to go up for everybody who is left behind on the regulated plans. I don’t know about you, but when I talk to my folks living paycheck to paycheck in Connecticut, they don’t have a lot of room in their budget for increased premiums for healthcare. They are maxed out as it is.

So I will stand down for now, but I will be back early next week to offer this unanimous consent request. I hope, if my colleagues turn it down, if they don’t want to bring up a piece of legislation that would stop this latest regulatory assault on the Affordable Care Act, that they will come to the table with other ideas as to how to protect people with preexisting conditions from this campaign of sabotage by the administration; that they will finally recognize that this assault on the Affordable Care Act in the court system is a really awful precedent to set.

It is going to come back and bite all of us as legislators if it is successful. Without any real hope of a replacement for the Affordable Care Act, it leads to a humanitarian disaster in which 20 million to 30 million people lose insurance because of it.

This is as important as it gets. There is very little that matters to people more than their health and their healthcare, and I hope possibly next week we can come together as a body and finally do something about the administration’s attempt to take away these protections for sick people and people with complicated diagnoses all across the country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

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

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

JOINT REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife, sent to the Senate by the
President on May 13, 2019, be referred jointly to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 189, 192, and 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nominations.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Jane L. Corwin, of New York, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada; Robert C. Sisson, of Michigan, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada; and Lance V. Yohe, of North Dakota, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the nominations be confirmed; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C. section 271(e):

To be rear admiral (Lower Half)

Capt. Brendan C. McPherson
Capt. Douglas M. Schofield
Capt. Andrew M. Sugimoto
Capt. Richard V. Timme
Capt. Todd C. Wiemers

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING SEYMOUR BRYSON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it didn’t seem historic at the time for Harvey Welch, but it was. Harvey, a native of Carbondale, IL, came to Southern Illinois University Carbondale on a basketball scholarship and became the first Black student at the university to letter in basketball in 1951. He achieved this 3 years before the Brown v. Board of Education decision found school segregation unconstitutional.

Harvey played basketball at SIU from 1951 to 1954. He also was the first Black student to complete the ROTC program at the university. When he finished college, he joined the U.S. Air Force and was one of the first three Black officers to be promoted to lieutenant colonel.
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Never forgetting SIU, Harvey came back to Carbondale after he retired from the Air Force in 1975. He became the first Black dean of student life at SIU and served as vice chancellor of student affairs from 1987 to 2000.

In addition to SIU, Harvey continued serving his community through the Carbondale Park District, Rotary International, and Southern Illinois Regional Social Services. His work earned him the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year Award in 2007.

SIU recognized with the Distinguished Service Award during commencement in 2018. For 22 years, students benefited not only from his leadership and wisdom, but from the Harvey and Trish Welch Scholarship Fund too.

Harvey helped define what it meant to be a Saluki. He loved hunting and golf, but his commitment to SIU and his family came first. Future generations of Salukis will continue to look up to Harvey’s legacy of service and dedication.

On May 4, Harvey passed away after an extraordinary life of service to his country and his community.

Harvey is survived by his four children and their spouses: Harvey Cato Welch and Anita, Gordon Patrick Welch and Retha, Karen Annette Welch Edwards and Terry, and Brian David Welch and Petrice. He leaves behind 11 grandchildren, 3 great-grandchildren, and numerous nieces and nephews.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes on May 13, May 14, and May 15 so I could return to Hawaii to tend to a family matter.

On May 13, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the cloture motion, motion to invoke cloture: Michael J. Truncale to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

On May 14, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the nomination, Confirmation of Michael J. Truncale to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

On May 15, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the nomination, Confirmation of Kenneth Kiyul Lee to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

On May 15, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the nomination, Confirmation of Kenneth Kiyul Lee to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, nay on the cloture motion, motion to invoke cloture: Wendy Vitter to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Motion to invoke cloture: Brian J. Bulatao to be an Under Secretary of State for Management, and nay on the cloture motion (motion to invoke cloture: Jeffrey A. Rosen to be Deputy Attorney General).

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

NOMINATION HOLD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am placing a hold on the nomination of David M. Satterfield, who has been nominated to serve as Ambassador to Turkey. My objection comes down to one increasingly irrefutable point: the State Department’s, through Ambassador Satterfield, consistent efforts to protect the Palestinian Authority and Palestine Liberation Organization from liability and thereby undermine the rights of American victims of Palestinian terrorism. This stands in sharp contrast to the intent of Congress.

Last year, I introduced the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act, ATCA, in response to recent court decisions that gutted the original reach of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1992, which I also authored. These decisions made it substantially more difficult for American victims to hold sponsors of international terrorism accountable in our nation’s courts.

The ATCA expressed a clear principle: If you accept taxpayer-backed assistance or maintain a presence in the United States, then you should be answerable in our courts if you are alleged to have supported terrorism that harmed or killed Americans.

The bipartisan bill was considered through regular order, with markups in both Chambers, as a standalone bill, passed Congress without objection, and was signed into law by President Trump in October. Never once did the State Department or the administration raise a single concern.

Yet, 2 months later, at the end of the 115th Congress, the State Department began directly lobbying Congress for a “fix” to the ATCA to remove certain forms of assistance from the statute, thereby allowing defendants like the Palestinian Authority to enjoy such benefits without risk of liability. Ambassador Satterfield led the State Department’s efforts to remove assistance to the Palestinian Authority, who benefited not only from its lead, but from the ATCA of the assistance that would have remained available to the Palestinian government. The bipartisan effort was made to provide support to the Palestinian Authority, who would then be able to provide support to the United States. His work in silencing any litigation arguments that would tangibly benefit victims. Rather, the Act of Extension of Visiting donated his concern about the law’s impact on the Palestinian Authority, who have been found liable in U.S. courts for supporting terrorist attacks against Americans.

I refuse to assist the State Department in silencing any litigation arguments of U.S. victims of terrorism.

I also understand that recent efforts in the House of Representatives have proved futile in finding language that both benefits American victims and gets support from the State Department. I am aware the Department putting the interests of alleged sponsors of terrorism over those of our own citizens. The State Department should work in good faith with Congress and victims by unambiguously demoting it, restoring jurisdiction over sponsors of terrorism.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, for over 50 years, our Nation has preserved an annual tradition of honoring the brave men and women of law enforcement who make the ultimate sacrifice. This act of remembrance dates back to President John F. Kennedy’s designation of a “Peace Officers Memorial Day” in 1962, which has evolved over the years to become National Police Week. Police Week now includes a weeklong celebration of our law enforcement officers and recognition for their sacrifices.

Tens of thousands from the law enforcement community have descended upon Washington this week, as they gather near the National Law Enforcement Memorial to remember their colleagues and their families. The memorial was dedicated in 1991 to honor our local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. The long gray walls are curved in a way that makes them appear to go on forever. Over 21,000 names are permanently inscribed into the marble walls as a reminder of the cost of maintaining a free, safe, and civil society.

On Wednesday, the 38th Annual National Peace Officers’ Memorial Service was held right outside on the West Front of the Capitol. During this solemn ceremony, the names of 228 brave men and women were read in honor of their priceless contribution to their fellow citizens.

Among those being remembered this week is one from my home State of South Carolina. Sergeant Terrence Carraway of the Florence Police Department, Detective Micheal Doty of...
the York County Sheriff’s Office, Corporal Dale Hallman of the Saluda County Sheriff’s Office, Deputy James Kirk, Jr., of the Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office, Deputy Farrah Turner of the Florence County Sheriff’s Office, and Deputy Jerry Hard, Jr., of the Richland County Sheriff’s Office, will all be memorialized on those stone walls. Their names will be a perpetual reminder to future generations of the high cost of keeping South Carolinians safe. We honor them, their families, and the other brave men and women who died while protecting our communities.

While every officer deserves to have their story heard, I would like to call attention to Sergeant Carraway and Deputy Turner. On October 3, 2018, Florence County law enforcement executed a warrant on an individual accused of sexual assault on a child. As they arrived on scene, the officers were ambushed by the suspect’s father. When they got out of the vehicles, the father started shooting at them. The standoff and the shooting continued for 2 long hours. Despite the danger, the officers did not retreat, but continued to fight. After all was said and done, seven law enforcement personnel had been shot. Sadly, both Sergeant Carraway and Deputy Turner were mortally wounded.

I was fortunate enough to attend Sergeant Carraway’s memorial service in Florence. It was a beautiful tribute to a life of service. This man was a decorated police officer, Air Force Reservist, coach, mentor, loving husband, father, and friend. Like many of those we are remembering this week, the Terrance Carraway’s of the world are the foundation of America’s goodness.

This is but one small example of how our law enforcement officers put themselves in harm’s way for the betterment of the community on a daily basis. They answered a call to take a suspect off the street, and it cost them their lives. It is our duty to honor and remember their contribution and their sacrifice.

Earlier this week I introduced a resolution to commemorate National Police Week. Included are the names of 159 brave men and women who answered the call of duty, but were sadly taken from us in 2018. This resolution has unanimous, bipartisan support and honored those who gave their lives in fulfilling this noble calling. I want to thank my 99 Senate colleagues who signed on as cosponsors of this measure.

In trying to grasp the essence of National Police Week, I think I remember that George H. W. Bush summed it up best. During the groundbreaking ceremony for the National Law Enforcement Memorial in 1989, President Bush said, “The story to be carved on these walls is the story of America, of a continuing quest to preserve both democracy and decency and to protect a national treasure that we call the American dream.” I am proud to echo his words today and, along with my colleagues, ensure the story of our heroes is told. I encourage all Americans to take a moment this week to reflect on how law enforcement positively affects their own community. These officers show up every day on behalf of their fellow citizens to serve and protect the American dream that President Bush spoke of nearly 30 years ago. Join me in remembering the fallen, and let us ensure their sacrifice is never forgotten.

NATIONAL PREVENTION WEEK
Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the misuse of opioids is a national crisis. Every single day, more than 130 people in this country overdose on these drugs, with tragic results.

In 2017, there were more than 70,000 drug overdose-related deaths in the United States, according to the Centers for Disease Control. This number eclipsed the number that were due to guns or automobile crashes.

May 12 through 18 is National Prevention Week, which is dedicated to increasing public awareness of substance abuse disorder. Addiction exists everywhere. We have taken steps in the past to fight this epidemic.

We passed comprehensive substance abuse and treatment legislation in 2016 and again last year. However, the opioid epidemic continues to destroy lives and communities. We need to remain committed to defeat this crisis.

This week also marks the seventh anniversary of my investigation, with former Senator Baucus, into opioid manufacturers’ connections to medical groups and physicians who advocated for the increased use of opioids. As senior members of the Senate Finance Committee in 2012, we sought documents and financial information from three opioid manufacturers, in a period when deaths from opioid overdoses were skyrocketing. News reports of that time suggested that opioid makers may have been motivated more by corporate profits than by concern to encourage the prescribing of opioids.

More recent news reports confirm that we had very good reason to launch this oversight work. For example, yesterday, BBC News published an article concerning opioid makers’ sponsorship, in the early 2000s, of so-called educational meetings for pain specialists from the United Kingdom. The doctors, whose opioid prescribing rates were being monitored by opioid makers, were invited to London, where they would stay in posh hotels and attend Broadway shows at a drugmaker’s expense, BBC reported. As reportedly shared by a doctor who attended one of these trips: “I feel very ashamed . . . I have just gulped down the prescribing of a class of drug.”

I remain concerned that opioid-related deaths over the last decade may have been fueled by misinformation and marketing practices embraced by drugmakers and financial organizations to which they donated.

What I said 7 years ago remains true today: “Doctors and patients should know if the medical literature and groups that guide [opioids’] use are paid for by the drugs’ manufacturers and if so, [by] how much.” As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I intend to continue my oversight work in this area, including by convening a congressional hearing later this summer.

I also believe that we need to do more to ensure that Americans have access to effective recovery treatment options. The recent arrests in multiple States of those who operated sham treatment facilities for addicts point to a problem. Moreover, we have reason to be concerned about the lack of information available to the public about the most promising treatment options available.

A related issue has been the lack of adequate, national standards of care in the addiction treatment field. That is why I joined several of my colleagues in supporting bipartisan legislation that calls for the development of new quality measures to improve treatment for Americans battling opioid and substance addiction. This measure directs the Food and Drug Administration, Medicare, and Medicaid Services to work with a coalition of healthcare providers to identify quality measures to be used to assess the effectiveness of substance use disorder treatment programs.

In 2016, I also supported the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA. This bipartisan measure was enacted after the Senate Judiciary Committee approved it during my tenure as chairman. It includes a number of the provisions I authored.

The causes of the opioid epidemic are complicated and its effects are widespread. It is impossible to solve this national crisis overnight. We must continue our efforts at the local, State, and Federal level to break the cycle of addiction.

54TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START AND 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF EARLY HEAD START
Ms. MURkowski. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the countless men and women in Alaska and across the Nation who have dedicated their talents to ensuring that young children and their parents have the tools they need to succeed. I speak of all those involved in their local Head Start and Early Head Start programs, classroom directors, teachers, aides, and parent leaders.

This week marks the 54th anniversary of Head Start and the 25th anniversary of Early Head Start. Since 1964, more than 36 million children have participated in Head Start programs. Research has shown reduces intergenerational poverty by helping parents to gain parenting, work, and leadership skills and which gives young children at risk the academic, health, and nutritional foundations they need to build a foundation for success.

Children who attend Head Start begin school with better literacy,
numercy, cognitive, and behavioral skills than they otherwise would have had. They are more likely to graduate and complete college. They are more likely to live healthy, productive lives as adults. Today, Head Start alumni are strong, resilient individuals who make positive contributions to their communities as doctors, nurses, athletes, parents, entrepreneurs, teachers, police officers, CEOs, authors, artists, and more.

Head Start and Early Head Start are more important now than they ever have been, helping families across the country so tragically hurt by the opioid crisis. Head Start and Early Head Start directors, teachers, aides, and parent leaders are on the front lines, helping our most at-risk children survive and thrive in the face of the adverse childhood experiences caused by homelessness, neglect, and abuse. They are there in times of natural disaster, community violence, and personal tragedies. They are helping children and grandparents provide stable and nurturing environments. In Native communities, they are helping to revitalize languages and strengthen traditional ways of knowing and living. Our communities and the Nation as a whole are stronger because Head Start and Early Head Start programs help millions of families find their way to strength and resilience.

Head Start staff in Alaska and across the country are dedicated, innovative, caring, and committed to working with motivated people who work hard each and every day to ensure that the children and families they serve have the tools they need to achieve their full potential. Beyond the voluminous research showing the positive impact of these programs, I know what they do makes a lasting difference. When I visit elementary schools across my State, principals tell me that the students who have participated in Head Start are better prepared in every way for school.

So I take this opportunity to wish every Head Start and Early Head Start staff member and participant. Happy anniversary. As a longtime supporter, I recommit to doing all I can to ensure that our Head Start and Early Head Start programs continue to make a positive difference for many more years to come.

REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to honor our former colleague Senator Richard Lugar, who passed away recently and whose memorial service was this past week. As the longest-serving Senator from his beloved Indiana, Richard Lugar dedicated 36 years of service to his State, the Senate, and our Nation. He was a dear friend and mentor who already had 22 years of Senate service when I joined the Senate. What I remember most fondly about Senator Lugar is that he combined an extraordinary intellect with good humor. He knew so much about foreign policy and was also so approachable that new Senators like myself never hesitated to seek his guidance.

Senator Lugar’s commitment to bipartisanship guided his engagement on issues from international affairs to agriculture. His commitment to achieve results, regardless of the political calculus. He eschewed polarization and cautioned colleagues that, “whatever is won today through division is usually lost tomorrow.” Instead he sought to foster good will to bring together otherwise compromised. He continued this effort after his service in the Senate with the Lugar Center, a nonprofit public policy institution that seeks to improve the quality of debate and bridge ideological divides on important issues.

It is this approach that led to great success in international affairs from South Africa to the Philippines.

Senator Lugar viewed support for democracy and development as a stabilizing force that helps mitigate threats. Around the world, partners trusted his foreign policy expertise and judgment. Perhaps his greatest achievement was his bipartisan work with Senator Sam Nunn in developing the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to dismantle weapons of mass destruction in the former states of the Soviet Union, eliminating nuclear arms in Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. His work to limit weapons of mass destruction led to the deactivation and destruction of thousands of nuclear warheads and ballistic missiles. Due to Senator Lugar’s vision, leadership, and bipartisan approach, we live in a safer world.

Through his contributions to international security, Senator Lugar serves as a reminder of what we can achieve if we work together to face the challenges that pose dangers to world peace and stability and, of course, to the interests of the United States and our international partners. As we reflect on his life and his lessons, I hope my colleagues will honor his legacy by building bipartisan bridges to resolve the pressing problems of today.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT JESSE EDINGER

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Jesse Edinger, MP, for his impact on the Lewis and Clark County and surrounding areas.

Jesse Edinger joined the U.S. Army directly after graduating high school in 1999. He attended basic and advanced individual training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO. His first duty station was in Fort Drum, NY, where he served as a military police Patrolman, MP. Shortly after, he received orders to go to Korea. There he was immediately assigned to the United Nations Command Military Police and the Korean Army Police. He served in a variety of assignments. In Korea, he met the love of his life Sunwoo. They married and transferred to Fort Riley, KS, in 2003. Immediately after arriving Fort Riley, Jesse received orders to deploy to Iraq. In Iraq, he completed a wide range of military police battlefield functions and was able to return safely to the U.S. In 2004, Jesse left Active Duty and decided to serve his home State in the Montana Army National Guard.

After 3 years in the Guard, he was once again called back to Iraq as an MP. He spent a year there and again returned safely to his family. In 2006, he volunteered for the Montana Army National Guard honor guard team and 1 year later was hired as the non-commissioned officer in charge of the military funeral honors team. He worked hand in hand with the state coordinator to ensure fallen veterans received the most professional honors possible. He was one of Montana’s first nationally certified honor guard instructors. In 2014, Jesse Edinger once again volunteered to deploy to Afghanistan as a military police investigator. After serving another yearlong deployment, he returned to his military funeral honors position at Fort Harrison, Montana, where he became the nominator as a casualty notification officer. These officers notify next of kin and assist family members of a soldier killed in action or that has died in the line of duty. Jesse was recently promoted to the rank of Master Sergeant and has conducted around 1,100 funeral honors missions for Montana veterans and soldiers killed in action.

For 20 years, MSG Jesse Edinger has served his country proudly and has honored the lives of more than 1,000 Montana veterans. His wife Sun also serves in the Montana Army National Guard. Together they have three children. MSG Edinger is the epitome of a military leader, and I am proud to recognize him during Military Appreciation Week.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE SRI LANKAN WAR

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, May 18 marks the 10th anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka. In May 2009, the war between the government and the separatist Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, LTTE, ended. The civil war was a 27-year-long assault on the coexistence of the Sri Lankan people, leaving scars that remain today. Both the Sri Lankan state and the LTTE targeted dissidents and members of other ethnic communities indiscriminately bombing places of worship, hospitals, and public transport. On this 10th anniversary, I urge the people of Sri Lanka to renew their commitment to peace, reconciliation, and accountability for human rights violations and crimes committed during the conflict. In the wake of the devastating terrorist attacks last month, the international community should also renew its commitment to supporting those Sri Lankan citizens committed to a peaceful and democratic society where the rights of all are protected under the law.
The final years of the war saw heightened intensity of fighting and soaring human rights abuses, including hundreds of enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killings of aid workers, arbitrary arrests, torture, and the use of child soldiers, government and LTTE leaders both denied any reports critical of the government’s war against the LTTE as “traitors” and “terrorists,” and the LTTE tolerated no dissent in areas it controlled. The last few months of fighting resulted in the deaths of as many as 40,000 civilians in the final assault against the LTTE. Victims’ groups say the fates of more than 100,000 people remain unknown. UN satellite images showed that the government repeatedly and indiscriminately shelled no fire zones, where it had encouraged civilians to concentrate, and where estimates show that as many as 330,000 civilians were trapped. UN investigations determined that “gross violations” of international law occurred on all sides of the conflict, including the thousands of civilian deaths in the military assault that ended the rebellion. Many deaths and tens of thousands of disappearances remain unaddressed.

For my Sri Lankans, the terrorist attacks last Easter Sunday, evoked emotions reminiscent of war times. I express my deepest condolences to the families who lost loved ones and de- nounce in the strongest terms this vile attack on all Sri Lankan people. As families recovered bodies of loved ones and buried and cremated them, they felt a pain that is sadly too familiar to so many Sri Lankans. While the perpetrators of the Easter Sunday attacks sought to sow hatred between communities and bring chaos to Sri Lanka, the government bears the responsibility to respond swiftly to retaliatory attacks against Muslim communities and ensure communal harmony and national unity. To be Sri Lankan is to be Buddhist, to be Hindu, to be Muslim, and to be Christian. All these communities have the right to exercise their religious identity and to live in peace and security in Sri Lanka.

On January 9, 2015, the Sri Lankan people voted to unseat President Mahinda Rajapaksa. A few months later, the government of Maithripala Sirisena cosponsored United Nations Human Rights Council, UNHRC, resolution 30/1, which calls for establishing a commission for truth, justice, reconciliation, and nonrecurrence. Despite commitments made by the government, Sri Lanka has not adopted a mechanism that would address the long held grievances of communities across the country. The government has failed to strengthen the victim and witness protection law. Security sector reforms, including repealing and replacing the Prevention of Terrorism Act, have not taken place. The lack of accountability with respect to war crimes suspects remains a serious concern. Limited legal action has been taken to prosecute and hold alleged perpetrators responsible and there is a lack of trust and confidence in domestic structures, so I echo the UN Human Rights Commissioner’s calls that the international community use the principle of universal jurisdiction to hold accountable those who face allegations of serious human rights violations.

Sri Lankan people deserve justice, peace, and protections. The country cannot move forward, rebuild, and prosper without a timebound plan for the government to fully implement its UNHRC commitments. Accountability, transitional justice, and reconciliation are hard, but left unresolved, these issues fester over time and could lead to renewed instability. Clearly, such an outcome should be avoided as it benefits no one in or outside of Sri Lanka. The war in Sri Lanka was a terrible episode in a country with a proud past. How Sri Lanka finally decides to deal with the legacy of the conflict is critically important for its future. My hope is that the government of Sri Lanka delivers on all its stated commitments, and that the international community maintains its focus on these postwar promises. As the country contends with the impact of reprehensible violence last month, it must renew its focus on the fundamentals of an inclusive multireligious and multi-ethnic society. I call on the friends of Sri Lanka around the world to support the principle of universal jurisdiction to hold accountable those who face allegations of serious human rights violations.

Bill’s story exemplifies how far one can go in Alaska if one works hard and exhibits a devotion for community service. Bill was lifelong Alaskan and a graduate of Ketchikan High School. He was a longshoreman, a proud member of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union, a business leader, serving as president of the Cape Fox Corporation, his ANCOSA village corporation. He was a fisherman. He served on the Saxman City Council and was mayor of Saxman. Bill was a lifelong Native Brother- hood and Tlingit and Haida.

In 1993, Bill was elected to the Alaska House of Representatives, serving until 2004. A strong advocate for development of Alaska’s natural resources and preservation of the traditional subsistence way of life, Bill distinguished himself in the Alaska Legislature. He rose to cochair the finance committee of the Alaska House of Representatives, one of the most powerful positions in the State of Alaska. Bill knew how to make deals. He said his word was his bond, he knew how to keep a deal. I proudly served alongside Bill throughout my tenure in the Alaska Legislature. He was both a friend and a mentor to me.

Tributes are pouring in from those who knew and loved Bill Williams. State Senator Bert Stedman, who is cochair of the senate finance committee in the current legislative session, had this to say about Bill: “He understood that political differences don’t need to divide Alaskans. In the Capitol, he was known for keeping his words and putting Alaska’s interests above politics. He took the lead on both subsistence and development issues. He was known for working with our federal delegation and governors to keep jobs in the Tongass. He was a strong voice on Alaska Native issues.”

The Ketchikan Daily News, in an editorial, remembered Bill as an honorable man who represented the community and the region with quiet, steadfast dignity. “Those who met Williams would not likely forget him. He was quiet and humble, possessing eyes of both twinkling good humor and the glint of iron resolve. Others in public life learned quickly not to underestimate the good representative from Saxman.”

Alaska Governor Mike Dunleavy has also reflected on the loss of Bill Williams this week. Governor Dunleavy said, “Real leaders do not come along very often, so it is especially tough when we lose one with the ability and character of Bill Williams. He worked both hard and smart for the constituents and communities he represented.” Governor Dunleavy has ordered flags to be lowered to half-staff this week in Bill’s memory.

From the central council of Tlingit and Haida Tribes, “Gunalcheesh, Haw’aa to Bill for his lifelong dedication to Southeast Alaska and its people.”
On behalf of my colleagues here in the U.S. Senate, I extend my condolences to Bill’s wife Caryl, his family, the Samox community, and all who hold this very special Alaskan dear in their hearts. It is a privilege to honor the late Bill Williams, an outstanding Alaskan, in the U.S. Senate today.

TRIBUTE TO PETER PETRASKO

Mr. ROUNDZ. Mr. President, today I recognize Peter Petrasko, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Peter is a graduate of O’Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD, and Brown University in Providence, RI. He is currently pursuing his master of data science degree through Harvard Extension School. Peter is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Peter for all of the fine work he has done, and I wish for his continued success in the years to come.

REMEMBERING STAN FURMAN

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of the Honorable Stan Furman, a former Arizona State senator and community leader who passed away in Phoenix, AZ, on April 1, 2019, at the age of 87.

Having spent his formative years in the Vista Del Mar Orphanage in Los Angeles, Stan developed a strong sense of family. While in the orphanage, Stan worked any job he could, and caddying at the Hillcrest Country Club gave him some great stories about George Burns, Milton Berle, Jack Benny and others.

Stan grew up in Depression-era Arizona which is why he was an Alaskan, in the U.S. Senate today.

In 1998, Stan was named Mediator of the Year by the Phoenix Community Mediation Program. Long active in the Arizona Civil Liberties Union, Stan served as Arizona ACLU president from 2002 to 2006 and was honored to be named Arizona Civil Librarian of the Year in 1995. He served on the board for several years on the National ACLU board of directors. Stan was an avid tennis player and golfer, quick-witted, and a natural joke teller. He loved crossword puzzles, Boggle, and all word games. He immersely enjoyed playing board games and online games with his children and grandchildren. He loved going to the beach while enjoying time at the family’s vacation home in Rocky Point, Mexico.

Stan is survived by his loving wife, Gloria, daughters Diane (Rand) and Susan, son Phil (Deb), grandsons Spencer, Dylan, Nate, Harrison, Alex (Jessi), Hugo and Oscar, and great-granddaughter Cheyanne. He will be greatly missed by his family members, friends, and the hundreds of people whose lives she touched. Please join me in honoring his memory.

REMEMBERING GERALDINE “JERRY” EMMETT

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Geraldine “Jerry” Emmett, a community leader who passed away in Prescott, AZ, on April 30, 2019, at the age of 104. Jerry was a lifelong Democrat and campaign worker.

While waiting tables in her family’s restaurant, she met and impressed an Arizona State Teachers College—now Northern Arizona University—recruiter from Flagstaff, and received a tuition scholarship of $14.00 per semester, allowing her to attend and graduate from ASTC in 1937 with a degree in elementary education. She began her 40-year teaching career at Kayenta on the Navajo Reservation. She also taught in Seligman, Tombstone, and Scottsdale, before finally settling in Phoenix at the Creighton School District. She taught in Phoenix for the next 30 years until her retirement, primarily at Lafayette Elementary School, Larry C. Kennedy. Evidently, her teaching career made an impression on her students, as over 60 former students attended her 100th birthday party.

Jerry co-founded the Prescott Area Democratic Women’s Club and was a regular sight at Democratic Party events with her friends Carolyn and Dawn. Her smile and stories of growing up in Depression-era Arizona will be missed.

Jerry is survived by her youngest son, Jim Emmett, five grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. She will be dearly missed by other family members, friends, and the hundreds of people whose lives she touched. Please join me in honoring her memory.

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN MIKLOS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Jonathan Miklos, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Jonathan is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he is double majoring in political science and history. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jonathan for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO F. ANTHONY CLIFFORD

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I extend my appreciation to Jonathan for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.
pursue science and engineering employment opportunities in the government. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Tony Clifford for his distinguished service to our country and wish him all the best in the coming years as he enjoys his well-earned retirement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
At 10:17 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 312. An act to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 375. An act to amend the Act of June 18, 1994, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1892. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes.

"The message also announced that pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, Public Law 93-344, the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate hereby jointly appoint the following individual to the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023: Dr. Phillip Swagel, Director.

MEASURES REFERRED
The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 375. An act to amend the Act of June 18, 1994, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 1892. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME
The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 312. An act to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2978. An act to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE
On request by Senator GARY PETERS, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, vice Charles H. Fulghum.

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

EC-1299. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Glufosinate Ammonium; Pesticide Tolerances [Olive, Stone Fruit (crop group 12-12), Tree Nuts (crop group 14-12) and Soybean Hull]" (FRL No. 9991–49–OCSPF) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1290. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1291. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf - Blowout Preventer Systems and Well Control Revisions" (RIN1014–AA39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1292. A communication from the Director of Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, 5 (five) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1293. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; GA and TN; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-Hour NO2 Standard" (FRL No. 9999–71–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1294. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Approval of Revised Statutes; Error Correction" (FRL No. 9999–94–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1295. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Approval of Revised Statutes; Error Correction" (FRL No. 9999–94–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1296. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Priorities List" (FRL No. 9993–49–OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1297. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Regulation to Require Drug Pricing Transparency" (FRL No. 9995–AT7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1298. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recognition and Denial of Section 897 Gain on 'S-S' Shares of a Closely Held Corporation" (RIN1545–BN03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1299. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees Relating to Enrolled Agents and Enrolled Retirement Plans Agents" (RIN1545–BO38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1298. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit for Carbon Oxidation and Recirculation - Section 41: Inflation Adjustment Factor" (Notice 2019–31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1291. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Ruling: Cash Distributions in Redemption of Stock of Former S Corporations During the Post-Termination Transition Period" (Notice 2019–13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1292. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Limited Expansion of the Determination Letter Program for Individually Designed Plans" (Notice 2019–20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1293. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2019–22" (Rev. Proc. 2019–12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1294. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2019–22" (Rev. Proc. 2019–12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1305. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2018 Section 45K(d)(2)(C) Reference Price" (Notice 2019–28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.
EC–1306. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Request for Comments on Necessary Clarifications to Normalization Requirements for Excess Tax Revenues Resulting from the Corporate Drax Rate Decrease" (Notice 2019-32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1307. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Request for Comments on Necessary Clarifications to Normalization Requirements for Excess Tax Revenues Resulting from the Corporate Drax Rate Decrease" (Notice 2019-33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1308. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maximum Values for 2019 For Use With Vehicle Cents-Per-Mile and Fleet-Average Valuation Rules" (Notice 2019-38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1309. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act regarding cooperation with a country or countries cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1310. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1311. A communication from the Deputy Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status of the Gulf of Mexico Bryde's Whale (RIN0648– XD669) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1312. A communication from the Chairman and Acting Administrator, Office of Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2018 through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1313. A communication from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, nine (9) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1314. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report entitled "2018 Report of the Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1315. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Council of the United States, transmitting, a report relative to Article III judiciary recommendations and correspondence from the Senate of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1316. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting proposed legislation that would amend the South Pacific Tuna Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1317. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environment and Energy, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Chesapeake Bay Office Biennial Report to Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–60. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to review and consider eliminating provisions of federal law which reduce Social Security benefits for certain federal, state, or local government retirement or pension systems, plans, or funds; to the Committee on Finance.

H. RES. 565. A resolution (Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GAVEL, Mrs. ANDERSON, Mr. DELISLE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. ROY, Mr. SHADDOCK, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ARTHUR, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr.}

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Senate and ordered to be printed for consideration:

S. 1310. A bill to establish National Wildlife Corridors to provide for the protection and restoration of certain native fish, wildlife, and plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WASHINGTON (for herself and Mr. INOSHEE):

S. 1301. A bill to modify the requirements for the longitudinal medical study of the Department of Defense on blast pressure exposure of members of the Armed Forces to assess the feasibility and advisability of uploading the data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. EMERICK, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. SAVIT):

S. 1502. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder...
threshold for registration under that Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN:
S. 1546. A bill to promote ethics and prevent corruption in Department of Defense contracting and other activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TILLIS:
S. 1594. A bill to amend section 3006 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation to the highest participants in programs under such title to distribute voter registration forms to students enrolled at the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mrs. KARSTEN):
S. 1518. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that establish a national standard for determining whether mobile and broadband services available in rural areas are reasonably comparable to those services provided in urban areas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHER, and Ms. HASSAN):
S. 1516. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen the future workforce and reduce the cost of postsecondary education by reducing rates of postsecondary remediation; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. Kaine (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):
S. 1510. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants for promoting industry or sector partnerships to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement as part of an infrastructure investment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. CAPPETO, and Mrs. FISCHER):
S. 1518. A bill to improve the process by which environmental documents are prepared and permits and applications are processed and regulated by Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):
S. 1518. A bill to address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, criminalize straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CASSIDY):
S. 1520. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Ms. PORTMAN:
S. 1521. A bill to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CUSHINGHAM (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MORAAN):
S. 1522. A bill to improve broadband data collection, validation, and the deployment of broadband services to all areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CARDIN):
S. 1523. A bill to prohibit drilling in the Arctic Ocean; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARREN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. GILLIBRAND):
S. 1524. A bill to provide for the overall health and well-being of service members, including the promotion of lifelong sexual health and healthy relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):
S. 1525. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for institutional ineligibility based on low cohort repayment rates and to require risk sharing payments of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SINE (for herself and Ms. ERNST):
S. 1526. A bill to enhance efforts to prevent sexual assault in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KLOBUCHER (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Ms. SHAHEEN, Mr. BURH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 1527. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, an assessment of the total amount of non-highway recreational fuel taxes received by the Secretary of the Treasury and transferred to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKZ):
S. 1528. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. HAWLEY):
S. 1529. A bill to make additional financial assets of the Government of Iran available to pay compensatory damages to the victims of terrorism sponsored by that Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. RUSKIN, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):
S. 1530. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to support the access of marginalized youth to sexual health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. CASSIDY):
S. 1531. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):
S. 1532. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to define the term 'rural health clinic' for purposes of the health care delivery system and to authorize grants and loan repayments for rural health clinics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
S. 1532. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to study the role pharmaceutical benefit managers play in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
S. 1533. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms.ERNST):
S. 1534. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of quantum computing technology to address problems associated with exposure to PFAS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BRAUN):
S. 1535. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):
S. 1536. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support healthy aging and age-friendly communities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Ms. TOOHEY (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):
S. 1537. A bill to ensure America's law enforcement and justice protocols applicable to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols associated with exposure to PFAS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BRAUN):
S. 1538. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support healthy aging and age-friendly communities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. BRAUN):
S. 1539. A bill to reduce the deficit by re-alizing, consolidating, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):
S. 1539. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAIN, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERCLEY, Mrs. MURRATY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHREZAD, Mr. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. Udall, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PETERS):
S. 1540. A bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to conduct elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS
The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:
By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHREZAD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. WARNER, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. MCALISTER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. SINEMA):
S. Res. 212. A resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the passage and ratification of the 19th Amendment, providing for women’s suffrage, to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):
S. Res. 213. A resolution designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2019, as “National Public Works Week”; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):
S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate for the lying in state of the remains of the last Medal of Honor recipient of World War II, in honor to the Greatest Generation (families of the more than 16,000,000 men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States from 1941 to 1945); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 155
At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 155, a bill to improve the financial literacy of secondary school students.

S. 191
At the request of Mr. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 191, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 227
At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 227, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 277
At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 277, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality.

S. 297
At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 297, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes.

S. 339
At the request of Ms. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 433
At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 457
At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. COLLINS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that $1 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.

S. 460
At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 504
At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEFEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 522
At the request of Mr. CARLIN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. MURRAY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 522, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality.
Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 532, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual’s period of consecutive years of teaching, or the individual works in a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 due to such a relocation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHIPROY) 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. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAACSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 580, a bill 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 former President, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semiannual Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ISAACSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 507th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill’s Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 784, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identification database to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces.

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

At the request of Mr. V An HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor 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 Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCALLISTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to provide better care for Americans living with Alzheimer’s disease and related dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

At the request of Ms. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1156, a bill to require the Secretary of each military department to develop resilience plans for installations of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1156, a bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

At the request of Mrs. BLANKENSHIP, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CORMACK), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator
from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Johnson), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Portman) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) 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. 1235

At the request of Mr. Schatz, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) were added as cosponsors of S. 1236, a bill to prohibit the sale of tobacco products to individuals under the age of 21.

S. 1236

At the request of Mr. Blunt, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1370, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain military survivor benefits as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax.

S. 1370

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Perdue) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide a guarantee of residency for registration of businesses of spouses of members of the uniformed services, to improve occupational license portability for military spouses through interstate compacts, and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. Sullivan, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of suicide prevention coordinators of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1401, a bill to establish eligibility requirements for education support professionals under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, and for other purposes.

S. 1401

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to promote affordable access to evidence-based opioid treatments under the Medicare program and require coverage of medication assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, to improve reversal for overdose and provide medications, and recovery support services by health plans without cost-sharing requirements.

S. 1424

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered or threatened, and for other purposes.

S. 1429

At the request of Mr. Cruz, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen school security.

S. 1442

At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1452, a bill to establish a program to provide assistance for education and research harbors.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1480

At the request of Mr. Brown, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 1481

At the request of Mr. Graham, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1494, a bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to protect alien minors and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end abuse of the asylum system and establish refugee application and processing centers outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1494

At the request of Ms. McSally, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Ms. Cotton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to amend title 10, 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 investigation and prosecution of such offenses, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. Roberts, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. Barrasso, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 99, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Thune) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 135, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Portman):

S. 1517. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants for prison industry sector partnerships to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement
as part of an infrastructure investment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, the U.S. infrastructure system is in critical need of an upgrade. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently graded the U.S. system a D+ given its capacity, condition, funding, future need, operation and maintenance, public safety, resilience and innovation. Any investment to improve our country’s infrastructure system would create millions of new jobs, requiring millions of skilled workers to fill them.

A recent study by the Center of Education and the Workforce at Georgetown University estimated that a $1 trillion infrastructure investment would create 11 million new jobs. Nearly half of these would require training past the high school level. Even without a significant investment, though, infrastructure industries are already struggling to meet workforce demands. Workers in these industries are expected to retire at a 50% higher rate than the general workforce. To ensure infrastructure investments benefit businesses, workers, and the economy, the U.S. must invest in the creation of a diverse pipeline of workers with skills necessary to access in-demand opportunities.

Industry and sector partnerships are a proven strategy for helping workers prepare for middle-skill jobs and helping businesses find skilled workers. The BUILDS Act. The BUILDS Act creates industry and sector partnerships working with community and human service organizations that can make these connections for workers and drastically improve their ability to succeed in targeted infrastructure clusters. Additionally, businesses and education providers would be connected to develop classroom curriculum to complement workplace learning, and workers would receive support services such as mentoring and career counseling to ensure that they are successful from the pre-employment to placement in a full-time position.

Our nation desperately needs improvements to critical infrastructure like our roads and bridges, however to do that work we must have a trained workforce that’s ready to fill these good-paying jobs. Virginia businesses in the transportation, maritime, and information technology industries continue to tell me they have trouble finding job applicants with the necessary skills. This bill will help workers get the job training they need to be hired. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle consider the BUILDS Act as a necessary component to any investment in our Nation’s infrastructure.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE AND RATIFICATION OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT, PROVIDING FOR WOMEN’S SUFFRAGE, TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. BURKHARDT, Mrs. SMITH, Ms. HARRISON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. McCASKILL, Ms. MCSCALLY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CORTEZ-Masto, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. McDOUGALD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. SINEMA) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 212

Whereas Congress passed the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, guiding the shared ideals of freedom, sovereignty, civil liberties, and individual rights;

Whereas from 1919 to 1920, the Sixty-Sixth Congress debated, and State legislatures considered, an amendment to the Constitution to provide suffrage for women;

Whereas on May 19, 1919, the House of Representatives approved a proposed amendment, followed by the Senate a few weeks later on June 4, 1919;

Whereas the introduction, passage, and ultimate ratification of the 19th Amendment were the culmination of decades of work and struggle by advocates for the rights of women across the United States and worldwide;

Whereas the ratification of the 19th Amendment ensured women could more fully participate in our democracy and fundamentally changed the role of women in the civic life of our Nation;

Whereas August 16, 2020, marks the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, providing the support necessary under article V of the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas August 26, 2020, marks the centennial of the 19th Amendment becoming a part of the Constitution of the United States, providing for women’s suffrage; and

Whereas the centennial anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment represents a historical milestone to be lauded and celebrated; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 100th anniversary of the passage and ratification of the 19th Amendment, providing for women’s suffrage, to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) honors the role of the ratification of the 19th Amendment in further promoting the core values of our democracy as promised by the Constitution of the United States;

(3) reaffirms the opportunity for people in the United States to learn about and commemorate the efforts of the women’s suffrage movement and the role of women in our democracy; and

(4) reaffirms the desire of Congress to continue strengthening public participation and to inspire future generations to cherish and preserve the historic precedent established under the 19th Amendment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 19 THROUGH MAY 25, 2019, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 213

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 19 through May 25, 2019, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improving—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—
S. CON. RES. 17
Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),
SEC. 1. HONORING THE LAST SURVIVING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT OF WORLD WAR II.
(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—The individual who is the last surviving recipient of the Medal of Honor for acts performed during World War II shall be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol upon death, if the individual (or the next of kin of the individual) so elects.
(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take the necessary steps to implement subsection (a).

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING
I, Senator Chuck Grassley, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey, dated May 16, 2019.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET
Mr. Portman. Mr. President, I have 6 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 ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 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 Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—H.R. 312 AND H.R. 2578
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes.
A bill (H.R. 2578) to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

Mr. McConnel. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

EFFECTIVE PROSECUTION OF POSSESSION OF BIOLOGICAL TOXINS AND AGENTS ACT OF 2019
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 744 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.
The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (S. 744), to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener’s error.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McConnell. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 744
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 “Effective Prosecution of Possession of Biological Toxins and Agents Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON THE POSSESSION OF BIOLOGICAL TOXINS AND AGENTS.
Section 175b of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) by striking “(a)(1) No restricted” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:
“(a) OFFENSE.—
“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a restricted person to—
“(A) ship, transport, or possess in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce any biological agent or toxin described in paragraph (2); or
“(B) receive any biological agent or toxin described in paragraph (2) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.
“(2) AGENTS AND TOXINS COVERED.—A biological agent or toxin described in this paragraph is a biological agent or toxin that—
“(A) is listed as a non-overlap or overlap select biological agent or toxin under part 73 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, pursuant to section 351A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262a); and
“(B) is not excluded or exempted under part 73 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations;”;
and
(B) by striking “(2) Whoever” and inserting “(3) PENALTY.—Whoever” and adjusting the margin accordingly; and
(2) in subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “DEFINITIONS.—” before “In this section.”.

PANDEMIC AND ALL-HAZARDS PREPAREDNESS AND ADVANCING INNOVATION ACT OF 2019
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from
further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1379) to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Policy Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (S. 1379) was passed, as follows:

S. 1379

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the “Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019”.

(b) Table of Contents.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Title I—Strengthening the National Health Security Strategy

Title II—Improving Preparedness and Response

Title III—Reaching All Communities

Title IV—Prioritizing a Threat-Based Approach

Title V—Increasing Communication in Medical Countermeasure Advanced Research and Development

Title VI—Advancing Technologies

Title VII—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References in Act.

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY


Sec. 201. Improving benchmarks and standards for preparedness and response.

Sec. 202. Amendments to preparedness and response programs.

Sec. 203. Regional health care emergency preparedness and response systems.

Sec. 204. Military and civilian partnership for trauma readiness.

Sec. 205. Public health and health care system situational awareness and biosurveillance capabilities.

Sec. 206. Strengthening and supporting the public health emergency rapid response fund.

Sec. 207. Improving all-hazards preparedness and response by public health emergency volunteers.

Sec. 208. Clarifying State liability law for volunteer health care professionals.

Sec. 209. Report on adequate national blood supply.


TITLE II—IMPROVING PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Sec. 301. Strengthening and assessing the emergency response workforce.

Sec. 302. Health system infrastructure to improve preparedness and response.

Sec. 303. Considerations for at-risk individuals.

Sec. 304. Improving emergency preparedness and response considerations for children.

Sec. 305. National advisory committees on disasters.

Sec. 306. Guidance for participation in exercises and drills.

TITLE IV—PRIORITIZING A THREAT-BASED APPROACH

Sec. 401. Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.

Sec. 402. Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise.

Sec. 403. Strategic National Stockpile.

Sec. 404. Preparing for pandemic influenza, antimicrobial resistance, and other significant threats.

Sec. 405. Reporting on the Federal Select Agent Program.

TITLE V—INCREASING COMMUNICATION IN MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 501. Medical countermeasure budget plan.

Sec. 502. Material threat and medical countermeasure notifications.

Sec. 503. Availability of regulatory management plans.

Sec. 504. The Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund.

Sec. 505. Additional strategies for combating antibiotic resistance.

TITLE VI—ADVANCING TECHNOLOGIES FOR MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES

Sec. 601. Administration of countermeasure programs.

Sec. 602. Updating definitions of other transactions.

Sec. 603. Medical countermeasure master files.

Sec. 604. Animal rule report.

Sec. 605. Review of the benefits of genomic engineering technologies and their potential role in national security.

Sec. 606. Report on vaccines development.

Sec. 607. Strengthening mosquito abatement and control programs.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Reauthorizations and extensions.

Sec. 702. Location of materials in the stockpile.

Sec. 703. Cybersecurity.

Sec. 704. Strategy and report.

Sec. 705. Technical amendments.

Sec. 2 References in Act.

Except as otherwise specified, amendments made by this Act to a section or other provision of law are amendments to such section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

TITLE I—STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY

Sec. 101. NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY.

Section 2022 (42 U.S.C. 300hh–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “2014” and inserting “2018”;

and

(ii) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “Such National Health Security Strategy shall describe potential emergency health security threats and identify the process for achieving the preparedness goals described in subsection (b) to be prepared to identify and respond to such threats and shall be consistent with the national preparedness goal (as described in section 280b(a)(9) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002), the National Incident Management System (as defined in section 501(7) of such Act), and the National Response Plan developed pursuant to section 564 of such Act, or any successor plan.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: “, and an assessment of any changes to the evidence-based benchmarks and objective standards under sections 319C–1 and 319C–2”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “2009” and inserting “2022”;

(ii) by inserting “(including gaps in the environmental health and animal health workforces, as applicable), describing the status of such workforce” after “gaps in such workforce”;

(iii) by striking “and identifying strategies” and inserting “and identifying strategies”; and

(iv) by inserting before the period at the end, and identifying current capabilities to meet the requirements of section 2903,” and in sub- section (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and investigation” and inserting “and related information technology activities”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and decontamination” and inserting “decontamination, relevant health care services and supplies, and transportation and disposal of medical waste”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) Response to environmental hazards.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “including mental health” and inserting “including pharmacies, mental health facilities,” and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or exposures to agents that could cause a public health emergency” before the period;

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and other applicable compacts” after “Comp-";

and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) ZOONOTIC DISEASE, FOOD, AND AGRICULTURE.—Improving coordination among Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial entities (including through consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture) to prevent, detect, and respond to outbreaks of animal or zoonotic disease that could compromise national security resulting from a deliberate attack, a naturally occurring threat, the intentional adulteration of food, or other public health threats, taking into account interactions between animal health, human health, and animals’ and humans’ shared environment as directly related to public health emergency preparedness and response capabilities, as applicable.”;

“(10) GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY.—Assessing current or potential health security threats from abroad to inform domestic public health preparedness and response capabilities pursuant to section 319C–3.”.

TITLE II—IMPROVING PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Sec. 201. IMPROVING BENCHMARKS AND STANDARDS FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

(a) Evaluating Measurable Evidence-Based Benchmarks and Objectives Standards.—Section 319C–1 (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a) is amended by inserting after section (j) the following:

“(k) Evaluation.—
"(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019 and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the evidence-based benchmarks and objective standards required under subsection (g). Such evaluation shall be submitted to the Congress and shall set forth such changes on the ability to track whether entities are meeting or making progress toward the goals under this section and, to the extent practicable, the applicable goals of the National Health Security Strategy under section 2802;

"(C) a description of amounts received by eligible entities described in subsection (b) and amounts paid by such eligible entities to subrecipients and the effect of such funding on meeting evidence-based benchmarks and objective standards; and

"(D) in paragraphs (3) and (4), as applicable and appropriate, to improve evidence-based benchmarks and objective standards to more accurately assess the ability of entities receiving funds to achieve the goals under this section and section 2802;''.

(B) EVALUATING THE PARTNERSHIP FOR STATE AND REGIONAL HOSPITAL PREPAREDNESS.—Section 319C–2(1)(i) (42 U.S.C. 247d–3(b)(1)(i)) is amended by striking "section 319C–1(g)(1), (j), and (k)" and inserting "section 319C–1(g), (i), (j), and (k)".

SEC. 202. AMENDMENTS TO PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE PROGRAMS

(a) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT APPLICATIONS FOR IMPROVING STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH SECURITY.—Section 319C–1 (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ", acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention," after "the Secretary;"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—

(A) in clause (vi), by inserting ", including public health agencies with specific expertise that may be relevant to public health security, such as environmental health agencies, after "stakeholders";

(B) by redesignating clauses (vii) through (ix) as clauses (viii) through (x);

(C) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

"(viii) a description of how, as applicable, such entity may integrate information to assess the ability of entities to collaborate and receive for the purpose of carrying out this section and subsection (g) of this Act; and

"(ix) a description of how, as applicable, such entity may integrate information to assess the ability of entities to collaborate and receive for the purpose of carrying out this section;"

(b) PARTNERSHIP FOR STATE AND REGIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEMS.—Section 319C–2 (42 U.S.C. 247d–3b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ", acting through the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response," after "The Secretary;"; and

(B) by striking "preparedness for public health emergencies and inserting "preparedness for, and response to, public health emergencies in accordance with subsection (c)";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking "partnership" and inserting "coalition";

(B) in clause (i), by striking ", including" and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) one or more emergency medical service organizations or emergency management organizations; and"

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "partnership" each place it appears and inserting "coalition"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking "medical preparedness" and inserting "preparedness and response";

(4) in subsection (f), by striking "partnering" and inserting "coalition";

(5) in subsection (g)(2)—

(A) by striking "Partnerships and inserting "Coalitions";

(B) by striking "partnerships" and inserting "coalitions"; and

(C) by inserting "and response after "preparedness"; and

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking "an entity" and inserting "a coalition"; and

(B) by striking "such partnership" and inserting "such coalition".

(c) PARTNERSHIP FOR STATE AND REGIONAL HOSPITAL PREPAREDNESS AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 319C–1(h)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ", including threats posed by one or more chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents, including emerging infectious diseases.";

(d) GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL HEALTH CARE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEMS.—(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to identify and provide guidelines for regional systems of hospitals, health care facilities, and other public and private sector entities, with varying levels of capability to treat patients and increase medical surge capacity during, in advance of, and immediately following a public health emergency, including threats posed by one or more chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents, including emerging infectious diseases.

(b) GUIDELINES.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, in consultation with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Commissioner of Health and Substance Use, the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish guidelines for regional systems of hospitals, health care facilities, and other public and private sector entities, with varying levels of capability to treat patients and increase medical surge capacity during, in advance of, and immediately following a public health emergency, including threats posed by one or more chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents, including emerging infectious diseases.

(c) GUIDELINES.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, in consultation with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Commissioner of Health and Substance Use, the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Commissioner of Health and Substance Use, shall develop guidelines for regional systems of hospitals, health care facilities, and other public and private sector entities, with varying levels of capability to treat patients and increase medical surge capacity during, in advance of, and immediately following a public health emergency, including threats posed by one or more chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents, including emerging infectious diseases.

(d) GUIDELINES.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, in consultation with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Commissioner of Health and Substance Use, the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, and the Tribal, State, and local public health officials, shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section—
“(1) identify and develop a set of guidelines relating to practices and protocols for all-hazards public health emergency preparedness and response for hospitals and health care providers and professionals, including first responders, and in consultation with states, regions, and others, to meet the goals under section 319C-2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-3b) or in programs under the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (b) determine appropriate, to meet the goals under section 319C-2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-3b) or in programs under the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (c) the Secretaries of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services may develop the guidance in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; (d) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (e) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services); (f) the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (g) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (h) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (i) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (j) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response; (k) the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; (l) the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; (m) the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use; (n) the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health; (o) the President; (p) the Council of Economic Advisers; (q) the National Economic Council; (r) the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives; (s) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; (t) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; (u) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (v) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (w) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (x) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (y) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (z) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (aa) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (bb) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (cc) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (dd) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (ee) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (ff) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (gg) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (hh) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (ii) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (jj) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (kk) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (ll) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (mm) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (nn) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (oo) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (pp) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (qq) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (rr) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (ss) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (tt) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (uu) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (vv) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (ww) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (xx) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (yy) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (zz) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (AAA) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (BB) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (CCC) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (DDD) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (EEE) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (FFF) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (GGG) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (HHH) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (III) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (JJJ) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (KKK) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (LLL) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (MMM) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (NNN) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (OOO) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (PPP) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups); (QQQ) the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (including appropriate expert groups); (PPP) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (including innovative health care deliverer models under the Medicare Alternative Payment Models program); (ZZZ) the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (including appropriate expert groups).
‘(B) shall be in an amount that does not exceed $1,000,000 per year.

‘(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1512 of title 31, United States Code, and other provision of law, funds available to the Secretary for obligation for a grant under this subsection shall remain available for expenditure for 100 days after the last day of the performance period of such grant.

‘(b) MILITARY TRAUMA CARE PROVIDER PLACEMENT PROGRAM.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall award grants to eligible trauma centers to enable military trauma care providers to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma centers.

‘(2) LIMITATIONS.—In the case of a grant awarded under paragraph (1) to an eligible trauma center, such grant—

‘(A) shall be for a period of at least 1 year and not more than 3 years (and may be renewed at the end of such period); and

‘(B) shall be in an amount that does not exceed in a year—

‘(i) $100,000 for each military trauma care provider that is a physician at such eligible trauma center; and

‘(ii) $50,000 for each other military trauma care provider at such eligible trauma center.

‘(c) GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—

‘(1) DEPLOYMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES.—As a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, a grant recipient shall agree to allow military trauma care providers providing care pursuant to such grant to—

‘(A) be deployed by the Secretary of Defense for military operations, for training, or for response to a public health emergency pursuant to section 319.

‘(B) be deployed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for response to a public health emergency pursuant to section 319.

‘(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section to an eligible trauma center may be used to train and incorporate military trauma care providers into such trauma center, including incorporation into operational exercises and training drills related to public health emergencies, expenditures for malpractice insurance, office space, information technology, specialty education and supervision, trauma programs, research, and allocable indirect fees for such military trauma care providers.

‘(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any other provision of law that preempts State law.

‘(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

‘(1) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Each eligible trauma care center awarded a grant under subsection (a) or (b) for a year shall submit to the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense a report for such year that includes information on—

‘(A) the number and types of trauma cases managed by military trauma teams or military trauma care providers pursuant to such grant during such year;

‘(B) the ability to maintain the integration of the military trauma care provider or team of providers as part of the trauma center, financing the effect of such grant on the trauma center;

‘(C) the educational effect on resident trainees in centers where military trauma care providers are provided care;

‘(D) any research conducted during such year supported by such grant; and

‘(E) any other information required by the Secretaries for the purpose of evaluating the effect of such grant.

‘(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not less than once each year, the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the congressional committees of jurisdiction that includes information on the effect of the grant to military trauma care providers in trauma centers awarded grants under this section on—

‘(A) maintaining military trauma care providers’ ability and ability to respond to and treat battlefield injuries;

‘(B) providing health care to civilian trauma patients in urban and rural settings;

‘(C) the capability of trauma centers and military trauma care providers to increase medical surge capacity, including as a result of a large-scale event;

‘(D) the ability of grant recipients to maintain the integration of the military trauma providers or teams of providers as part of the trauma center;

‘(E) efforts to incorporate military trauma care providers into operational exercises and training and drills for public health emergencies; and

‘(F) the capability of military trauma care providers to participate as a part of a medical response during or in advance of a public health emergency, as determined by the Secretary, or a military exercise.

‘(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part:

‘(1) ELIGIBLE HIGH-ACUITY TRAUMA CENTER.—The term ‘eligible high-acuity trauma center’ means a Level I trauma center that satisfies each of the following:

‘(A) Such trauma center has an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to enable military trauma teams to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma center.

‘(B) At least 20 percent of patients treated at such trauma center in the most recent 3-month period for which data are available are treated for a major trauma at such trauma center.

‘(C) Such trauma center utilizes a risk-adjusted benchmarking system and metrics to measure performance, quality, and patient outcomes.

‘(D) Such trauma center is an academic training center—

‘(i) affiliated with a medical school;

‘(ii) that many military trauma care providers participating in training programs and fellowships in critical trauma specialties and subspecialties, and provides education and supervision of military trauma team members assigned to those specialties and subspecialties; and

‘(iii) that undertakes research in the prevention and treatment of traumatic injury.

‘(E) Such trauma center serves as a medical and public health preparedness and response leader for its community, such as by participating in a partnership for State and regional preparedness established under section 319C-2 or 319C-3.

‘(2) ELIGIBLE TRAUMA CENTER.—The term ‘eligible trauma center’ means a Level I, II, or II trauma center that satisfies each of the following:

‘(A) Such trauma center has an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to enable military trauma care providers to provide trauma care and related acute care at such trauma center.

‘(B) Such trauma center utilizes a risk-adjusted benchmarking system and metrics to measure performance, quality, and patient outcomes.

‘(C) Such trauma center demonstrates a need for military trauma care providers to maintain or improve the trauma clinical capability of such trauma center.

‘(D) Such trauma center provides health care to civilian trauma patients in urban and rural settings;

‘(E) efforts to incorporate military trauma care providers into operational exercises and training and drills for public health emergencies; and

‘(F) the capability of military trauma care providers to participate as a part of a medical response during or in advance of a public health emergency, as determined by the Secretary, or a military exercise.

‘(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $11,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

‘(2) FACILITIES, CAPACITIES, AND BIOSURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES.—

‘(a) FACILITIES, CAPACITIES, AND BIOSURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES.—Section 319D (42 U.S.C. 247d-4) is amended—

‘(1) in the section heading, by striking ‘‘REVALIDIZING’’ and inserting ‘‘FACILITIES AND CAPACITIES’’;

‘(2) in subsection (a)—

‘(A) in the section heading, by striking ‘‘FACILITIES, CAPACITIES, AND BIOSURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES’’ and inserting ‘‘IN GENERAL’’;

‘(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘and improved’’ and inserting ‘‘, improved, and appropriately maintained’’;

‘(3) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ‘‘expand, enhance, and improve’’ and inserting ‘‘expand, enhance, improve, and appropriately maintain’’; and

‘(B) by adding at the end the following:

‘(i) STUDY OF RESOURCES FOR FACILITIES AND CAPACITIES.—Not later than June 1, 2022, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on Federal spending in fiscal years 2013 through 2018 for activities authorized under this subsection. Such study shall include a review and assessment of obligations and expenditures directly related to such activity under paragraphs (2) and (3), including a specific accounting of, and delineation between, obligations and expenditures incurred for the construction, renovation, modernization, and security upgrades of facilities and associated contracts under this subsection, and the obligations and expenditures incurred to establish and improve the situational awareness and operational net-work under subsection (b), and shall identify the agency or agencies incurring such obligations and expenditures.’’;

‘(3) in subsection (b)‘‘NATIONAL AWARENESS AND BIOSURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES.—

‘(A) in the section heading, by striking ‘‘NATIONAL’’ and inserting ‘‘ESTABLISHMENT OF SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC HEALTH’’;

‘(B) in paragraph (1)‘‘imputation of immunization information systems, after ‘‘centers,’’;’’;

‘(B) in paragraph (2) (i) by inserting ‘‘develop a plan to, and’’ after ‘‘The Secretary shall’’; and

‘(ii) by inserting ‘‘and in a form readily usable for analytical approaches’’ after ‘‘in a second year’’;

‘(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

‘(E) STANDARDS.—

‘(1) GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, the Secretary, in cooperation with military trauma care providers, State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health officials, and relevant Federal
agencies (including the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology and the National Institute of Standards and Technology), shall, as necessary, develop and report standards, including standards for interoperability as defined by section 3000, for networks under paragraph (1) and update such standards as such standards shall be made available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services, in a manner that does not compromise national security.

"B) Dependence to standards development organizations.—In adopting and implementing standards under this subsection and subsection (c), the Secretary shall give deference to standards published by standards development organizations and voluntary and standards entities.

(4) in subsection (c)—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by striking "Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary" and inserting "The Secretary";
(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as subparagraph (B), and inserting after "after shall establish";
(iii) by striking "of rapid" and inserting "of, rapid";
(iv) by adding "or technology" and inserting "such connectivity" and inserting "such interoperability";
(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:
"(2) Coordination and consultation.—In establishing and improving the network under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—
"(A) facilitate coordination among agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services that provide, or have the potential to provide, information and data to, and with, the network, the situational awareness and biosurveillance network under paragraph (1), including coordination among relevant agencies related to health care services, the facilitation of health information exchange (including the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology), and public health emergency preparedness and response; and
"(B) consult with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce (and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology) the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the heads of other Federal agencies, as the Secretary determines appropriate.
"(C) in paragraph (3)—
(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;
(ii) in clause (iv), as so redesignated—
(I) by inserting "immunization information systems," after "poison control," and
(II) by striking "and clinical laboratories" and inserting ", clinical laboratories, and public health agencies;"
(iii) by striking "The network" and inserting the following:
"(A) In general.—The network; and
(B) Review.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019 and every 6 years thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the elements described in subparagraph (A). Such review shall include a discussion of the benefits and gaps in scientific understanding of the interconnections of any elements pursuant to clause (v), including elements added to advancing new technologies, and identify any challenges in the incorporation of elements described in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall provide such review to the congressional committees of jurisdiction.

(D) in paragraph (5)—
(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;
(ii) by striking "in establishing" and inserting the following:
"(A) In general.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees of jurisdiction a coordinated strategy and an accompanying implementation plan that—
(I) develop, implement, and evaluate the network described in paragraph (1), utilizing elements described in paragraph (3)(A); and
(II) modernize and enhance biosurveillance activities, including strategies to include innovative technologies and analytical approaches (including prediction and forecasting for pandemics and all-hazards) from and with public and private entities; and
(III) increase sharing, coordination, and communication among disparate biosurveillance systems supported by the Department of Health and Human Services, including the identification of methods to improve accountability, better utilize resources and workforce capabilities, and incorporate innovative technologies within and across agencies; and
(III) by adding the following:
"(IV) test and evaluate capabilities of the interoperable network of systems to improve situational awareness and biosurveillance capabilities;"
(iv) by adding the following:
"(V) privacy and security protections provided by the Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments, and by the network described in paragraph (1), utilizing elements described in paragraph (3)(A); and
(VI) the identification of gaps and inefficiencies in nationwide public health situational awareness and biosurveillance capabilities, resources, and authorities needed to address such gaps; and
(iv) by adding the following:
"(v) a summary of resources previously extended to establish, improve, and utilize the nationwide public health situational awareness and biosurveillance network under paragraph (1);
(ii) estimates of costs and resources needed to establish and improve the network under paragraph (1) according to the strategy and implementation plan under paragraph (A); and
(iii) the identification of gaps and inefficiencies in nationwide public health situational awareness and biosurveillance capabilities, resources, and authorities needed to address such gaps; and
(iv) a strategy to minimize and address such gaps and improve inefficiencies;"
"(G) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—
(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(taking into account zoonotic disease, including gaps in scientific understanding of the interactions between human, animal, and environmental health) after "human health"; and
(ii) in subparagraph (B)—
(I) by inserting "and gaps in surveillance programs" after "surveillance programs"; and
(II) by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;
(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(1) by inserting ‘‘animal health organizations related to zoonotic disease,’’ after ‘‘health care entities;’’ and

(II) by striking the period and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(D) provide recommendations to the Secretary, appropriate agencies and entities, and the appropriate committees of jurisdiction for any missed or delayed implementation of measurable steps identified under subsection (c)(6)(A)(iii).’’

‘‘(E) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation and submit to the Secretary and the congressional committees of jurisdiction a report concerning the activities conducted under subsection (c)(6) and provide recommendations, as applicable and appropriate, on necessary improvements to the biosurveillance and situational awareness network.

(3) other programs, projects, and activities under the Public Health Emergency Fund and related to the purpose of this Act, unless the Secretary determines that such programs, projects, and activities are not necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.”.

‘‘SEC. 216. STRENGTHENING AND SUPPORTING THE PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY RESPONSE SYSTEM.

‘‘(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Subsection (a) of section 319D (42 U.S.C. 247d–4), as redesignated by subsection (a)(6), is amended by striking ‘‘$158,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018’’ and inserting ‘‘$161,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023’’.

‘‘(b) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation and submit to the Secretary and the congressional committees of jurisdiction a report concerning the activities conducted under subsection (a)(6) and provide recommendations, as applicable and appropriate, on necessary improvements to the biosurveillance and situational awareness network.

‘‘(c) B I OLOGICAL THREAT DETECTION RE-

PORT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives on the state of Federal biological threat detection efforts, including the following:

(1) An identification of technological, operational, and programmatic successes and failures of domestic detection programs supported by Federal departments and agencies, and recommendations for improving such programs;

(2) A description of Federal efforts to facilitate the exchange of information related to the information described in paragraph (1) among Federal departments and agencies that utilize biological threat detection technology;

(3) A description of the capabilities of domestic programs in use by Federal departments and agencies including the capability to—

(A) rapidly detect, identify, characterize, and confirm the presence of biological threat agents;

(B) recover live biological agents from collection devices;

(C) determine the geographical distribution of biological agents;

(D) determine the extent of environmental contamination and persistence of biological agents;

(E) provide advanced molecular diagnostics to State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health and other laboratories that support bioterrorism and biowarfare activities;

(F) determine and disseminate the appropriate and appropriate.

(4) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

‘‘(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

‘‘(2) USES.—The Secretary may use amounts in the Fund established under paragraph (1), to—

(A) facilitate coordination between and among Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial entities and public and private health care entities that the Secretary determines are affected by a public health emergency or potential public health emergency referred to in paragraph (1) (including collaboration among such entities with relevant international entities, as applicable);

(B) make grants, provide for awards, enter into contracts, and conduct investigations pertaining to a public health emergency or potential public health emergency, including further supporting programs under section 319C–1, 319C–2, or 319C–3; and

(C) facilitate and coordinate, as applicable, advanced research and development of security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–2), qualified countermeasures (as defined in section 319F–1), or qualified pandemic or epidemic products (as defined in section 319F–3), that are applicable to the public health emergency or potential public health emergency referred to in paragraph (1); and

‘‘(D) strengthen biosurveillance capabilities and laboratory capacity to identify, collect, and analyze information regarding such public health emergency or potential public health emergency, including the systems under section 319D;

‘‘(E) support initial emergency operations and assets related to preparedness and deployment of intermittent disaster response personnel under section 2812 and the Medical Reserve Corps under section 2813; and

(e) by inserting after paragraph (1), in co-

ordination with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, shall conduct a review of the Fund under this section and make recommendations to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the
SEC. 208. CLARIFYING STATE LIABILITY LAW FOR VOLUNTEER HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) In General.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following:

SEC. 225. HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS AS-SISTING DURING A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.

(1) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any State law, an emergency declaration made under section 319I specifies a need for additional personnel to assist in the provision of health care services during a public health emergency, major disaster, or emergency; and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the number of health care providers who register under the Emergency System for Advance Registration of Volunteer Health Professionals under section 319I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7b) in advance to provide services during a public health emergency.

(b) GAO STUDY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the number of health care providers who register under the Emergency System for Advance Registration of Volunteer Health Professionals under section 319I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7b) in advance to provide services during a public health emergency.

SEC. 209. REPORT ON ADEQUATE NATIONAL BLOOD SUPPLY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report containing recommendations related to maintaining an adequate national blood supply, including:

(1) challenges associated with the continuous recruitment of blood donors (including those newly eligible to donate);

(2) ensuring the adequacy of the blood supply in the case of public health emergencies;

(3) implementation of the transfusion transmission monitoring system; and

(4) other measures to improve the safety and innovation, such as the development, use, or implementation of new technologies, processes, and procedures to improve the safety and reliability of the blood supply.

SEC. 210. REPORT ON THE PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPA-BILITIES OF HOSPITALS, LONG-TERM CARE FACIL-ITIES, AND OTHER HEALTH CARE FA-CILITIES.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall enter into an agreement with an appropriate entity to conduct a study regarding the public health preparedness and response capabilities and reliability of the hospitals, long-term care facilities, and other health care facilities to prepare for,
and respond to, public health emergencies, including natural disasters.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the entity shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, State, local, and territorial public health officials (as appropriate), and health care providers and facilities with experience in public health preparedness activities.

(3) EVALUATION.—The study under paragraph (1) shall include—
(A) an evaluation of the current benchmarks and objective standards, as applicable, related to programs that support hospitals, long-term care facilities, and other health care facilities, and their effect on improving public health preparedness and response capabilities and medical surge capacity at such facilities, including the Hospital Preparedness Program, the Public Health Emergency Preparedness cooperative agreements, and the Regional Health Care Emergency Preparedness and Response Systems under section 319C-3 of the Public Health Service Act (as added by section 2033);
(B) surge capacities of gaps in preparedness, including with respect to such benchmarks and objective standards, as those identified during recent public health emergencies (2000) of the Department of Health and Human Services, and other health care facilities to address future potential public health threats;
(C) an evaluation of coordination efforts between the recipients of Federal funding for programs described in subparagraph (A) and entities with expertise in emergency power systems and other critical infrastructure partners to ensure that such partners and those systems are able to identify gaps and recommendations for addressing such gaps;
(D) N O T I F ICATION OF SHORTAGE.—As part of the National Health Security Strategy under section 2802, the Secretary shall evaluate the findings from the review under subparagraph (A) and provide recommendations to modify the policies of the National Disaster Medical System as necessary.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF SHORTAGE.—Section 2812(c) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11(c)), as amended by subsection (a)(3), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

``(B) UPDATE.—As part of the National Health Security Strategy under section 2802, the Secretary shall update the findings from the review under subparagraph (A) and provide recommendations to modify the policies of the National Disaster Medical System as necessary."

(4) S ORT I N G.—Section 2812(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11(c)(2)), as amended by subsection (a)(3), is further amended—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by inserting ‘‘or preparedness and response activities, including rapid response to a nationwide public health emergency;’’;
(ii) by striking ‘‘$35,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$50,000’’; and
(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘3 years’’ and inserting ‘‘2 years’’; and
(C) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ‘‘For the purpose of carrying out this section’’ and inserting the following:

``(i) in general—For the purpose of carrying out this section, except as described in paragraph (2);’’; and
(ii) by adding at the end the following:

``(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘(ii)’’ and inserting ‘‘(i)’’.

(5) S E R V I C E B E N E F I T S.—Individuals who are appointed to the National Disaster Medical System Volunteers under section 2812 through 2023.

(6) S E R V I C E B E N E F I T S.—Individuals who are appointed to the National Disaster Medical System Volunteers under section 2812 through 2023.

T A B L E III—REACHING ALL COMMUNITIES

S E C T I O N 301. STRENGTHENING AND ASSESSING THE EMERGENCY RESPONSE WORKFORCE.

(a) NATIONAL DISASTER MEDICAL SYSTEM.—
(1) STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL DISASTER MEDICAL SYSTEM.—Clause (ii) of section 2812(a)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11(a)(3)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

``(ii) in such system to the congressional committees of jurisdiction each quarter for which this authority is in effect."

(2) REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL DISASTER MEDICAL SYSTEM.—Section 2812(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

``(2) REVIEW AND MEDICAL SURGE CAPACITY STRATEGIC PLAN.—
``(A) REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and in consultation with the Public Health Emergency Response Team, shall conduct a joint review of the National Disaster Medical System. Such review shall include—
(i) an evaluation of medical surge capacity, as described in section 2802(a); and
(ii) an assessment of the available workforce of the intermittent disaster response personnel described in subsection (c);
(iii) the criteria for the workforce described in clause (ii) to respond to all hazards, including capacity to simultaneously respond to multiple public health emergencies and the capacity to respond to a nationwide public health emergency;
(iv) the effectiveness of efforts to recruit, retain, and train such workforce; and
(v) gaps in such workforce and recommendations for addressing such gaps.
``(B) UPDATES.—As part of the National Health Security Strategy under section 2802, the Secretary shall report the findings from the review under subparagraph (A) and provide recommendations to modify the policies of the National Disaster Medical System as necessary.
``(C) STRATEGIC PLAN.—For purposes of carrying out this section, except as described in paragraph (2),""
activated such National Disaster Medical System; and

“(ii) determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to be hazardous.”

(3) In the event of a public health emergency, including a public health emergency or disaster, including entities captured as part of the National Disaster Medical System; and

(a) the number of health care providers who have volunteered to provide health care services during a public health emergency, including members of the National Disaster Medical System, the Disaster Medical Assistant System, the Medical Response System, and other volunteers who have volunteered to work in such a system; and

(b) the capacity of the workforce described in paragraph (a) to respond to a public health emergency or potential public health emergencies, including the capacity to respond to multiple concurrent public health emergencies and the capacity to respond to a nationwide public health emergency; and

(C) the preparedness and response capabilities and mission readiness of the workforce described in subparagraph (A) taking into account areas of health care expertise and considerations for at-risk individuals as defined in section 2802(b)(4)(B), the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7a);

(D) an assessment of the effectiveness of efforts to recruit, retain, and train such workforce; and

(E) identification of gaps that may exist in such workforce and recommendations for addressing such gaps, and any recommendations from the Comptroller General to address such gaps.

SEC. 301. HEALTH SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE TO IMPROVE PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

(a) Coordination of Preparedness—Section 2811(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 300h–10(b)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such critical support shall include working—

with other relevant Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health officials and private sector entities to identify the critical infrastructure assets that are needed to prevent, protect, and respond to threats and events that may affect public health; and

with other relevant Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health officials to identify the critical infrastructure assets that are needed to prevent, protect, and respond to threats and events that may affect public health.”

(b) Countermeasure Considerations—Section 319L(c)(6) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(c)(6)) is amended by inserting—

“products”.

(c) Evaluation of Barriers to Rapid Delivery of Medical Countermeasures.—(1) RAPID DELIVERY STUDY.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response may conduct a study on issues that have the potential to delay the handling, and rapid delivery of medical countermeasures to individuals during public health emergencies occurring in the United States.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate containing the findings of such study.

SEC. 302. CONSIDERATIONS FOR AT- RISK INDIVIDUALS.

(a) AT-RISK INDIVIDUALS IN THE NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY STRATEGY.—Section 2802(b)(4)(B) (42 U.S.C. 300h–1(b)(4)(B)) is amended by—

(1) by striking “this section and sections 319C–1, 319F, and 319L,” and inserting “this Act;”;

(2) by striking “special” and inserting “access”;

(b) Countermeasure Considerations.—Section 319L(c)(6) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(c)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking “elderly” and inserting “older adults”; and

(2) by striking “with relevant characteristics that may affect the process of researching and developing such countermeasures and products” before the period.

(c) Biosurveillance of Emerging Public Health Threats.—Section 2814 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “;” and “and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting “;”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) facilitate coordination to ensure that, in instances where awareness and biosurveillance networks under section 319D, the Secretary considers incorporating data and information from Federal, State, local, Tribal and territorial public health officials and entities relevant to detecting emerging public health threats that may affect at-risk individuals, such as pregnant and postpartum women, and infants, and including adverse health outcomes of such populations related to such emerging public health threats;”

SEC. 303. IMPROVING EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CONSIDERATIONS FOR CHILDREN.

Part B of title I of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act or the National Emergencies Act, including by establishing methods to exchange critical information and deliver products consumed or used to preserve, protect, or sustain life, health, or safety, and sharing of specialized expertise.

“(b) Countermeasure Considerations.—Section 2811(d)(2)(C) (42 U.S.C. 300h–10(d)(2)(C)) is amended by inserting “;” and ancillary medical supplies; and assist with the utilization of such countermeasures or products, after

“products.”

(c) Evaluation of Barriers to Rapid Delivery of Medical Countermeasures.—(1) RAPID DELIVERY STUDY.—The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response may conduct a study on issues that have the potential to delay the handling, and rapid delivery of medical countermeasures to individuals during public health emergencies occurring in the United States.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate containing the findings of such study.

SEC. 304. IMPROVING EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE FOR CHILDREN.

(a) Enhancing Emergency Preparedness for Children.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this subsection as the “Director”), shall maintain an internal team of experts, to be known as the Children’s Preparedness Unit (referred to in this subsection as the “Unit”), to work collaboratively to provide guidance on the considerations for, and the specific needs of, children before, during, and after public health emergencies. The Unit shall inform the Director regarding emergency preparedness and response efforts pertaining to children at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) Expertise.—The team described in subsection (a) shall include one or more pediatricians, who may be a developmental-behavioral pediatrician, and may also include behavioral scientists, child psychologists, epidemiologists, biostatisticians, health communications staff, and individuals with other areas of expertise, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) Duties.—The team described in subsection (a) may—

“(1) assist State, local, Tribal, and territorial emergency planning and response activities related to children, and efforts to include developing, identifying, and sharing best practices;

“(2) provide technical assistance, training, and consultation to Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health officials to improve preparedness and response capabilities with respect to the needs of children, including providing technical assistance, training, and consultation to eligible entities in support of the achievement of measurable evidence-based benchmarks and objective standards applicable to sections 319C–1 and 319C–2;

“(3) improve the utilization of methods to incorporate the needs of children in planning for and responding to a public health emergency, including public awareness of such methods;

“(4) coordinate with, and improve, public-private partnerships, such as health care coalitions pursuant to sections 319C–2 and 319C–3, to address gaps and inefficiencies in emergency preparedness and response efforts for children;

“(5) provide expertise and input during the development of guidance and clinical recommendations to address the needs of children preparing for and responding to a public health emergency, including pursuant to section 319C–3; and

“(6) carry out other duties related to preparedness and response activities for children, as the Secretary determines appropriate.”;

SEC. 305. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON DISASTERS.

(a) Reauthorizing the National Advisory Committee on Children and Disasters.—Section 2811A (42 U.S.C. 300h–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting “mental and behavioral,” after “medical;”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A) and (B), by striking “(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “15” and inserting “25;” and

(b) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) REQUIRED NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—The Secretary, in consultation with such other Heads of Federal agencies as may be appropriate, shall appoint to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (1) at least 13 individuals, including—

“(A) at least 2 non-Federal professionals with expertise in pediatric medical disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery;
“(B) at least 2 representatives from State, local, Tribal, or territorial agencies with expertise in pediatric disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery;

(2) at least 2 Federal members or their designees, including representatives from the agencies in paragraphs (1) through (4); and

(3) at least 2 members representing health care professionals, which may include members with expertise in pediatric emergency medicine; pediatric trauma, critical care, or behavioral health, treatment of pediatric patients affected by chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents, including emerging infectious diseases; pediatric mental or behavioral health related to children affected by a public health emergency; or pediatric primary care; and

(D) other members as the Secretary determines appropriate, of whom—

(i) at least one such member shall represent a children’s hospital;

(ii) at least one such member shall be an individual with expertise in schools or child care settings;

(iii) at least one such member shall be an individual with expertise in the needs of parents or caregivers of children with disabilities, or individuals with expertise in the needs of par- ents or caregivers of children with disabilities.

(G) FEDERAL MEMBERS.—The Advisory Committee under paragraph (1) shall include the following Federal members or their designees (who may be nonvoting members, as determined by the Secretary):

(A) The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.

(B) The Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

(C) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(D) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(E) The Director of the National Institutes of Health.

(F) The Assistant Secretary of the Administration for Children and Families.

(G) The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration.


(I) The Administrator of the Administration for Community Living.

(J) The Secretary of Education.

(K) At least 2 representatives from such Federal agencies (such as the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and the Department of Homeland Security) as the Secretary determines appropriate to fulfill the duties of the Advisory Committee under subsections (b) and (c).

(4) TERM OF APPOINTMENT.—Each member of the Advisory Committee appointed under paragraph (2) shall serve for a term of 3 years, except that the Secretary may adjust the terms of the Advisory Committee appointed under paragraph (2) to coincide with the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, or appoint members who are initially appointed after such date of enactment, in order to provide for a staggered term of appointment for all members.

(5) CONSECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS; MAXIMUM TERMS.—A member appointed under paragraph (2) may serve not more than 3 terms on the Advisory Committee, and not more than two of such terms may be served consecutively:

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end “At least one meeting per year shall be an in-person meeting.”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(5) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate duties and activities authorized under this section in accordance with section 2811D; and

in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023.”

(b) AUDITORS.—The National Advisory Committee on Seniors and Disasters. —Subtitle B of title XXVIII (42 U.S.C. 300hh et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2811A the following:

“SEC. 2811B. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SENIORS AND DISASTERS.

“(a) Establishment.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the National Advisory Committee on Seniors and Disasters (referred to in this section as the ‘Advisory Committee’).

“(b) Duties.—The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) provide advice and consultation with respect to the activities carried out pursuant to section 2814, as applicable and appropriate;

(2) evaluate and provide input with respect to the medical and public health needs of seniors related to preparation for, response to, and recovery from all-hazards emergencies; and

(3) provide advice and consultation with respect to State preparedness and response activities relating to seniors, including related drills and exercises pursuant to the preparedness goals under section 2802(b).

“(c) Additional Duties.—The Advisory Committee may provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary with respect to seniors and the medical and public health needs of seniors, including related drills and exercises pursuant to the preparedness goals under section 2802(b).

“(d) Members.—The Secretary shall appoint not more than 11 members to the Advisory Committee. In appointing such members, the Secretary shall ensure that the total membership of the Advisory Committee is an odd number.

“(e) Required Members.—The Advisory Committee shall include Federal members or their designees (who may be nonvoting members, as determined by the Secretary) and non-Federal members, as determined by the Secretary:

(A) The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.

(B) The Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

(C) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(D) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(E) The Director of the National Institutes of Health.

(F) The Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(G) The Administrator of the Administration for Community Living.

(H) The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(I) The Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(J) At least 2 non-Federal health care professionals with expertise in geriatric medical disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery.

(K) At least 2 representatives of State, local, Tribal, or territorial agencies with expertise in disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery.

(1) At least 2 representatives of State, local, Tribal, or territorial agencies with expertise in disaster planning, preparedness, response, or recovery.

(L) Representatives from other Federal agencies (such as the Department of Energy and the Department of Homeland Security) as the Secretary determines necessary to fulfill the duties of the Advisory Committee.

(3) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet not less frequently than bim-
response, or recovery for individuals with disabilities.

"(M) At least 2 individuals with a disability with expertise in disaster planning, preparedness, and response for recovery for individuals with disabilities.

"(d) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet not less frequently than biannually. At least one meeting per year shall be an in-person meeting.

"(e) DISABILITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘disability’ has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

"(f) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate duties and activities authorized under this section in accordance with section 2811D.

"(g) SUNSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2022.

"(2) RECOMMENDATION.—Not later than October 1, 2022, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a recommendation on whether the Advisory Committee should be extended.

"(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATION.—Subtitle B of title XXVIII (42 U.S.C. 300hh et seq.), as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by inserting after section 2811C the following:

"SEC. 2811D. ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATION.—

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall coordinate duties and activities authorized under sections 2811A, 2811B, and 2811C, and make efforts to reduce unnecessary or duplicative reporting, unnecessary duplicative meetings and recommendations under such sections, as practicable. Members of the advisory committees authorized under such sections, or their designees, shall annually meet to coordinate any recommendations, as appropriate, that may be similar, duplicative, or overlapping with respect to addressing the needs and interests of individuals with disabilities during public health emergencies. If such coordination occurs through an in-person meeting, it shall be considered the required in-person meetings under any of sections 2811A(e), 2811B(e), or 2811C(d).

"(b) COORDINATION AND ALIGNMENT.—The Secretary, and the members of the Congressionally designated pursuant to section 2814, shall align preparedness and response programs or activities to address similar, dual, or overlapping needs of seniors, and individuals with disabilities, and any challenges in preparing for and responding to such needs.

"(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall annually notify Congressionally designated entities of jurisdiction regarding the steps taken to coordinate, as appropriate, the recommendations under this section, and provide a summary description of such coordination.

"SEC. 306. GUIDANCE FOR PARTICIPATION IN EXERCISES AND DRILLS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue final guidance regarding the ability of personnel funded by programs authorized under this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) to participate in drills and operational exercises related to all-hazards medical and public health preparedness and response. Such drills and operational exercises may include activities that incorporate medical surge capacity planning, medical countermeasure planning, and administrative and personnel preparedness and preparing for and responding to identified threats for that region. Such personnel may include State, local, Tribal, and territorial health department or agency personnel funded under this Act (including the amendments made by this Act). The Secretary shall consult with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other applicable Federal departments and agencies in developing and administering the development of such guidance. The Secretary shall make the guidance available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services.

"TITLE IV—PRIORITIZING A THREAT-BASED APPROACH

SEC. 401. ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

Section 2811(b) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10(b)) is amended—

"(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ‘utilize experience related to public health, biodefense, medical countermeasures, and other relevant topics’ after ‘shall’; and

"(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

"(1) THREAT AWARENESS.—Coordinate with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, the President, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, as specified in section 312(f), to compile threat information on threats that may pose a threat to the health security needs of the United States, and develop threat-based guidance for use by Federal, State, Tribal, and local public health agencies and other appropriate entities, as required by section 312.

"(2) PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES ENTERPRISE STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Section 2811(d) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10(d)) is amended—

"(1) in paragraph (1)—

"(A) by striking ‘Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this sub- section’ and inserting ‘Not later than March 15, 2020, and biennially thereafter’; and

"(B) by striking ‘‘and’’ and inserting ‘‘and shall’’; and

"(2) in paragraph (2)—

"(A) by striking ‘utilize experience related to preparedness and response to counter- measures and challenges to addressing such needs including any regulatory challenges, and (ii) alignment of countermeasure procurement with recommendations to address such needs under subparagraph (A).’’

"(C) by striking ‘‘and shall’’ and inserting ‘‘and’’;

"(D) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’; and

"(E) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(3) in paragraph (4)—

"(A) by striking ‘utilize experience related to preparedness and response to counter- measures and challenges to addressing such needs including any regulatory challenges, and (ii) alignment of countermeasure procurement with recommendations to address such needs under subparagraph (A).’’

"(B) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(C) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(D) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(E) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(F) by striking ‘‘and’’ and inserting ‘‘and shall’’;

"(G) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(H) by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Secretary shall consult with the State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and agencies on the development of the strategy and implementation plan’’;

"(I) THREAT AWARENESS.—Coordinate with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, the President, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attorney General, on the following:

"(i) to consult in a public health emergency.

"SEC. 402. PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES ENTERPRISE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (referred to in this section as the ‘PHEMCE’). The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall serve as chair of the PHEMCE.

"(b) MEMBERS.—The PHEMCE shall include each of the following members, or the designee of such members:

"(1) The Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.

"(2) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

"(3) The Director of the National Institutes of Health.

"(4) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

"(5) The Secretary of Defense.


"(7) The Secretary of Agriculture.

"(8) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

"(9) The Director of National Intelligence.

"(10) Representatives of any other Federal agency, which may include the Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, the Director of the Strategic National Stockpile, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and the Director of the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(c) FUNCTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The functions of the PHEMCE shall include—

"(A) Utilize a process to make recommendations to the Secretary regarding research, advanced research, development, procurement, stockpiling, deployment, distribution, and utilization with respect to countermeasures, as defined in section 312F–2(c), including prioritization based on the risk assessment of the United States. Such recommendations shall be informed by, when available and practicable, the National Health Security Strategy pursuant to section 2802, the Strategic National Stockpile needs pursuant to section 319F–2, and assessments of current national security threats, including weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and nuclear threats, including emerging infectious diseases. In the event that members of the PHEMCE do not agree upon a recommendation, the Secretary shall provide a determination regarding such recommendation.

"(B) Identify national health security needs, including gaps in public health preparedness and response related to countermeasures and challenges to addressing such needs (including any regulatory challenges), and (ii) alignment of countermeasure procurement with recommendations to address such needs under subparagraph (A).

"(C) Assist the Secretary in developing strategies related to logistics, deployment, distribution, dispensing, and use of countermeasures that may be applicable to the activities of the strategic national stockpile under section 319F–2(a).

"(D) Provide consultation for the development of the strategy and implementation plan under section 2811(d) with respect to—

"(i) in carrying out subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), the PHEMCE shall solicit and consider input from State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments and officials or otherwise thereafter; and

"(ii) by striking ‘Director of the Bio- medical Advanced Research and Development Authority, the Director of the Strategic National Stockpile, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and the Director of the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response’ and after ‘provide’;

"(ii) by striking ‘and, as informed by existing recommendations of, or consultations with, the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise established under section 2811–1;’ and

"(ii) by striking ‘and, as informed by existing recommendations of, or consultations with, the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise established under section 2811–1, make necessary additions or modifications to the contents of such stockpile or stockpiles based on the recommendations made pursuant to section 2811–1 before the period of the first sentence; and

"(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

"(ii) by inserting paragraph (1) following ‘provide’;

"(ii) by inserting ‘and, as informed by existing recommendations of, or consultations with, the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise established under section 2811–1, make necessary additions or modifications to the contents of such stockpile or stockpiles based on the recommendations made pursuant to section 2811–1 before the period of the first sentence; and

"(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

"(ii) by inserting paragraph (1) following ‘provide’;
each year thereafter, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce on the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in a manner that does not compromise national security.

(B) ADDITIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND REPLACEMENTS.—Each annual threat-based review under subparagraph (A) shall, for each new or modified countermeasure procurement or replenishment, provide—

(ii) an assessment of the extent to which additions, modifications, and replenishments reviewed under paragraph (2) align with previous relevant reports or reviews by the Secretary, the Comptroller General, or the GAO.

(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 319F–2(1) (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b(1)) is amended by striking ‘‘$338,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, and inserting ‘‘$610,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended’’.

SEC. 404. PREPARING FOR PANDEMIC INFLUENZA, ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE, AND OTHER SIGNIFICANT THREATS.

(A) STRATEGIC INITIATIVES.—Section 319F–2(1)(c) (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b(1)(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(F) STRATEGIC INITIATIVES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of BARDA, may implement strategic initiatives, including by building on existing programs and by awarding contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, or entering into transactions, in support of investigational candidate products in preclinical and clinical development that address priority, naturally
occuring and man-made threats that, as determined by the Secretary, pose a significant level of risk to national security based on the characteristics of a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threat, or capabilities to respond to such a threat (including medical response and treatment capabilities and manufacturing infrastructures). Such initiatives shall accelerate and support the advanced research, development, and procurement of countermeasures and products, as applicable, to address areas including:

(i) chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats, including emerging infectious diseases for which research is approved, licensed, or authorized countermeasures exist, or for which such threat result, or for which a potential threat may become a pandemic, such as pandemic influenza, which may include the advanced research and development, manufacturing, and production of stockpiling of quanified pandemic or epidemic products, and products, technologies, or processes to support the advanced research and development of such threats (including multipurpose platform technologies for diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutics; virus seeds; clinical trial lots; novel virus strains; and antigen and antibody responses); and

(ii) threats that result primarily or secondarily from a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agent, or emerging infectious diseases, and which may present increased treatment complications such as the occurrence of resistance to available countermeasures and other countermeasures, including antimicrobial resistant pathways.

(b) PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY FROM THREATS.—Section 2811(b)(7) (42 U.S.C. 300hh–10(b)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "March 1" and inserting "March 15";

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking "and" and inserting "; and";

(B) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

"(iii) procurement, stockpiling, maintenance, and potential replenishment (including manufacturing capabilities) of all products that could be discussed and included in such plans; and

(iv) the availability of technologies that may assist in the advanced research and development of countermeasures and opportunities to accelerate and navigate challenges unique to countermeasure research and development; and

(2) potential deployment, distribution, and utilization of medical countermeasures; development of clinical guidance and emergency use instructions for the use of medical countermeasures; and, as applicable, potential postmarketing activities related to medical countermeasures;"

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

"(D) identify the full range of anticipated medical countermeasure needs related to research and development, procurement, and stockpiling, including the potential need for countermeasures that could be discussed and included in such plans; and

(E) contact information for beginning the regulatory management plan process;"

(3) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking "paragraph (4)(A)'" and inserting "paragraph (5)(A)'; and

(B) by striking "paragraph (4)(B)'" and inserting "paragraph (5)(B)'; and

(4) in paragraph (7)(A), as so redesignated, by inserting "paragraph (5)(A)'; and

SEC. 504. THE BIOMEDICAL ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.—Section 319F–2(g)(1) (42 U.S.C. 247d–6g(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "$2,300,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "$7,100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023, to remain available until expended"; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

(b) THE BIOMEDICAL ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 319F–2(d) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7(e)(2)) is amended by striking "$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "$151,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 through 2023".

SEC. 505. ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES FOR COMBATING ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE.

(a) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") may continue the Presidential Advisory Council on Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria, referred to in this section as the "Advisory Council"
(b) Duties.—The Advisory Council shall advise and provide information and recommendations to the Secretary regarding programs and policies intended to reduce or combat antibiotic-resistant bacteria that may present a public health threat and improve capabilities to prevent, diagnose, mitigate, or treat such resistance. Such advice, information, and recommendations may be related to improving—

(1) the effectiveness of antibiotics;
(2) research and advanced research on, and the development and implementation of methods for combating or reducing antibiotic resistance, including new treatments, rapid point-of-care diagnostics, alternatives to antibiotic stewardship and antimicrobial resistance, and antimicrobial stewardship activities;
(3) surveillance of antibiotic-resistant bacterial infections, including publicly available and up-to-date information on resistance to antibiotics;
(4) education for health care providers and the public with respect to up-to-date information on antibiotic resistance and ways to reduce or combat such resistance to antibiotics related to humans and animals;
(5) identify or reduce the transmission of antibiotic-resistant bacterial infections, including stewardship programs; and

(6) coordination with respect to international efforts in order to inform and advance United States capabilities to combat antibiotic resistance.

(c) Meetings and Coordination.—

(1) Meetings.—The Advisory Council shall meet not less than biannually and, to the extent practicable, in coordination with meetings of the Antimicrobial Resistance Task Force established under section 319E(a) of the Public Health Service Act.

(2) Coordination.—The Advisory Council shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate activities carried out by the Council with the Antimicrobial Resistance Task Force established under section 319E(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–5(a)).

(d) FACa.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the activities and duties of the Advisory Council.

(e) Extension of Advisory Council.—Not later than October 1, 2022, the Secretary shall convene a committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a recommendation including whether the Advisory Council should be extended, and in addition, identify whether there are other committees, councils, or task forces that have overlapping or similar duties to that of the Advisory Council, and whether such committees, councils, or task forces should be combined, including with respect to section 319E(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–5(a)).

TITLE VI—ADVANCING TECHNOLOGIES FOR MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES

SEC. 601. ADMINISTRATION OF COUNTERMEASURES.

Section 319L(c)(4)(D)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7(e)(4)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “and platform technologies” and inserting “platform technologies and administering countermeasures, and technologies to improve storage and transportation of countermeasures”.

SEC. 602. UPDATING DEFINITIONS OF OTHER TRANSACTIONS.

Section 319L (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “, such as” and all that follows through “Code”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(5)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “under this subsection” and all that follows through “Code” and inserting “(as defined in subsection (a)(3)) under this subsection”; and

(B) by adding clause (ii) to read as follows—

(II) in subsection (D), by striking “$20,000,000” and inserting “$100,000,000”;

(II) by striking “senior procurement executive” and inserting “senior procurement executive under” and inserting “Secretary for Financial Resources”; and

(III) by striking “senior procurement executive under” and inserting “Secretary for Financial Resources under”.

SEC. 603. MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE MASTER FILES.

(a) General.—The purpose of this section (including section 565B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (b)) is to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, qualified pandemic or epidemic products, or qualified countermeasures, qualified pandemic or epidemic products by facilitating and encouraging submission of data and information to support the development of such products, and through clarifying the authority to cross-reference data and information previously submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) or other data and information submitted to medical countermeasure master files or other master files.

(b) Medical Countermeasure Master Files.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 565A the following:

SEC. 565B. MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE MASTER FILES.

(a) Applicability of Reference.—

(1) In General.—A person may submit data and information to the Secretary with the intent to reference, or to authorize, in writing, another person to reference, such data or information to support the approval of a medical countermeasure (including a supplement or amendment to any such submission), without requiring the master file holder to disclose the data and information to support the approval, clearance, licensure, or authorization of such medical countermeasure, or qualified pandemic or epidemic product. The Secretary may rely upon the data and information within the medical countermeasure master file and how such written notification was provided in additional applications, as applicable and appropriate and upon the request of the master file holder so notified in writing or by an authorized person of such holder.

(2) Certain Applications.—If the Secretary has reviewed and relied upon specified data or information within a medical countermeasure master file to support the conditional approval of an application under section 571 to subsequently support the approval, clearance, licensure, or authorization of a security countermeasure, qualified countermeasure, or qualified pandemic or epidemic product, the Secretary shall provide a brief written description to the master file holder regarding the elements of the application fulfilled by the data or information within the master file and how such data or information contains data and information that meets the standards of evidence under section (c) or (d) of section 565, subsection (d) of section 512, or section 511 of the Public Health Service Act, which shall not include any trade secret or confidential commercial information.
(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) limit the authority of the Secretary to approve, license, clear, conditionally approve, withdraw, modify, deny, or cancel approvals, licenses, conditions, or decisions pursuant to, as applicable, this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (as such applicable Act is in effect on the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019), including the standards of evidence, and applicable conditions, for approval under the applicable Act;

(2) alter the standards of evidence with respect to any license, clearance, or approval, or applicable laws, and any or all of the substantive evidence standards under sections 505(d) and 512(d) or this Act and section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act; or

(3) alter the authority of the Secretary under this Act or the Public Health Service Act to determine the types of data or information previously submitted by a sponsor or any other person that may be incorporated by reference in an application, request, or notification for a drug, biological product, or device submitted under sections 505(i), 505(b), 505(k)(1), 512(i), 512(k), 364, 373, 513(f), 513(f)(2), or 513(k) of this Act, or subsection (a) or (f) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, including a supplement or amendment to such submission or the requirements associated with such reference.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ‘master file holder’ means a person who submits data and information to the Secretary with the intent to reference or incorporate such data or information into a master countermeasure submission, as described in subsection (a).

(2) The term ‘medical countermeasure submission’ means an investigational new drug application under section 505(i), a new drug application under section 505(b), or an abbreviated new drug application under section 505(j) of this Act, a biological product licensure application under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act or a biosimilar biologic product application under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act, a new animal drug application under section 512(b)(1) or abbreviated new drug application under section 512(b) of the Public Health Service Act, an application for conditional approval of a new animal drug under section 571, an investigational device application under section 520(g), an application with respect to a device under section 515, or a request for an emergency use authorization under section 564 to support—

(A) the approval, licensure, registration, clearance, conditional approval, or authorization of a security countermeasure, qualified countermeasure, or qualified pandemic or epidemic product; or

(B) the new indication to an approved security countermeasure, qualified countermeasure, or qualified pandemic or epidemic product.

(3) The terms ‘qualified countermeasure’, ‘security countermeasure’, ‘qualified countermeasure’, and ‘qualified pandemic or epidemic product’ have the meanings given in such terms in sections 311, 312, and 319, respectively, of the Public Health Service Act.

(4) The extent to which the guidance issued under section 565(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bb–4(c)), entitled ‘Product Development Under the Animal Rule’ (as determined by the Secretary), and the guidance issued under section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bb–4), entitled ‘Product Development Under the Animal Rule’ (as determined by the Secretary), has assisted in achieving the purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall include—

(a) a discussion of the extent to which qualified animal models can advance the use of tools and technologies to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products, including through reliance on cross-referenced data and information contained within master files under section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and section 565 as added by subsection (b), and

(b) a discussion of the extent to which qualified animal models can advance the use of tools and technologies to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products, including through reliance on cross-referenced data and information contained within master files under section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and section 565 as added by subsection (b).

SEC. 604. ANIMAL RULE REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the application of the requirements under subsections (c) and (d) of section 565 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bb–4) to support and expedite the research and development of medical countermeasures, as applicable.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall publish draft guidance about how reliance on cross-referenced data and information contained within master files under section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (b) or submissions otherwise submitted to the Secretary may be used for specific technologies (including genome editing platform technologies) that have the potential to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products. The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall publish the final guidance not later than 3 years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. REVIEW OF THE BENEFITS OF GENOMIC ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES AND THEIR POTENTIAL ROLE IN NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) MEETING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’) shall convene a meeting to discuss the potential role advancements in genomic engineering (including genome editing technologies) may have in advancing national health security. Such meeting shall be held in a manner that does not compromise national security.

(b) ATTENDEES.—The attendees of the meeting under paragraph (1)—

(1) shall include—

(A) representatives from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, the National Institutes of Health, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Defense;

(B) representatives from academic, private, and nonprofit entities with expertise in genome engineering technologies, biopharmaceuticals, medicine, and biodefense, and other relevant stakeholders; and

(C) other representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services, as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, shall solicit input from stakeholders, including developers of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, qualified pandemic or epidemic products, and stakeholders developing technologies to assist in the development or manufacture of security countermeasures with respect to how the Food and Drug Administration can advance the use of tools and technologies to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products, including through reliance on cross-referenced data and information contained within master files and submissions previously submitted to the Secretary as set forth in section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (b).

(d) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall publish draft guidance about how reliance on cross-referenced data and information contained within master files under section 565(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (b) or submissions otherwise submitted to the Secretary may be used for specific technologies (including genome editing platform technologies) that have the potential to support and advance the development or manufacture of security countermeasures, qualified countermeasures, and qualified pandemic or epidemic products. The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall publish the final guidance not later than 3 years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 606. ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES AND MATERIALS SECURITY.
(A) the current state of the science of genomic engineering technologies related to national health security, including:

(i) medical countermeasure development, including efficiencies in the development pathway and detection technologies; and

(ii) the international and domestic regulation of products using genomic editing technologies; and

(B) national security implications, including:

(i) capabilities of the United States to leverage genomic engineering technologies as a part of the medical countermeasure enterprise, including current applicable research, development, and validation efforts undertaken within the Department of Defense;

(ii) the potential for state and non-state actors to utilize genomic engineering technologies as a national health security threat; and

(iii) security measures to monitor and assess the potential threat that may result from and interact with genomic engineering technologies and related technologies for the purpose of compromising national health security.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the meeting described in subsection (a) is held, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response shall issue a report to the congressional committees of jurisdiction on the topics discussed at such meeting, and provide recommendations, as applicable, to utilize genomic engineering (including genome editing) and related technologies as a part of preparedness and response activities to advance national health security. Such report shall be issued in a manner that does not compromise national security.

SEC. 607. REPORT ON VACCINES DEVELOPMENT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report describing efforts and activities to coordinate with other countries and international partners during recent public health emergencies with respect to the research and advanced research and development of, qualified pandemic or epidemic products (as defined in section 319F-3 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6d)). Such report may include—

(A) an accounting of information that is created or obtained during research and development of, qualified pandemic or epidemic products, such information shall not include information that may compromise national security.

(TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. REAUTHORIZATIONS AND EXTENSIONS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF MOSQUITO ABATEMENT FOR SAFETY AND HEALTH.

Section 317F (42 U.S.C. 247d–20) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(B)—

(A) by inserting “including programs to address emerging infectious mosquito-borne diseases, after “subdivisions for control programs’’; and

(B) by inserting “or improving existing control programs” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, including improvement,” after “operation”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) a public health emergency due to the incidence or prevalence of a mosquito-borne disease that presents a serious public health threat; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) a public health emergency due to the incidence or prevalence of a mosquito-borne disease that presents a serious public health threat; and

(IV) by striking “, including” after “the Secretary”;

and

(II) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) is located in a State that has received a grant under subsection (a); or

(II) that demonstrates to the Secretary that the consortium will exist State mosquito control plans or, other applicable State preparedness plans.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “that extraordinary” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(that extraordinary) and all that follows through the period at the end.”

(B) R EAUTHORIZATION OF MOSQUITO ABATEMENT FOR SAFETY AND HEALTH.

Section 317F (42 U.S.C. 247d–6d)) (as amended by the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6d)) shall not include information that may compromise national health security.

(C) by redesignating such section 405 as section 319L–1; and

D) by transferring such section 319L–1, as redesignated, to the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), to appear after section 319L of such Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(A) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act (Public Law 109–471) is amended by striking the item related to section 405.

(B) REFERENCE.—Section 319L(c)(4)(A)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) is amended by striking “section 405 of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act” and inserting “section 319L–1”.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Subsection (e)(1) of section 319L (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(1)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) NONDISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Information described in clause (ii) shall be deemed to be information described in section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

“(ii) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this clause is information identified to programs of the Department of Health and Human Services that could compromise national security and reveal significant and not otherwise publicly known vulnerabilities of the national or public health defenses against chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats, and is comprised of—

“(I) specific technical data or scientific information that is created or obtained during the countermeasure and product advanced research and development carried out under subsection (c);

“(II) information pertaining to the location security, personnel, and research materials and methods of high-containment laboratories conducting research with select agents, toxins, or other agents with a material threat determination under section 319F–2(c)(2); or

“(III) security and vulnerability assessments.”;

(B) by redesigning subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) REPORTING.—One year after the date of enactment of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on the number of instances in which the Secretary has used the authority under section 319L–1 to waive or delay the release of information from disclosure, as well as the nature of any request under section 552 of title 5, United States Code;
States Code that was denied using such authority.’’; and
(4) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking ‘‘12’’ and inserting ‘‘17’’.

SEC. 702. LOCATION OF MATERIALS IN THE STOCKPILE.

Subsection (d) of section 319F–2 (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b) is amended to read as follows:
‘‘(d) Federal agency may disclose under section 552 of title 5, United States Code any information identifying the location at which materials in the stockpile described in subsection (a) are stored, or other information regarding the contents or deployment capability of the stockpile that could compromise national security.’’.

SEC. 703. STRATEGY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE TO CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ‘‘Secretary’’) shall prepare and submit to the relevant committees of Congress a strategy for public health preparedness and response to address cybersecurity threats (as defined in section 102 of the Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501)) that present a threat to national health security. Such strategy shall include—

(A) identifying the duties, functions, and preparedness goals for which the Secretary is responsible in order to prepare for and respond to such cybersecurity threats, including metrics by which to measure success in meeting preparedness goals;

(B) identifying gaps in public health capabilities to achieve such preparedness goals; and

(C) strategies to address identified gaps and strengthen public health emergency preparedness and response capabilities to address cybersecurity threats.

(b) PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—The Secretary shall make such strategy available to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and other congressional committees of jurisdiction, in a manner that does not compromise national security.

SEC. 704. STRATEGY AND REPORT.

Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response and the Assistant Secretary for the Administration on Children and Families or other appropriate office, and in collaboration with other departments, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and other relevant congressional committees—

(1) a formal strategy, including interdepartmental positions and efforts to reunify children with their parents or guardians, in all cases in which such children have been separated from their parents or guardians as a result of the initiative announced on April 6, 2018, and due to prosecution under section 273(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326(a)), if the parent or guardian chooses such reunification and the child—

(A) was separated from a parent or guardian and placed into a facility funded by the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(B) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, remains in the care of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(C) can be safely reunited with such parent or guardian; and

(2) a report on challenges and deficiencies related to the oversight of, and care for, unaccompanied alien children in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services, including deficiencies identified and publicly reported by Congress, the Government Accountability Office, or the inspectors general of the Department of Health and Human Services or other Federal departments.

SEC. 705. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—Title III (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (5) of section 319F–1(42 U.S.C. 247d–9a(4)), by striking ‘‘section 319F(h)’’ each place such term appears and inserting ‘‘section 319F(e)’’; and

(2) in section 319K(a) (42 U.S.C. 247d–7a(a)), by striking ‘‘section 319F(h)(4)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 319F(e)(4)’’.

(b) PUBLIC HEALTH SECURITY GRANTS.—Section 319C–1(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 247d–3a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘individuals,’’ and inserting ‘‘individuals,’’; and

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking ‘‘make satisfactory annual improvement and describe’’ and inserting ‘‘makes satisfactory annual improvement and describes’’.

(c) EMERGENCY USE INSTRUCTIONS.—Subparagraph (f) of section 564A(c)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360bbb–3a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ‘‘(B) a report on challenges and deficiencies related to the oversight of, and care for, unaccompanied alien children in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services, including deficiencies identified and publicly reported by Congress, the Government Accountability Office, or the inspectors general of the Department of Health and Human Services or other Federal departments, in a manner that does not compromise national security.’’;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(B) PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGMENT.—In the case of the Secretary, pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii), make information publicly available, the Secretary shall provide on the internet website of the Food and Drug Administration an acknowledgment of the information that has not been disclosed, pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii).’’.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

DEBBIE SMITH ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 80, S. 820.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.
Mr. President, I so order.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 820) to strengthen programs authorized by the Debbie Smith Act of 2014.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 820

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 ‘‘Debbie Smith Act of 2019.’’

SEC. 2. DNA BACKLOG GRANT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘including’’ and inserting ‘‘prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations’’; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ‘‘including’’ and inserting ‘‘in particular’’;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(8) provide assurances that the DNA section of the laboratory to be used to conduct DNA analyses has a written policy that prioritizes the analysis of, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations, samples from homicides and sexual assaults;’’;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’;
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J. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am informed by my colleagues that by the terms of the Senate Rules, when an objection is made to the further consideration of a bill reported by a Senate committee, the Senate must recess to allow the Senate to return to consideration of the original bill. It is my understanding that it is the wish of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the original bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 80, S. 820, to remain in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(4) in subsection (g)—
(A) by redesignating paragraph (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and adjusting the margins accordingly;
(B) by striking ‘‘Not later’’ and inserting the following:
‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later’’; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
‘‘(2) REPORT ON PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Debbie Smith Act of 2019—
(A) the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall—
(i) define DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program-wide goals in clear, specific, and measurable terms;
(ii) use performance measures for each goal defined under clause (i) that fully reflect the appropriate attributes of successful performance measures according to recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office in the report entitled, ‘‘DNA Evidence: DOJ Should ImprovePerformance Measurement and Properly Design controls for Nationwide Grant Program’’ (GAO-19-216); and
(B) the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs shall fully establish all appropriate controls relating to conflicts of interest and to lobbying as reported by the Government Accountability Office in the report entitled, ‘‘DOJ Should Improve Performance Measurement and Properly Design controls for Nationwide Grant Program’’ (GAO-19-216).
‘‘(3) REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF GRANT PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States issues the 2018 report on the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program to improve on the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program based on the recommendations of the Comptroller General; and
(B) this section includes recommendations for reforms that could enhance the effectiveness of the program in reducing the backlog of unanalyzed DNA evidence in sexual assault cases.
‘‘(5) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 fiscal years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report on the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program to improve and establish all appropriate controls relating to conflicts of interest and to lobbying as required under paragraph (2)(A); and
‘‘(6) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘2015 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’.
‘‘(g) in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.—(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘including’’ and inserting ‘‘prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations’’; and
(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ‘‘including’’ and inserting ‘‘in particular’’;
(2) in subsection (b)—
(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;
(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
‘‘(8) provide assurances that the DNA section of the laboratory be conducted to conduct DNA analyses has a written policy that prioritizes the analysis of, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations, samples from homicides and sexual assaults.’’;
(3) in subsection (c)—
(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’; and
(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’;
(4) in subsection (g)—
(A) by redesignating paragraph (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and adjusting the margins accordingly;
(B) by striking ‘‘Not later’’ and inserting the following:
‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later’’; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
‘‘(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Debbie Smith Act of 2019—
(A) the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall—
(i) define DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program-wide goals in clear, specific, and measurable terms;
(ii) use performance measures for each goal defined under clause (i) that fully reflect the appropriate attributes of successful performance measures according to recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office in the report entitled, ‘‘DNA Evidence: DOJ Should Improve Performance Measurement and Properly Design controls for Nationwide Grant Program’’ (GAO-19-216); and
(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’.
‘‘(3) SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.
Section 205 of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking ‘‘2015 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’.
‘‘(4) SEC. 4. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF GRANT PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States issues the 2019 report on the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program, or 180 days after the date of enactment of the Debbie Smith Act of 2019—
(A) the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Debbie Smith Act of 2019’’.

SEC. 2. DNA BACKLOG GRANT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.
Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘including’’ and inserting ‘‘prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations’’; and
(B) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;
(2) in subsection (b)—
(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’; and
(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’;
(3) in subsection (g)—
(A) by redesignating paragraph (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and adjusting the margins accordingly;
(B) by striking ‘‘Not later’’ and inserting the following:
‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later’’; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
‘‘(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Debbie Smith Act of 2019—
(A) the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall—
(i) define DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program-wide goals in clear, specific, and measurable terms;
(ii) use performance measures for each goal defined under clause (i) that fully reflect the appropriate attributes of successful performance measures according to recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office in the report entitled, ‘‘DNA Evidence: DOJ Should Improve Performance Measurement and Properly Design controls for Nationwide Grant Program’’ (GAO-19-216); and
(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2019’’ and inserting ‘‘2019 through 2024’’.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous resolution that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered laid and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 820), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed as follows:
Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that—

(A) describes any action taken by the Department of Justice since the release of the 2018 report on the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program to improve the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program based on the recommendations of the Comptroller General; and

(B) includes recommendations for reforms that could enhance the effectiveness of the program in reducing the backlog of unanalyzed DNA evidence in sexual assault cases.

(4) DOD REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, and once every 3 fiscal years thereafter through fiscal year 2025, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report on the DNA analysis workloads at laboratories that participate in the Combined DNA Index System using data available from the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Grant Program or other sources that—

(A) describes, by year—

(i) the total number of new crime scene DNA analysis requests submitted to laboratories;

(ii) the total number of crime scene DNA analysis requests analyzed including, to the extent practicable and reported separately—

(I) the number analyzed at laboratories participating in Combined DNA Index System;

(II) the number of requests outsourced and analyzed at private laboratories;

(iii) the total number of DNA profiles from crime scene evidence uploaded to the Combined DNA Index System;

(iv) the total number of Combined DNA Index System hits and investigations aided resulting from the DNA profiles recovered from crime scene evidence;

(v) the number of outstanding crime scene DNA analysis requests at the end of each year and the number of such outstanding requests that are older than 30 days at the end of the year; and

(vi) to the extent practicable, the number of requests associated with sexual assault cases submitted to laboratories during the year and the number of such requests that are older than 30 days at the end of the year; and

(B) includes a determination as to—

(i) whether the National Institute of Justice has fully established all appropriate controls relating to conflicts of interest and to lobbying as required under paragraph (2)(A); and

(ii) whether the Office of Justice Programs has fully established all appropriate controls relating to conflicts of interest and to lobbying as required under paragraph (2)(B); and

(iii) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2015 through 2024”.

SEC. 2. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 2(2) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(b)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SUPPORTING AND TREATING OFFICERS IN CRISIS ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate pro-
Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 20; 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, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed in today’s session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, May 20.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under its previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:04 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 20, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS
Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY
WENDY VITTER, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

IN THE COAST GUARD
CAPT. BRENDAN C. MCPHERSON
CAPT. DOUGLAS M. SCHOFIELD
CAPT. ANDREW M. SUGIMOTO
CAPT. RICHARD V. TIMME
CAPT. TODD C. WIEMERS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
MATTHEW H. TUELLER, OF UTAH, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA
JANE L. CORWIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.
ROBERT C. SISSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.
LANCE V. YOHE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BRIAN J. BULATAO, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (MANAGEMENT).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
JEFFREY A. ROSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL.
CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR. DAVID A. HAMBURG
HON. NANCY PELOSI
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019
Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and enduring legacy of a giant of humanitarianism and a leader of conscience, who made lasting, life-saving contributions to the cause of eradicating violent conflict and eliminating human suffering: Dr. David Alan Hamburg.

Trained as a physician and psychiatrist, Dr. Hamburg led a career of incredible scope and immense impact, beginning with sweeping contributions made to the field of medicine from distinguished posts at hospitals, universities, research laboratories, and scientific and public policy organizations. “Ounce of prevention, ton of cure” was his favorite motto, and would guide him through all his work, from disease prevention to conflict resolution.

Dr. Hamburg followed his pioneering scholarship on disease prevention with studies of human behavior, specializing in the evolution of human violence. As a recognized authority on the study of aggression, stress and conflict, he revolutionized the worlds’ conception of civil conflict and warfare, led by his deep faith in the need to “mobilize human ingenuity” for peace. Much of his game-changing research was conducted alongside his beloved wife, the trailblazing and renowned Dr. Beatrice Hamburg.

At the helm of the prestigious Carnegie Corporation for fifteen years, Dr. Hamburg would use his belief in the power of prevention to create prosperity, as he launched initiatives for the advancement of civilization of a startling scale, from early childhood education to youth health to conflict resolution. He was a powerful and early force for the study of terrorism, violence and genocide, warning that for too long, scholars had treated these global priorities as “almost a nonsubject.”

His leadership was critical in conflict prevention and mitigation efforts, including through initiatives such as the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, co-chaired with former Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance, which studied ethnic and regional conflicts in Africa and the Balkans, and which was cited as one of the United Nation’s “major reference points” for peace efforts by Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon.

He was a respected voice among our colleagues in the Congress on nuclear non-proliferation, which is a pillar of America’s national security. His work to develop and pass proliferation, which is a pillar of America’s national security. His work to develop and pass the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and later bringing an estimated 50 relatives to America to escape the Nazi regime. This “firsthand knowledge [on] how brutal people could be” would be a powerful beacon for him, as he sought to bring resolution, cooperation and healing to the world. His enduring contributions to turn that painful legacy into a more peaceful future for others will be a lasting blessing for all.

May it be a comfort to Dr. Hamburg’s children, Eric and Margaret, his three grandchildren, David, Rachel and Evan, and all their loved ones that David has been reunited with the love of his life, Betty. May it also be a comfort that so many grieve with them and pray for them during this sad time.

IN RECOGNITION OF VA-10 UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ENLISTEES
HON. JENNIFER WEXTON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019
Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 27 high school seniors from Virginia’s 10th Congressional District who plan to enlist in the United States Air Force after graduation. These students have excelled over the course of their high school careers and I congratulate them on their graduation and their future plans.

I commend these student leaders for their courageous decision to pursue a path to serve their country as a member of the United States Air Force. I rise to recognize the following students: Denzel Abdullah, Ishmael Bobbitt, Mia Broady, Ivanna Jenkins, Michael Jones, Alexine Koowood, Kirsten Ladestron, Stefanie Marroquin, Jeremy Michaels, Kendal Riley, Kamaryn Sablan, Adam Sibal, Ian Allison, Shawn Bourne, Daniel Castano, Nicholas Featherton, Douglas Fienniken, Benjamin Hayams, Guillermo Lozano, Jayden Nowicki, Tim Rickard, Elijah Robinson, Sean Stewart, Amanda Vacher, John Zuñiga-Castaneda, Corbin Tucker, and Dallas Tucker.

The students were recognized at a ceremony conducted in Sterling, Virginia on May 16, 2019, by the Northern Virginia chapter of Our Community Salutes and the Blue Star Mothers of Northern Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and applauding these students and their families on their pursuits and wish them the best as they set forth to begin the process of learning to defend our country as a member of the United States Air Force.

IN RECOGNITION OF VA-10 UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ENLISTEES
HON. J. LUIS CORREA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019
Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the City of Garden Grove’s Fallen Five: Sergeant Myron L. Trapp, Officer Andy Reese, Officer Donald F. Reed, Officer Michael Rainford, and Master Officer Howard Dallies, Jr.—the officers Garden Grove has lost in the line of duty.

On October 6, 1959, Sergeant Myron L. Trapp was responding to a call involving a man who was angry about the noise from road work on his street. Trapp was trying to talk the man out of his house when a fellow officer approached the front door. The man fired his rifle through the door. The officer was shot in the face but struck and killed Trapp.
IN RECOGNITION OF VA–10 UNITED STATES ARMY ENLISTEES

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 24 high school seniors from Virginia’s 10th Congressional District who plan to enlist in the United States Army after graduation. These students have excelled over the past four years and are motivated to construct a child development center, a parsonage was built at 818 Martin Academy Street and was operated under the leadership of Rev. A. Monroe. During Rev. Monroe’s tenure as pastor, the church grew not only in size and in faith, but also in membership, having included several founding members who were instrumental to the development of the church.

These five brave men donned the uniform of the Garden Grove Police Department and they all sacrificed their lives to keep their community safe. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these officers for their service.

IN RECOGNITION OF NELSON CHAPEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH’S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Nelson Chapel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Bainbridge, Georgia as the church’s membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 150 years. The congregation will celebrate this very significant anniversary on Sunday, May 19, 2019, at the church located at 640 Hall Street.

Tracing its roots back to the post-Civil War era, the church was founded in 1869 when a group of slaves set off from their landowners’ church and boldly founded their own place of worship. The original church was located on Academy Street and was operated under the leadership of Rev. A. Monroe. During Rev. Monroe’s tenure as pastor, the church grew not only in size and in faith, but also in membership, having included several founding members who were instrumental to the development of the church.

Since its founding, Nelson Chapel AME Church has endured several additions and renovations, all of which help tell the story of the church. In 1902, the church relocated to its current location on Hall Street to a property donated by the late Mr. Adam Nelson. The foundation of the church was laid under the esteemed leadership of the late Rev. N.L. Holmes and the building was constructed during the pastorate of the late Rev. George Smith. In the 1970s, under the tutelage of Rev. C. E. Shepherd, the congregation was motivated to construct a child development center to provide a mishap and incorporate a mission to help the community. The center, which consisted of a fellowship hall, full kitchen, and a baptismal pool, was named for the late Dr. J.H. Griffin, M.D. and was managed for many years as the Dr. J.H. Griffin Educational Complex. In addition to the construction of the church and child development center, a parsonage was built at 818 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard for the comfort and living of the pastoral family.

This ardent community of believers has extended its circle to include more and more members as the years have gone by, though it has never lost its essential character. Today, the spirit and faith of its people are manifested through the current sanctuary, which includes an organ, carpeting, pulpit furniture, a modern sound system, the Carillon Tower Chimes, a paved parking lot, office space, and many other structural improvements. That same faith and spirit extend beyond the church doors, in the presence of members who give fully of themselves wherever they go.

Throughout the years, a number of pastors, deacons, and members contributed to its legacy, which boasts more than 300 members, eight choirs, a 70-member Young People’s Division (YPD), and many ministries to support the surrounding community and congregation. Because of their dedicated efforts, Nelson Chapel AME Church is the lead church in the Thomasville/Bainbridge District of the South Georgia Annual Conference, Sixth Episcopal District of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

The story of Nelson Chapel AME Church, which recounts a long history of a group of believers coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship the Lord, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in God.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the 730,000 residents of Georgia’s Second Congressional District, in paying tribute to Nelson Chapel AME Church in Bainbridge, Georgia for its congregation’s enduring commitment to each other and to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. May their actions continue to inspire the community in courage, in dedication, and in faith.

HONORING THE MCDONALD BAPTIST CHURCH ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 130TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DELAURIO
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. DELAURIO. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I introduce this resolution to honor the congregation of the Macedonia Baptist Church of Ansonia, Connecticut in extending my heartfelt congratulations on the celebration of their 130th Anniversary. Throughout its history, the Church and its congregation have demonstrated a unique commitment to serve the community and ensure that the most vulnerable of our citizens could find comfort and resources in their time of need.

In 1889, with the help of local businessman Franklin Farrel, a group of local African-American residents banded together to organize and incorporate a mission to help the community. It was soon to become the Macedonia Baptist Church. In addition to helping the group organize and incorporate the mission, the Farrel family donated a beautiful stained glass window, which remains today, as well as the bell for the belfry. Over the course of the last one hundred thirty years, the Macedonia Baptist Church has strengthened the bonds of faith and friendship and has become an iconic fixture in the community.

From its first Pastor, the Reverend Edward Johnson, who traveled from Yonkers and was so beloved that parishioners of all ages would meet him at the train station to escort him to church, to the Reverend Julian Taylor who served the ministry for more than four decades; and from the Reverend V. Loma St. Clair who expanded the reach of the Macedonia Baptist Church across the community, to today’s leadership of Pastor Alfred Lee Smith, Jr., the spiritual guidance that has led the congregation over time has not only provided parishioners with nourishment of the soul but encouraged them to make a difference in the community.

The Macedonia Baptist Church has not only been a center for religious worship, but a vehicle through which their members could give...
back to the community. Our churches play a vital role in our communities—providing people with a place to turn to for comfort when they are most in need. The Macedonia Baptist Church gives its members a place to find their spiritual center and to solidify and support their values as they reach hundred thirty years, the Macedonia Baptist Church has been a fixture in our community. Through their ministry and outreach efforts, they have left an indelible mark on our community and continue to make a difference in the lives of others. I am proud to stand today and extend my very best wishes to them as they reach this milestone in their history. Happy 130th Anniversary.

HONORING COPPER HILLS HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS STRICKEN BY CANCER

HON. BEN MCDAMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. MCDAMAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor two courageous teachers at a West Jordan, Utah high school and the students and faculty members who rallied around them when they were stricken by cancer.

Cancer is an insidious disease that doesn’t discriminate. It occurs in Utahns of all ages, incomes, professions and ethnic backgrounds. But students and faculty at Copper Hills High School in West Jordan have shown us how a community stands up to this disease.

Recently, Megan Butler, a physical education teacher at the school, along with 17 other faculty members, students and community members, all shaved their heads—as part of a “Brave to Shave” event. It was part of the school’s effort to raise money for children’s cancer research. But the hair itself went towards making a wig for Megan Butler, who was diagnosed with breast cancer. The Copper Hills Grizzlies raised more than $4,000.

Not only was the school dealing with Butler’s illness, students also lost a beloved English teacher—Michelle Szetela—to the disease. She was diagnosed with Stage four adenocarcinoma on March 11th and died just six days later. Tyler Carson, vice president of the school’s National Honor society chapter, shaved his head in Szetela’s honor.

All the participants said that events like this empower them in the fight against a remorseless opponent. Their hair will grow back and empower them in the fight against a remorseless opponent. Their hair will grow back and empower them in the fight against a remorseless opponent. Their hair will grow back and empower them in the fight against a remorseless opponent.

The students were recognized at a ceremony conducted in Sterling, Virginia on May 16, 2019, by the Northern Virginia chapter of Our Community Salutes and the Blue Star Mothers of Northern Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and applauding these students and their families on their pursuits and wish them the best as they set forth to begin the process of learning to defend our great nation and remember that we owe those who serve a debt of gratitude.

SUPPORTING THE DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

HON. JENNIFER GONZÁLEZ-COLON
OF PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Speaker, it is urgent to pass a Disaster Supplemental Bill.

Citizens across our nation—from California to the Carolinas, from Florida to the Northern Marianas and Puerto Rico, are counting on us to pass a bill that address the urgent needs caused by natural disasters.

The more that passage is delayed, the longer our communities will have to wait, because just passing the appropriation is the beginning of a long line of work.

I know my constituents are waiting, for the 600 million dollars for the Nutritional Assistance Program that I have long been advocating, which will cover a gap in funding under the supplemental appropriations made in the immediate aftermath of Hurricanes Irma and Maria. As of last month, these residents who have not fully recovered are already seeing a decrease in benefits because we have yet to pass a disaster bill.

They are also waiting, like those in many states and territories, for funds Congress already appropriated.

For example, after 20 months later, of some 42.3 Billion allocated to Puerto Rico, less than half has been obligated, and only 12.6 has been outlayed.

This funding is still being reviewed with great scrutiny by FEMA, by HUD, by the OMB Office of Regulatory Affairs.

The funds that have been disbursed are being used to pay for work already done or have strict definitions as to what these funds can be used for.

Conditions and requirements that slow the flow of funds has resulted in companies and nonprofits that did work and provided services are still waiting to get paid.

So I welcome the language included in the Disaster Supplemental passed by the House, that provides a firm deadline for OMB to publish the Federal Register guidance for use of funds so things can start moving.

I am also encouraged by the provision that extends the 100 percent federal cost share, which is essential for communities whose assets and sources of revenue were affected; and the language that FEMA “shall”, rather than just “may”, help rebuild to better standards. There provisions benefit all affected jurisdictions.

One thing we must still address is the definition of “critical services” eligible for Stafford Act support, which today does not include important elements such as first responders, nonemergency major medical services, solid waste and stormwater management, and emergency supply transportation.

That is why I presented H.R. 2242, which I proposed as an amendment to H.R. 2157 but was not made in order, to expand the definition of “critical services” for eligibility for FEMA disaster Public Assistance.

By allowing these important elements as critical services, we can ensure that communities will not need to deal with such a burden after having their own resources destroyed or exhausted in the initial response.

For example, not being able to get supplies out the port to where they were needed, and loss of access to major medical services, worsened the impact on the population in Puerto Rico.

My proposal would amend the Stafford Act to include emergency supply transportation, nonemergency medical, first response and security services, and stormwater management among the critical services for which Section 428 may be applied. I urge that my proposal receive the needed consideration.

Madam Speaker, it is up to Congress to continue the support for the recovery of all communities affected by these disasters. Let us do that.

CONGRATULATING LAKELAND COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I want to send my congratulations to the men and women of Lakeland Community Hospital in my hometown of Haleyville, Alabama as it marks 50 years of serving the people of Winston and Marion counties and the surrounding area.

Lakeland Community Hospital first opened its doors to patients on Monday, May 19, 1969. Known as Burdick-West Hospital for many years, it was originally owned by Winston County and governed by a nine-member hospital board. The original name came from Mr. Fred Burdick, then Chairman of the Winston County Commission during the establishment of the hospital, and from Haleyville businesswoman, Ms. Ila West, who donated the property to the county on which the hospital sits. The hospital was a two-story structure, with 32 beds served by 5 doctors. Later, a third floor was added to the hospital to accommodate more patients. Mr. Tillman Hill was the
first hospital administrator and the hospital thrived for many years under his direction.

Five decades after it opened, Lakeland Community Hospital is truly living up to its name, as it is owned and operated by the community. Now a 49-bed facility, under the administration of Martha McCormick, the hospital is committed to providing high-quality medical care in a friendly environment.

Lakeland’s medical staff includes 8 skilled physicians representing a wide range of medical specialties. The hospital is also equipped with some of the most advanced medical technology available today and provides services such as CT scans, nuclear medicine, digital mammography, senior care and medical detoxification. These tools help their doctors properly diagnose and treat a wide variety of illnesses with greater effectiveness than ever before.

Lakeland Community Hospital is the only hospital in Winston County, Alabama. Like many other rural hospitals, it recently faced the threat of closure. However, due to the hard work of the leaders such as Haleyville Mayor Ken Sunseri, the Haleyville City Council, the Winston County Commission and citizens of Winston County, the Haleyville Winston County Hospital Authority was created, and it has partnered with Java Medical to keep the hospital open and serving those in the area who need medical care.

I want to send my congratulations to the administration and the leadership and staff of Lakeland Community Hospital for their 50 years of service to the citizens of the entire area. I’m confident that in the years to come, Lakeland Community Hospital will be there to provide quality healthcare that is needed to Winston, Marion and surrounding counties.

IN RECOGNITION OF VA-10 UNITED STATES NAVY ENLISTEES

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 14 high school seniors from Virginia’s 10th Congressional District who plan to enlist in the United States Navy after graduation. These students have excelled over the course of their high school careers and I congratulate them on their graduation and their future plans.

I commend these student leaders for their courageous decision to pursue a path to serve their country as a member of the United States Navy. I rise to recognize the following students: Luis Bolivar, Judith George, Caleb German, Keldon Jones, Hanna Lund, Aedoyde Muhammad Yasin, German, Keldon Jones, Hanna Lund, Adeodye Muhammad Yasin, Luis Bolivar, Judith George, Caleb German, Keldon Jones, Hanna Lund, Adeodye Muhammad Yasin.

The students were recognized at a ceremony conducted in Sterling, Virginia on May 16, 2019, by the Northern Virginia chapter of Our Community Salutes and the Blue Star Mothers of Northern Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and applauding these students and their families on their pursuits and wish them the best as they set forth to begin the process of learning to defend our great nation and remember that we owe those who serve a debt of gratitude.

HONORING EDGAR G. GRIFFIN
HON. JUDY CHU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Edgar G. Griffin, who passed away in April at the age of 94. Mr. Griffin was a World War II veteran, proud member of the Knights of Columbus, and a longtime resident of California’s 27th Congressional District.

Mr. Griffin was born in Leon Guanajato, Mexico on December 7, 1924 and emigrated to Los Angeles as a teenager with his mother after the death of his father. Although he held American citizenship through his father, Mr. Griffin joined the Army to secure his mother’s residency. A member of the 101st airborne division of the Army, Mr. Griffin survived the Normandy landing on D-Day in 1944. He was awarded a Presidential Unit Citation for his service, as well as a Purple Heart and numerous other medals. At the time of his passing, Mr. Griffin was the only surviving Mexican-American veteran of the landing at Normandy.

After the war, Mr. Griffin returned to California, where he met his wife Mimi and they raised their nine children together. After first settling in the City of Commerce while Mr. Griffin worked in their Aircraft Assembly Radar Section of Hughes Aircraft, the family eventually moved to Monterey Park. There, he worked as a sound and lighting engineer for the Century Plaza Hotel, until he retired at the age of 68. He was also an active member of the Knights of Columbus, elected Grand Night four times.

Mr. Griffin was due to return to Normandy next month for the 75th anniversary of the D-Day invasion. He would have been nearly a century old and one of very few surviving veterans of the battle that heralded the end of World War II. While his passing deprived him of that distinction, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of a true American hero.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ CHANCELLOR GEORGE BLUMENTHAL
HON. JIMMY PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the retiring Chancellor of University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC), George Blumenthal, for his 47 years of service to our community on the central coast of California. His leadership has touched the lives of many, and I am honored to acknowledge this legacy.

Chancellor Blumenthal’s record in education has shown him to be a distinguished professor, researcher, and leader on the UCSC campus. He first joined the Astronomy and Astrophysics Department at UCSC in 1972 and was appointed as Chancellor of the university in 2007. Committed to expanding his involvement in public service, Chancellor Blumenthal has also served on multiple governing boards in California, including the California Association for Research in Astronomy, the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, and the Monterey Bay Economic Partnership.

Throughout his academic career, Chancellor Blumenthal’s work has led to numerous groundbreaking studies and discoveries in our understanding of galaxies and the interactions of celestial bodies. His work has transformed knowledge of concepts once seen only as science fiction, including the function and behavior of dark matter and how it plays a role in the shaping of the universe. His contributions cannot be overstated.

A natural leader, Chancellor Blumenthal has garnered praise from his associates, coworkers, and students. This past year, Santa Cruz Mayor, Martine Watkins, declared May 9th to be “George Blumenthal Day” in the city of Santa Cruz as an annual recognition of his scholarly and governing efforts. Chancellor Blumenthal’s decades of service make him more than just a former university leader; he is a hero of the American people.

As he celebrates his retirement, I am proud to commend Chancellor Blumenthal on his invaluable work as an academic leader for the past four decades. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Central Coast, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chancellor Blumenthal for his contribution to our community and wishing him a long and healthy retirement.

RECOGNIZING BOB DOROUGH
HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Dorough, a constituent of mine from Mt. Bethel, Pennsylvania. Bob’s music is universally known: generations of children have learned about the work that happens in this Chamber—along with their earliest lessons in health and science—from Schoolhouse Rock, which he scored.

Schoolhouse Rock is just one aspect of Bob’s legacy—his legendary seven-decade career as a jazz singer led him to play with many of the greatest musicians in American history, including Miles Davis and Charlie Parker. These performances etched his recordings into our country’s soundtrack forever.

A few weeks ago, Bob was posthumously honored at the Kennedy Center as a recipient of the 2019 Jazz Master Award—our nation’s highest recognition for jazz musicians. Through his family, friends, and each new generation that continues to discover the warmth of his voice and the uniquely American music that he loved, Bob’s spirit will endure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the following roll call.
votes. Had I been present for them, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call 203, H.R. 299, Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act—YEA; Roll Call 204, H.R. 2379, To reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program—YEA; Roll Call 205, Ordinance Quorum; Quorum Call of thePrevious Question on H. Res. 377—NAY; Roll Call 206, H. Res. 377—NAY; Roll Call 207, H.R. 312, Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act—YEA; Roll Call 208, 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 the Wampanoag Tribe of Res. 377—NAY; Roll Call 209, H.R. 1892, Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act—YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER of Missouri IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed votes on Wednesday, May 15, 2019. I had intended to vote "yes" on Roll Call vote 207, "yes" on vote 208 and "yes" on vote 209.

HONORING CHEF ESTEVAN JIMENEZ

HON. JIMMY PANETTA of California IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chef Estevan Jimenez for his exemplary community service on the central coast of California. Chef Jimenez’s important work with at-risk youth at Ranch Cielo has had a lasting impact on the community and continues to inspire young people to pursue careers in the culinary arts. Recently awarded the 2019 Chef of the Year by the American Culinary Federation’s Monterey Bay Chapter, Chef Jimenez exemplifies the very best of the Central Coast.

Chef Jimenez attended the California School of Culinary Arts Le Cordon Bleu program. He moved to Monterey shortly after graduating to work as a chef for Bon Appétit Management, handling the restaurants and events for the Monterey Bay Aquarium. Always exuding professionalism and expertise, Chef Jimenez was promoted in 2007 and eventually moved on to the position of executive sous chef at the Ventana Inn in Big Sur. He then returned to the Monterey Peninsula to work for Aqua Terra Culinary and eventually Rancho Cielo’s Drummond Culinary Academy. Over the years, Chef Jimenez has blazed a fiery trail in the culinary industry and has always promoted excellence and encouragement.

As executive chef of the Drummond Culinary Academy, Mr. Jimenez oversees all of the culinary education programs and acts as a mentor, undererved and disconnected youth to provide a path for a brighter future. Chef Jimenez has also volunteered his time for a variety of fundraising causes throughout Monterey County including the United Way, Salinas Rotary, Kinship Center, ASPCA, Meals on Wheels, Artichoke Festival, and Community Christmas Dinner of Monterey. Utilizing his culinary talents, Chef Jimenez has mentored and prepared our community throughout his career.

Chef Jimenez, it is my honor to recognize the incredible community service of the American Culinary Federation’s Monterey Bay Chapter 2019 Chef of the Year, Chef Estevan Jimenez, for his tremendous contributions to California’s 20th Congressional District. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking him for all that he has done for our community on the Central Coast and congratulating him on this prestigious award.

RECOGNIZING LAWRENCE GREAVES FOR HIS SERVICE AS SILVERDALE PORT COMMISSIONER

HON. DEREK KILMER of Washington IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the career of my constituent, Mr. Lawrence Greaves. Following nearly two decades of service as a Silverdale Port Commissioner, Mr. Greaves recently retired from the commission, leaving behind an impactful legacy in our region and in his hometown of Silverdale, Washington.

Mr. Greaves’ family roots were first planted in Silverdale when his great-grandfather, Charles Greaves, purchased land in what is recognized today as downtown Silverdale. Mr. Greaves was born and raised in Silverdale, where his parents, Lawrence and Ellen Greaves, owned a farm and local business. After graduating from Central Kitsap High School, he attended the University of Washington where he earned his bachelor’s degree in mechanical engineering. Mr. Greaves then began working for the Shell Oil Company, which moved his career to Ancortes, Washington, and then to Wood River and Chicago, Illinois.

Eventually, Mr. Greaves found his way back to Silverdale, where he tested torpedoes at the Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division in Keyport. Following his retirement, Mr. Greaves began his service as a Commissioner at the Port of Silverdale, where he spent the next 20 years overseeing port facilities, as well as making marked improvements upon the expansion, improvement, and programming of the Port of Silverdale.

His dedication to the community and to the Port of Silverdale will long be recognized, and I am especially grateful for his continued service to our region. Congratulations, Mr. Greaves.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF SRI LANKA’S CIVIL WAR

HON. BRAD SHERMAN of California IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize 50 years of outstanding work by Cornerstone Services in Will County, Illinois. On March 20, 1969 a group of community members, parents and civic leaders launched the Will County Sheltered Workshop to create employment opportunities for adults with disabilities. Later renamed Cornerstone Services, the organization greatly expanded their services as the demand for assistance grew.

Since the 1990s, Cornerstone has extended its reach across Will and Kankakee Counties as they focus on moving individuals in need of special assistance out of larger facilities and into smaller neighborhood group homes. In 2018, the program provided a record 187 new jobs for individuals with disabilities, delivering $1.6 million in wages. Today, Cornerstone provides services to over 1,200 people per day.

I would like to thank Cornerstone Services for its commitment to the citizens of Illinois.
TRIBUTE TO ELLEN TAUSCHER

HON. JACKIE SPEIER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the lifelong contributions made by Ellen Tauscher, who led the charge in every aspect of her life, from politics to world diplomacy and from Wall Street to motherhood.

She was a woman with strong convictions, a steel backbone, and an unshakable moral compass. As a Democratic centrist she didn’t let party politics rule every decision and bucked a lot of trends.

Ellen never met an obstacle she couldn’t overcome. Frustrated as a working mother struggling with lack of access to quality childcare, she wrote a book to help other moms and put her money and her time where her mouth was by founding a service to screen prospective child-care providers and donating hundreds of thousands of dollars to California and Texas schools.

She broke new ground as one of the first women to hold a seat on the New York Stock Exchange. At age 25, she was the youngest woman there ever. Ellen also was an officer on the American Stock Exchange and worked as an investment banker and bond trader for 14 years before she became one of the driving forces behind Sen. DIANNE FEINSTEIN’s successful 1992 bid for the U.S. Senate.

In 1996, Ellen ran against Congressman William P. Baker, the Republican incumbent, in a heavily conservative district in the East Bay. She won the race, and the votes of many Republican women, with her common-sense campaign in favor of access to abortion, increased spending on education, gun-control legislation, and focus on fiscal responsibility.

She served 13 years in Congress, including her work in the House Armed Services Committee, formerly known as the National Security Committee, and as chairwoman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Ellen’s interest in arms control and nuclear weapons was a key asset during her tenure as a diplomat in the Obama Administration. She was integral to the negotiation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 2010, which brought American and Russian nuclear arsenals to their lowest levels in nearly 60 years. As Hillary Clinton said, “She made American and the world safer through her work on arms control . . .”

And she did all of this with a beautifully infectious smile that lit up any room she entered.

My heart goes out to Ellen’s daughter, Katherine, and her other family members who lost her far too soon. I can only hope that they are able to take some comfort in knowing Ellen’s legacy to make the world a better, safer place will live on.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DUCK BOAT SAFETY ACT, TO IMPLEMENT SAFETY REGULATIONS RELATED TO AMPHIBIOUS PASSENGER VESSELS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce the Duck Boat Safety bill, to implement safety regulations for amphibious passenger vessels. These safety recommendations were made by federal agencies to address known problems associated with duck boats that have resulted in far too many injuries and fatalities.

I became aware of these problems when my constituents, the Coleman family, were involved in a horrible duck boat accident on July 19, 2018 in Branson, Missouri. Tia Coleman was one of only two survivors in her family of 11, losing her husband Glenn and her children Reece (nine years old), Evan (seven years old), and Arya (one year old). Tia’s 13-year-old nephew, Donovan Coleman, was the other surviving family member, losing his mother Angela, his younger brothers, Maxwell (two years old), his uncle Ervin (76 years old) and Butch (70 years old), and his aunt Belinda (69 years old). Boarding a duck boat on Table Rock Lake started out as a fun outing for this family, but it turned into an unspeakable tragedy when the boat capsized and sank. Seventeen of the 31 passengers on board were killed.

Investigations by state and federal authorities are still underway, and lawsuits are pending over the specifics of this incident. But there is a long record of problems associated with duck boat operations that should be addressed now. Since 1999, more than 40 people have died in duck boat accidents, the vast majority of them from drowning when the vessel sinks. In 2002, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) issued recommendations to improve the safety of the vessels in cases of flooding or sinking, but little has been done to implement those measures. We know from these past incidents that more can be done to make these vessels safe. Congress does not need to wait to act.

While we wait to learn more about the specific circumstances and causes that led to the tragedy on Table Rock Lake, this legislation would implement the NTSB’s past recommendations to improve the safety of duck boats (officially referred to as “amphibious passenger vessels”) to stay afloat in a flooding or sinking vessel.

Specifically, this bill would direct the Coast Guard to issue regulations within one year of enactment to require operators of amphibious passenger vessels to retrofit their vessels to provide reserve buoyancy. Vessel operators would have no longer than two years to comply with the requirements.

While vessel operators work to comply with the reserve buoyancy requirements, this bill directs them to implement interim measures to improve vessel safety, including:

a. Removing canopies from vessels for waterborne operations, or replacing canopies with structures that do not restrict escape in the event of flooding or sinking;

b. If canopies are removed, requiring that all passengers wear a personal flotation device while the vessel is on the water;

c. Permanently closing all unnecessary access plugs and reducing through-hull penetrations to the minimum number and size necessary;

d. Installing independently-powered electric bilge pumps;
e. Installing no fewer than four independently-powered bilge alarms;
f. Mandating inspections of vessels in water after each through-hull penetration;

g. Verifying watertight integrity of vessels in the water at the outset of each waterborne departure;

h. Otherwise complying with existing Coast Guard regulations related to the inspection, configuration, and operation of such vessels.

Those vessels that do not meet the one-year deadline to implement interim safety measures, as well as those that do not meet the two-year deadline to install reserve buoyancy systems, would be prohibited from operating on U.S. waterways until they are compliant.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill to make common-sense corrections to the persistent safety problems facing duck boats so that no other family must face the kind of tragedy experienced by my constituents on Table Rock Lake. I urge the House to support this bill.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for the 7th annual Infrastructure Week, which runs May 13 through 20. America’s businesses, workers, citizens, and elected leaders from all levels of government are all united around one message: America’s future will be shaped by the infrastructure choices we make today.

In the 116th Congress, my fellow Transportation and Infrastructure Committee colleagues and I are working across the aisle to achieve key objectives for the people, including creating and sustaining family-wage jobs, improving the daily lives of Americans, preserving and protecting our environment, building sustainable and resilient communities, and ensuring U.S. economic competitiveness.

Specifically, in my home state of Texas, we have worked to establish milestones such as laying the groundwork for the Texas Central high-speed passenger rail line which will connect the fourth and fifth largest economies in the country in less than 90 minutes. In Dallas, there are currently over $2 billion dollars in active highway projects and an additional $1.5 billion in design-build projects. In Congressional District 30 alone, there are $1 billion dollars worth of projects under construction. Other investments include a new 26-mile regional transit passenger rail line, an airport runaway realignment project, and expansions of one of the largest inland ports as well as major interstates and highways. These efforts have contributed to a $7 billion-dollar economic impact and nearly 67,000 jobs.

While we are focused on the need for sustainable infrastructure, we must also highlight and for its contribution to the communities of Will and Kankakee Counties.
the need for diversity and inclusion as well. We must recognize the importance of having individuals with various backgrounds at the table, creating innovative solutions to address new transportation needs that truly help all communities. Programs such as the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Women & Girls in Transportation Initiative (WITI) or the Small Business Administration’s 8(a) Business Development Program are great opportunities to foster an inclusive environment that encourages, supports, and celebrates our similarities and differences.

Above all, Infrastructure Week highlights the apparent need for investment. Our nation’s infrastructure is crumbling, and we can’t wait another day to act. At this critical juncture, it is imperative that Congress moves with expediency in addressing these pressing issues, as it is essential to the quality of life of our citizens and the vitality of our economy.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019
SPEECH OF
HON. AL LAWSON, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 2019

The House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2157) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a historic neighbor-ghood in the Historic District of Newport News, Virginia. The Historic Truxtun Community in Portsmouth, Virginia will celebrate its centennial on May 18, 2019. To mark the occasion, I would like to take a moment to highlight the history of this neighborhood and recognize its contributions to our community.

The community of Truxtun was named after Thomas Truxtun, a Revolutionary War sailor who was known for successfully capturing British ships during the Revolutionary War. He went on to become the Commandant of the USS President. There have been six United States Navy ships named in his honor. The Truxtun community sits on 43 acres of land within walking distance of the Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, Virginia. It was constructed in 1918 as a project of the U.S. Housing Corporation to address the housing shortage for shipbuilders employed at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard. At the time, the United States had just entered World War I and the newly developed Naval Operating Base was gearing up to assist with the war effort.

Truxtun stands out in United States history as the first government housing project developed for African-Americans. The neighborhood had 250 lots consisting of duplexes and five-bedroom single family homes. The homes Truxtun had a distinguished style—exposed rafter ends, jerkinhead roofs, and central chimneys. Truxtun homes also offered indoor plumbing and electricity at a time where many people, especially African Americans, did not have access to such amenities. Despite the modern architecture and amenities in Truxtun, it was still a segregated community. Because of the Supreme Court’s 1896 decision in Plessy v. Ferguson, Jim Crow segregation laws forced blacks to reside in Truxtun while whites lived in their own newly developed government housing project called Cradock.

Those who relocated to Truxtun considered the community tight-knit and vibrant. Rents were affordable and started at $17.50 per month. Southern black workers were happy to abandon their agricultural lives and start fresh with higher wages and improved working conditions. Truxtun helped transformed the Hampton Roads region and the region benefited economically, socially and culturally.

The Truxtun neighborhood was developed with a “new urbanism” style and had everything a town needed to thrive. From its own convenience store, school and church to civic leagues and sporting events, this town provided residents a place to live, play and shop within an easy commute to the shipyard. The neighborhood had four policemen, a town manager and even a townhouse to do official work. Since Truxtun was formed as an independent township within what was then Norfolk County, its locally elected town manager could levy taxes and provide public services.

This is, until Portsmouth acquired the community in 1923.

100 years after its founding, Truxtun is experiencing a revival that places it as one of Portsmouth’s most prized cultural centers. In 1982, Truxtun was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was one of the first out of about 100 federally financed housing projects during World War I, and it remains a national model for communities that are looking to plan and build inclusive, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the residents of Truxtun on their centennial celebration and for helping to make Portsmouth a great place to live and raise a family.

CELEBRATING WORLD DOG DAY 2019
HON. ALICE HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, today I am honored to rise today to recognize and celebrate World Dog Day 2019, which will take place on Saturday, May 18th in West Hollywood, CA. Created by my good friend, Lisa Vanderpump and the Vanderpump Dog Foundation in 2016, World Dog Day is a day focusing on the celebration of our furriest family members by recognizing the impact that dogs bring to our everyday lives. This celebration draws attention to the amazing, empathetic creatures that dogs are, while also raising awareness about global dog abuse that sadly still exists today.

Our love for these animals, without the necessary activism, can’t protect themselves from abuse or neglect. This event is so critically important in taking a stand against the abuse of animals and being united in the fight against the global dog meat trade.

Sadly, dogs and other animals across our nation and around the world suffer abuse from animal fighting, to torture, inhumane research testing, and abuse in puppy mills. We must advocate for all animals who cannot defend themselves and ensure their overall well-being and safety.

In the 115th Congress, I was proud to work with Lisa, Dr. John Sessa, and the Vanderpump Dog Foundation on passing H. Res. 401, a resolution urging all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade and to enforce existing laws against such trade. Their steadfast leadership and unwavering commitment to the welfare of animals is truly inspiring.

Passage of H. Res. 401 was a culmination of years of hard work and dedication. From the bottom of my heart, I cannot thank them enough, along with the thousands of activists around the country and across the globe for all of their efforts. Lisa, John, and the Vanderpump Dog Foundation have never wavered in their commitment to fight against the global dog meat trade. I am honored to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with them to champion this effort, sending a strong signal to the world that the welfare of animals must be taken seriously.

As we celebrate World Dog Day 2019, we must come together to raise awareness about global dog abuse and work to end this horrific and barbaric practice once and for all.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Lisa Vanderpump, Dr. John Sessa, and the Vanderpump Dog Foundation on what I am certain will be another successful World Dog Day. I look forward to our continued work on animal welfare issues for years to come.
HONORING DR. STUART DORSEY

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Stuart Dorsey, an educator, an innovator, and a leader.

Dr. Dorsey currently serves as the President of Texas Lutheran University in Seguin, Texas. He began his tenure in the summer of 2011 and will conclude his work at TLU on June 30, 2019.

Dr. Dorsey’s story is one that exhibits commitment and dedication at every turn. Dr. Dorsey earned his bachelor’s degree in economics from the University of South Dakota. From there, he earned both his Master and doctor of philosophy in economics from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. He then served the public in the U.S. Department of Labor before joining the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance where he was the Committee’s Chief Economist from 1982 to 1984.

Dr. Dorsey then began his career in academia as an associate professor of economics at West Virginia University. He went on to serve as Dean of the Faculty at Baker University in Kansas and then as Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Evansville in Indiana. Afterward, he served as the President of the University of Redlands in California until he became the President of Texas Lutheran University.

Over the past eight years, Dr. Dorsey oversaw tremendous change to the university’s campus and culture. Under his leadership, the university completed a freshmen residence hall, a studio theatre, and a School of Music building. Dr. Dorsey also oversaw the completion of Bulldog Stadium, which has allowed the university to host football games and track and field events on campus for the first time in its history. Through these accomplishments, Dr. Dorsey has laid a strong foundation for the university to continue its success.

Furthermore, Dr. Dorsey expanded the university’s academic influence by leading the creation of several new programs of study, including a popular undergraduate program in nursing and graduate programs in accounting, data analytics, and athletic training.

Dr. Dorsey has worked tirelessly to expand opportunities for the students and community of TLU. His unwavering devotion to his students’ success is evident and furthered by his wife Michelle’s equally impressive dedication to service. Through their combined efforts, the university was named a Great College to Work for seven years in a row.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Dorsey has worked endlessly to make a difference in the lives of Central Texans. His efforts have made him a pillar of the community and an example to us all. It is an honor to represent selfless, committed individuals like him. I wish him and his wife Michelle nothing but the best as they begin retirement in California.

HONORING OHIO’S LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EFFORTS TO KEEP THEM SAFE

HON. DAVID P. JOYCE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women of Ohio’s law enforcement. As a former prosecutor, I know all too well the danger our heroes face in blue face every day to protect us and our families, and I applaud the efforts made to ensure their safety.

Just the other night, in observance of National Police Week, I was proud to vote to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program, which provides critical resources to state, local and tribal jurisdictions to purchase bulletproof body armor for law enforcement officers.

For 30 years, bullet-resistant body armor has protected law enforcement officers. According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in 2012 alone, protective vests were directly attributable to saving the lives of at least 33 law enforcement and corrections officers in 20 different states.

However, much of the body armor used today slows down and fatigues our officers due to overbearing weight and discomfort levels. As arms and ammunitions continue to become more powerful, we must do the necessary research to develop next generation body armor that addresses these challenges. I am proud to say that we have organizations in Ohio, like ShotStop, that are doing just that. Due to their light weight and dynamic material, ShotStop’s bullet-resistant products create a safer environment for the brave men and women in blue who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities.

Madam Speaker, please join me in applauding ShotStop and all other organizations that are working to ensure our officers are better equipped to return home safely to their loved ones. At the end of each shift, I am proud to support Ohio’s law enforcement officers, not just during National Police Week, but each and every day, and commend those who are doing all they can to protect them.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AFGHAN ALLIES PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation would authorize 4,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visas and require the State Department to report to Congress on the obstacles to protecting Iraqi and Afghan allies as well as suggestions for improving the program.

Since 2002, the United States Government has employed thousands of Afghan and Iraqi allies to serve alongside U.S. troops, diplomats, and other government employees. As a result of their service, these allies and their families have become the targets of anti-American persecution and violence. As U.S. Government agencies and personnel continue to rely on local partners to ensure critical mission capabilities, Afghan and Iraqi partners continue to be threatened, abducted, or assassinated for their willingness to assist the United States.

With broad bipartisan support, Congress created two Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) programs to provide pathways to safety for Iraqis and Afghans whose work with and allegiance to the U.S. Government has exposed them to direct threats, jeopardizing their safety and that of their loved ones. Although the Iraqi SIV program stopped accepting applications in 2010, the Afghan SIV program continues protecting Afghan allies to this day.

In recent years, the SIV applicant backlog has continued to grow while Congress has struggled to allot enough visas to bring our allies to safety in the United States. While the recent Fiscal Year 2019 omnibus spending bill authorized 3,500 SIVs, the backlog remains at nearly 20,000 Afghans. Worse, the processing times for existing applications has slowed dramatically, forcing many to wait for years while living in fear of being targeted. Due to these issues and others facing the program, SIV arrivals have fallen by more than half over the last fiscal year.

This legislation makes more visas available for the thousands of applicants in the pipeline and starts the process of improving the program so our allies can be brought to safety faster. The safety of these brave men and women, security of our troops, and our international standing depend on the United States be true to our word. We can’t leave anyone behind.

RECOGNIZING HOWARD BRODSKY

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard Brodsky, who is receiving the Global Leadership Award from the World Affairs Council of New Hampshire on May 19, 2019. A Manchester native and a pioneer of the cooperative business model, Mr. Brodsky has dedicated his life to helping entrepreneurs and small business compete in the global marketplace.

As the Chairman, Co-founder, and Co-Chief Executive Officer of CCA Global Partners, Mr. Brodsky created the second largest private company in the state of New Hampshire, comprised of 13 affiliated companies with total sales of over $10 billion. Mr. Brodsky has dedicated his career to building a model for arms and ammunitions continues to be a problem due to overbearing weight and discomfort levels. As arms and ammunitions continue to become more powerful, we must do the necessary research to develop next generation body armor that addresses these challenges. I am proud to say that we have organizations in Ohio, like ShotStop, that are doing just that. Due to their light weight and dynamic material, ShotStop’s bullet-resistant products create a safer environment for the brave men and women in blue who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities.

Madam Speaker, please join me in applauding ShotStop and all other organizations that are working to ensure our officers are better equipped to return home safely to their loved ones. At the end of each shift, I am proud to support Ohio’s law enforcement officers, not just during National Police Week, but each and every day, and commend those who are doing all they can to protect them.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AFGHAN ALLIES PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation would authorize 4,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visas and require the State Department to report to Congress on the obstacles to protecting Iraqi and Afghan allies as well as suggestions for improving the program.

Since 2002, the United States Government has employed thousands of Afghan and Iraqi allies to serve alongside U.S. troops, diplomats, and other government employees. As a result of their service, these allies and their families have become the targets of anti-American persecution and violence. As U.S. Government agencies and personnel continue to rely on local partners to ensure critical mission capabilities, Afghan and Iraqi partners continue to be threatened, abducted, or assassinated for their willingness to assist the United States.

With broad bipartisan support, Congress created two Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) programs to provide pathways to safety for Iraqis and Afghans whose work with and allegiance to the U.S. Government has exposed them to direct threats, jeopardizing their safety and that of their loved ones. Although the Iraqi SIV program stopped accepting applications in 2010, the Afghan SIV program continues protecting Afghan allies to this day.

In recent years, the SIV applicant backlog has continued to grow while Congress has struggled to allot enough visas to bring our allies to safety in the United States. While the recent Fiscal Year 2019 omnibus spending bill authorized 3,500 SIVs, the backlog remains at nearly 20,000 Afghans. Worse, the processing times for existing applications has slowed dramatically, forcing many to wait for years while living in fear of being targeted. Due to these issues and others facing the program, SIV arrivals have fallen by more than half over the last fiscal year.

This legislation makes more visas available for the thousands of applicants in the pipeline and starts the process of improving the program so our allies can be brought to safety faster. The safety of these brave men and women, security of our troops, and our international standing depend on the United States be true to our word. We can’t leave anyone behind.

RECOGNIZING HOWARD BRODSKY

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard Brodsky, who is receiving the Global Leadership Award from the World Affairs Council of New Hampshire on May 19, 2019. A Manchester native and a pioneer of the cooperative business model, Mr. Brodsky has dedicated his life to helping entrepreneurs and small business compete in the global marketplace. As the Chairman, Co-founder, and Co-Chief Executive Officer of CCA Global Partners, Mr. Brodsky created the second largest private company in the state of New Hampshire, comprised of 13 affiliated companies with total sales of over $10 billion. Mr. Brodsky has dedicated his career to building a model for
Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Madam Speaker, I proudly recognize the impressive record of achievement of Leadership Niagara, the longest running leadership development organization in New York State. Headquarters in Niagara Falls, a city I proudly represent and home to one of the Wonders of the World, this binational program provides individuals of all ages the skills necessary to forge a better and more productive future for themselves, their companies and the communities of Western New York and Southern Ontario.

For more than 35 years, Leadership Niagara has served as a premier leadership resource to those who desire to observe the passion, desire and willingness to work to effect positive change in all aspects of their lives, including the companies and communities they represent.

Leadership Niagara’s mission to strengthen regional leadership is reflected in their time-honored tradition of the Annual Leader of the Year Awards Ceremony. Now in its 29th year, this program delivers a powerful message that builds on the example, motivation and success of those being recognized for their transformational leadership in a variety of fields.

This year, Leadership Niagara has selected five individuals and one organization that exemplify collaboration, innovation and leadership. They include Kenneth Sass, Lifetime Achievement Award, Father James J. Maher, Leader of the Year; The Niagara Falls Boys and Girls Club, Organization of the Year; Bonnie Kane Ph.D., Distinguished Alumnus; Alicia Laible-Kenyen, Emerging Leader and Ethan Menges, Youth Leader. These honorees are most deserving for the strides they have made in the promotion of positive change and strong leadership regardless of title, age, education, industry or boundaries.

Kenneth Sass served a community in need with determination and kindness as the long-time president of Pinnacle Community Services, formerly Family and Children’s Services of Niagara County. In December 2018, Mr. Sass worked for Pinnacle Community Services for 25 years, the past 21 as president and CEO. It was during his tenure that he spearheaded two capital campaigns, totaling $3.3 million, to build the agency’s first new headquarters in 100 years and the Niagara Family Center, a multi-service collaboration between seven nonprofit agencies. Programs were also expanded and developed to better address serious issues including mental health, domestic violence, child abuse and chronic medical illnesses. His dedication to those he serves underscores what it means to be a compassionate leader.

Father James J. Maher’s selection as Leader of the Year is an inspired choice. A member of the Vincentian community, he was appointed the 26th president of Niagara University in 2013. Since becoming president, Father Maher has focused on advancing the academic reputation of the university, building an international and diverse campus community and shaping the university’s commitment to the revitalization of Niagara Falls and Western New York. His deep commitment to the Vincentian mission of service is reflected in his actions and words that included his belief that “Niagara University should function as a bridge to people in everyday distress, including poverty.” Father Maher is that bridge.

The Niagara Falls Boys and Girls Club is Leadership Niagara’s organization of the year for their commitment to serving the community and creating healthy youth and families. For more than 80 years, they have focused on academic success, career and leadership development. With an annual membership of over 1400 young people, ranging from five to twenty-one years old, the Niagara Falls Boys and Girls Club lives its mission to provide appropriate and diversified programs and activities that teach skills needed to build positive lives, attitudes & behaviors. An invaluable community asset, their dedication to education, healthy living and leadership provides a model to follow for other Western New York organizations.

Bonnie Kane, Ph.D., has been a Leadership Niagara member since 2017 and is being recognized as this year’s Distinguished Alumnus. Since receiving her M.A. in School Psychology from the University of Buffalo and a Ph.D. in Counseling, School and Educational Psychology from Niagara University, this principled and purposeful dynamo has worked in the Niagara Falls City School District as a school psychologist and as co-department chair for special education. Her commitment to lifting the lives of others is evidenced by her ability to listen, learn and guide students on career paths while promoting the importance of education and mentorship. Dr. Kane is a treasured resource whose belief in the dignity and rights of all people makes our community a better place to live.

This year’s Emerging Leader is Alicia Laible-Kenyen, Executive Director of Elderwood Health Plan (Niagara Advantage). Responsible for the outcomes of this managed long-term care plan, Alicia has led this effort to provide access to affordable and quality health care for individuals with chronic health issues and older adults. Her efforts enable many others to remain healthy, independent and able to reside in their own homes. Unafraid of a challenge, her commitment to ensuring a healthier community makes her a worthy recipient.

Leadership Niagara has again underscored the fact that age is no barrier to leadership and has recognized this potential in Ethan Menges of Lockport High School as this year’s Youth Leader. As a student athlete, he leads by example on and off the field. Through his years at Lockport High School, he has been an active participant in career, education and life skills development programs through internships and community events. He understands that he and his classmates must be prepared and ready to be a part of positive and constructive interaction in today’s world and is a model example of what it means to be a leader.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Leadership Niagara for its significant contributions to the Western New York Community as they gather together on May 17 to honor this year’s most worthy recipients at the Leader of the Year Awards Ceremony.

HONORING UNITA ZELMA BLACKWELL
HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Unita Zelma Blackwell on her great contributions to civil rights activism.

Born in Lula in 1933 into a sharecropping family, Blackwell left Mississippi as a child to attend school in West Helena, Arkansas, because black children weren’t allowed to consistently attend school at that time in the Mississippi Delta. Blackwell forfeited school at the eighth grade and began sharecropping with her family.

During the early 70s, Blackwell became an important pillar in the civil rights movement in the South. She served as a project director and field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), helping organize voter drives for African Americans across Mississippi. These efforts landed her in jail at least 70 times.

In 1967, she co-founded Mississippi Action Community Education, a community development organization which helped districts to incorporate as towns. Incorporation enabled them to set their geographical boundaries so that they could have a legal identity—an important advantage when they wanted government help in installing streetlights or electricity.

In 1976, Unita Blackwell became the first African American woman mayor in the state of Mississippi (Mayersville, MS) where she developed the city’s infrastructure with an annual $30,000 budget. She also served as an advisor to Presidents Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton.


Her son, Jeremiah Blackwell, Jr., informed Mississippi Today of his mother’s death on Monday, May 13, 2019 at age 86.

Madam Speaker, today I honor the life of Ms. Unita Blackwell for her many contributions to education, civil rights, and the great state of Mississippi. Blackwell made a career of serving others, and her work had a direct and positive influence on the lives of thousands.
Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the second vote series on May 15, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 209.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding constituent, a friend, and a truly remarkable woman, Irene Schafer.

May 16 is Irene's 89th birthday, and I can attest that those 89 years have been spent tirelessly serving those around her. Service to her community is who Irene is.

Irene is 15 years on the Board of Directors and 20 years on the Board of Advisors. In addition, Irene has been a dedicated member of the Dickinson Community Foundation for over 20 years, during which she has served as a volunteer, a member of the Board of Directors, and a member of the Capital Campaign Committee.

The Power of 100 Women donated more than $15,000 to help open Hope's Landing, a sober-living home in Dickinson for women suffering from addiction. The group donated $10,000 to the Dickinson Backpack Program to purchase 2,000 backpacks for schoolchildren in need. Most recently, the group donated $20,000 to Project H.E.R.O. (Helping Educators Reach Out), a non-profit organization ensuring that children are eating lunch every day. Since its founding, the organization’s members have donated over $240,000 to community-serving organizations.

Irene's mission in life is to build a great community and she is doing that every day through her community service. My warmest greetings to Irene on her 89th birthday. Blessings to her and her family on this special occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF IRENE SCHAFER

HON. KELLY ARMSTRONG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding constituent, a neighbor, and a dedicated community servant, Irene Schafer.

Irene Schafer has been a tireless advocate for the community and serves on the board of the Community Food Bank of the Dickinson Area and is the founder of the Backpack Program. She is a strong supporter of education and has been instrumental in the development of the Dickinson Public Schools Foundation.

Irene is the recipient of the 2018 Community Service Award from the Dickinson Area Chamber of Commerce and has been recognized by the Dickinson City Commission for her dedication to the community.

Irene Schafer is an example of what it means to be a dedicated community servant and a true role model for all of us. She has made a significant impact on the lives of those around her and continues to be an inspiration to all.

IN RECOGNITION OF HONORED CITIZEN

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this resolution honoring retired Congressman John Conyers on the occasion of his 90th Birthday. Congressman Conyers was born in Highland Park, Michigan, on May 16, 1929, and grew up in the city of Detroit. Like many men of his generation, he served in the military and was stationed in Korea, where he became a First Lieutenant in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, where he was awarded combat and merit citations.

Following the completion of his military service, he earned both his B.A. (1957) and LL.B. (1958) degrees from Wayne State University and became an active member of the Michigan Bar. He had the distinction of working on the staff of Congressman John Dingell, serving as counsel to Detroit-area labor union locals and as a referee for Michigan’s workers’ compensation department.

His commitment to civil rights was forged during the great movement of the 1960’s, when traveling throughout the South, and was in Selma, Alabama, for the Freedom Day voter registration drive in 1963. In correspondence, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., would later remark that Conyers presence in Selma, Alabama “had an electric effect on the voiceless and beleaguered Negro citizens of this city, state and nation.”

Conyers legislative career began in 1964 when he ran for an open seat in Michigan’s 1st District, following the landmark 1964 Baker v. Carr decision, and defeated his opponent with 84 percent of the vote. In this race, Congressman Conyers received the only known endorsement from Dr. King, and Rosa Parks, known for her prominent role in the Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott, moved to Detroit and served on Conyers’ staff between 1965 and 1988.

Congressman Conyers went on to serve 26 terms, winning re-election twenty-five times, and is the third longest-serving member of the House in history, and the sixth longest-serving member of Congress in history. He was one of the 13 members who founded the Congressional Black Caucus in 1969 and was considered the Dean of the Caucus during his tenure.

As a freshman member, Congressman Conyers won a seat on the Judiciary Committee and went on to serve as Chairman of that Committee from 2007 to 2011, serving as the ranking Democratic member on the Committee from 1995 to 2007 and again from 2011 to 2017. During his tenure, he successfully worked to oppose initiatives that would have violated Constitutional values and served as a beacon of hope to those facing poverty and injustice. He was also the first member to introduce legislation to hold hearings on an important series of civil rights issues, including: police misconduct; LGBTQ protections; violence against the Arab and Muslim American communities; Apartheid-era policies of the African-American community; environmental racism; and restorative justice, just to name a few.

Over the course of his legislative career, Congressman Conyers was responsible for more than 100 bills, amendments, and resolutions being enacted, in which he was the overall lead sponsor, and an additional 56 that he managed or was the lead Democratic sponsor. From his position on the Judiciary Committee, he led many of our most notable legislative efforts on civil rights and civil liberties, including the Martin Luther King Holiday Act, the Voting Rights act Reauthorizations, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorizations, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.
Act, Pattern and Practice Enforcement Act, the USA Freedom Act, the Fair Sentencing Act, the “Motor Voter” Act, and the Innocence Protection Act.

For these reasons, Congressman Conyers is recognized as a champion of civil rights and civil liberties, receiving numerous honors, including the NAACP Spingarn Medal and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights Hubert H. Humphrey Award. Always a leader and gentleman, Congressman Conyers walked the halls of this institution for more than 50 years, leaving a lasting impact through his dedication to freedom and justice for all people.

Like so many in this body, I am proud to have been his colleague and friend. The celebration of his 90th birthday is an ideal time to reflect on his accomplishments and celebrate his distinguished legislative career. His dedication and commitment to service is an example for us all. He will always be the Chairman.

THE EQUALITY ACT

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2019
Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong and steadfast support of the Equality Act.

We’ve made a lot of progress in recent years, but the reality is that many still face discrimination because of who they are and the people they love.

In Texas, the discrimination and inequality faced by the LGBTQ community is heartbreaking and entirely un-American, but with the Equality Act we can do something about it.

The Equality Act will greatly extend civil rights for the LGBTQ community, providing consistent and explicit protections from discrimination for LGBTQ people across key areas of life including employment, housing, credit, and education.

In Texas, that means having explicit protections for LGBTQ people for the first time in our history. Updating federal law will tear down barriers to prosperity and lead to better outcomes for our family members, neighbors, and loved-ones.

This is long overdue for nearly 1 million LGBTQ Texans and is why I urge all of my colleagues to make the Equality Act the law of the land.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2893–S2949

Measures Introduced: Forty-two bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1499–1540, S. Res. 212–213, and S. Con. Res. 17.

Measures Passed:

Protecting America’s First Responders Act: Senate passed S. 1208, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program: Senate passed H.R. 2379, to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

Effective Prosecution of Possession of Biological Toxins and Agents Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 744, to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener’s error, and the bill was then passed.

Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 1379, to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and the bill was then passed.

Debbie Smith Act: Senate passed S. 820, to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, after agreeing to the committee amendments.

Supporting and Treating Officers In Crisis Act: Senate passed S. 998, 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, after agreeing to the committee amendment.

Collins Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Daniel P. Collins, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, May 16, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2019.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Nielson Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Howard C. Nielson, Jr., of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Daniel P. Collins, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Clark Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Howard C. Nielson, Jr., of
Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.  

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  
  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.


A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.  

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  
  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Bell Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.  

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Carl J. Nichols, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  
  * Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Wallace Nomination Referral—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, sent to the Senate by the President on May 13, 2019, be referred jointly to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Collins, Nielson, Clark, Nichols, and Bell Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed on Thursday, May 16, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2019.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

  By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 114), Wendy Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.  
  By 92 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 115), Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).  
  By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 116), Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.  
  Jane L. Corwin, of New York, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.  
  Robert C. Sisson, of Michigan, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.  
  Lance V. Yohe, of North Dakota, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.  
  Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq.  
  5 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Read the First Time:

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today.  

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:04 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, May 20, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on pages S2948–49.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE RESEARCH

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather concluded a hearing to examine atmospheric science research and forecasting innovation, after receiving testimony from Waleed Abdalati, University of Colorado Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, Boulder; Deborah A. Bronk, Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences, East Boothbay, Maine; Radley Horton, Columbia University, Palisades, New York; and Erika Washburn, Lake Superior National Estuarine Research Reserve, Superior, Wisconsin.

CARBON CAPTURE, UTILIZATION, AND STORAGE PROGRAMS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing 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, after receiving testimony from Steven E. Winberg, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy; S. Julio Friedmann, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs Center on Global Energy Policy, Livermore, California; Adam Goff, 8 Rivers Capital, LLC, Durham, North Carolina; John Harju, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks; Richard Jackson, Occidental Petroleum Low Carbon Ventures, Houston, Texas; and Judith Lagano, NRG Energy, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing 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, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1328, to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens; and

S. 1321, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

NOMINATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of James Byrne, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 39 public bills, H.R. 2780–2818, and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 385–387, were introduced. Pages H3923–24

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H3925–27

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2779, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–66, Part 1);

H.R. 1775, to establish a task force on NOTAM improvements, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–67);
H.R. 1200, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2019, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–68);

H.R. 2045, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–69); and Supplemental Report on H.R. 965, to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products (H. Rept. 116–55, Part 3).

Pages H3868–73

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Jackson Lee to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H3845

Recess: The House recessed at 10:45 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H3850

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Bruce Lustig, Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, DC.

Page H3850

Marketing and Outreach Restoration to Empower Health Education Act of 2019: The House passed H.R. 987, to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities, by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 214.

Pages H3853–H3890, H3910–11

Rejected the Walden motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 213.

Pages H3890–10

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill.

Pages H3868–73

Agreed to:

Pallone amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that clarifies communication requirements for eligible product developers and license holders regarding requests, offers, and delivery of product samples;

Pages H3873–74

Welch amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that prohibits the Secretary of HHS from ending autoenrollment;

Pages H3876–77

Blunt Rochester amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to release all aggregated studies and data sets created on or after January 1, 2014 related to marketing and outreach for the Affordable Care Act's individual marketplace;

Pages H3877–78

DeSaulnier amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that commissions a study by the National Academy of Medicine into the amount of federal funding and research used in the development of drugs by pharmaceutical companies, and to put measures in place to curb excessive drug costs;

Pages H3878–79

Shalala amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that states the sense of Congress that the Secretary of HHS should not take any action to prohibit or restrict “silver loading”;

Pages H3879–80

Hayes amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that amends the Federally-Facilitated Marketplace (FFM) navigator program to authorize $25,000,000 out of amounts collected by user fees for State-Based Exchanges; ensures that no state shall receive a grant that is less than $1,000,000;

Pages H3880–81

McBath amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that provides pharmacy school outreach by directing the Labor HHS and Education Secretaries to do outreach to institutions of higher education as it relates to the use and availability of generic drugs;

Pages H3881–83

Scanlon amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires the HHS Secretary to issue bi-weekly public reports during the annual open enrollment period on the performance of the federal exchange and the Small Business Health Options Program exchange; each report will include a summary of information on the open enrollment season including the number of website visits, accounts created, calls to the call center, number of people who enroll in a plan and what enrollment path they took, e.g., website, broker, or call center;

Pages H3883–84

Morelle amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires GAO to study the effect of President Trump’s cuts to ACA outreach and the Navigator Program on health insurance enrollment and the cost of coverage;

Pages H3884–85

Waters amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires HHS to submit to Congress a report on the extent to which increases in the prices of commonly prescribed drugs have caused individuals with health insurance to forego needed treatment;

Pages H3885–86

Johnson (TX) amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires Navigators to receive
training on how to assist consumers with Medicaid and CHIP enrollment;

Lynch amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that extends the deadline by which States may apply for federal assistance to establish state-based marketplaces by one year to December 31, 2023; extends the date by which the State Exchanges must be self-sustaining by one year to January 1, 2025;

Lynch amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that asks the GAO to conduct a cost benefit analysis of the establishment of State-administered health insurance plans for states that may want to offer a public option in their health insurance exchanges; the report is due to Congress no later than one year after enactment;

Lipinski amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires a GAO report to determine whether the Department of Health and Human Services has taken appropriate steps to ensure that routine maintenance to the Healthcare.gov website is minimally disruptive to consumers;

Deutch amendment (No. 17 printed in H. Rept. 116–61), as modified, that adds a duty requiring navigators to provide information in plain language regarding essential health benefits and consumer protections under the mental health and substance use disorder benefits parity law;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that adds that the Secretary shall implement outreach and educational activities in areas with high health disparities;

Gomez amendment (No. 19 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that clarifies the ability of Navigators to provide referrals to community-based organizations that address social needs related to health outcomes;

Escobar amendment (No. 20 printed in H. Rept. 116–61), as modified, that requires Navigators to assist vulnerable populations including individuals with limited English proficiency and chronic illnesses;

Pappas amendment (No. 22 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to set annual enrollment targets for the Exchanges for the plan year 2020 and each subsequent plan year;

Cox (CA) amendment (No. 23 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that adds a new subsection (b): Promote Transparency and Accountability in the Administration’s Expenditures of Exchange User Fees, which requires HHS to submit an annual report to Congress that includes a detailed breakdown of the Department’s spending on outreach and enrollment, navigators, maintenance of Healthcare.gov, and operation of the Healthcare.gov call centers;

Cox (CA) amendment (No. 24 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that adds areas with high concentrations of unemployment to the list where such outreach and educational activities shall be provided;

Horn amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that ensures rural areas are included in navigator outreach;

Cunningham amendment (No. 27 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that ensures that state healthcare Exchanges’ outreach activities are also targeted towards veteran populations;

Harder (CA) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that provides opioid specific education and training to the Navigators and the Certified Application Counselors (CACs) that ensures they can best educate individuals on the marketplace plans specifically for opioid health care treatment (by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 211); and

Wexton amendment (No. 21 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that includes findings that the final rule on short-term, limited duration insurance weakens protections for the millions of Americans living with preexisting health conditions, including children with complex medical needs and disabilities and their families (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 212).

Rejected:

McKinley amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 116–61) that sought to strike title II—Health Insurance Market Stabilization (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 210).

Agreed that in the engrossment of the bill, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes.

H. Res. 377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5), (H.R. 312), and (H.R. 987) was agreed to yesterday, May 15th.

Requiring each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to complete a program of training in workplace rights and responsibilities each session of each Congress: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 30, requiring each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to complete a program of training in workplace rights and responsibilities each session of each Congress.
Making technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110–279: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 1436, to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110–279.

Permission to File Report: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to file a supplemental report on H.R. 965, to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representatives Correa, Gonzalez of (TX), Jackson Lee, Escobar, Lofgren and Carbajal.

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership: Representatives Moore, Titus, Connolly, Ted Lieu (CA), Torres (CA), Kelly (IL), Sewell (AL), DeGette, Plaskett and Lee (CA).

Senate Referral: S. 1208 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H3853 and H3876.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3902–03, H3903, H3904, H3909–10, and H3910. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a 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. The Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2020 was approved. The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, was ordered reported, as amended.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE’S FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT REMEDIATION PLAN: THE PATH FORWARD
Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Department of Defense’s Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan: The Path Forward”. Testimony was heard from David Norquist, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Department of Defense; Thomas Harker, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller), U.S. Navy; John Roth, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller), U.S. Air Force; and John Whitley, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller), U.S. Army.

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?
Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a 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?”. Testimony was heard from James N. Stewart, Performing the Duties of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Thomas Seamands, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–1, U.S. Army; Vice Admiral Robert P. Burke, Chief of Naval Personnel, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Brian T. Kelly, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services, U.S. Air Force; and Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, U.S. Marine Corps.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a 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

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2574, the “Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act”; and H.R. 2639, the “Strength in Diversity Act of 2019”. H.R. 2574 and H.R. 2639 were ordered reported, as amended.

OVERSIGHT OF PRUDENTIAL REGULATORS: ENSURING THE SAFETY, SOUNDNESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF MEGABANKS AND OTHER DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of Prudential Regulators: Ensuring the Safety, Soundness and Accountability of Megabanks and Other Depository Institutions”. Testimony was heard from Rodney Hood, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration; Jelena McWilliams, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Joseph Otting, Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and Randal Quarles, Vice Chairman of Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

DEMOCRACY, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEFENSE: REBALANCING U.S.-AFRICA POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Democracy, Development, and Defense: Rebalancing U.S.-Africa Policy”. Testimony was heard from Tibor P. Nagy, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Ramsey Day, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Michelle Lenihan, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs, Department of Defense.

THE DANGERS OF REPORTING ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “The Dangers of Reporting on Human Rights”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS: PREPARING AMERICA’S LAW ENFORCEMENT TO PROTECT THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers: Preparing America’s Law Enforcement to Protect the Homeland”. Testimony was heard from Thomas J. Walters, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security; John Kelly, Acting Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; and Greg Davis, Captain, Department of Public Safety Academy Training Coordinator, Texas Department of Public Safety.

JUSTICE DENIED: FORCED ARBITRATION AND THE EROSION OF OUR LEGAL SYSTEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law held a hearing entitled “Justice Denied: Forced Arbitration and the Erosion of our Legal System”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant Commander Kevin Ziober, Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy Reserves; and public witnesses.

OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT: IMPACTS OF WATER POLLUTION ABOVE AND BELOW GROUND

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Oil and Gas Development: Impacts of Water Pollution Above and Below Ground”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing entitled “Examining the President’s Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Geological Survey”. Testimony was heard from Brenda Burman, Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and Don Cline, Associate Director, Water Resources Mission Area, U.S. Geological Survey.

INVESTIGATING THE HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS OF NATIVE CHILDREN AT BIE BOARDING SCHOOLS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing
entitled “Investigating the Health and Safety Risks of Native Children at BIE Boarding Schools”. Testimony was heard from Mark Cruz, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Economic Development, Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

**HIV PREVENTION DRUG: BILLIONS IN CORPORATE PROFITS AFTER MILLIONS IN TAXPAYER INVESTMENTS**

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “HIV Prevention Drug: Billions in Corporate Profits after Millions in Taxpayer Investments”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**CFPB’S ROLE IN EMPOWERING PREDATORY LENDERS: EXAMINING THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE PAYDAY LENDING RULE**

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy held a hearing entitled “CFPB’s Role in Empowering Predatory Lenders: Examining the Proposed Repeal of the Payday Lending Rule”. Testimony was heard from Thomas Pahl, Policy Associate Director for Research, Markets and Regulations, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

**EVENT HORIZON TELESCOPE: THE BLACK HOLE SEEN ROUND THE WORLD**

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Event Horizon Telescope: The Black Hole Seen Round the World”. Testimony was heard from France Córdova, Director, National Science Foundation; and public witnesses.

**THE FUTURE OF FORECASTING: BUILDING A STRONGER U.S. WEATHER ENTERPRISE**

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:* Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “The Future of Forecasting: Building a Stronger U.S. Weather Enterprise”. Testimony was heard from Neil Jacobs, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Louis Uccellini, Assistant Administrator for Weather Services, and Director, National Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT OF THE SBA’S WOMEN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS FEDERAL CONTRACT PROGRAM**

*Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the SBA’s Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program”. Testimony was heard from William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; and Robb N. Wong, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration.

**THE IMPACTS OF STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISES ON PUBLIC TRANSIT AND FREIGHT RAIL SECTORS**

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Impacts of State-Owned Enterprises on Public Transit and Freight Rail Sectors”. Testimony was heard from Phillip A. Washington, Chief Executive Officer, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, California; and public witnesses.

**OVERCOMING RACIAL DISPARITIES AND SOCIAL DETERMINANTS IN THE MATERNAL MORTALITY CRISIS**

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Overcoming Racial Disparities and Social Determinants in the Maternal Mortality Crisis”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kelly of Illinois and Herrera Beutler; Melanie Rouse, Coordinator, Maternal Mortality Projects Coordinator, Virginia, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, Virginia Department of Health; Loren Robinson, Deputy Secretary for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, Pennsylvania Department of Health; and public witnesses.

**CHINA’S DIGITAL AUTHORITARIANISM: SURVEILLANCE, INFLUENCE, AND POLITICAL CONTROL**

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “China’s Digital Authoritarianism: Surveillance, Influence, and Political Control”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**Joint Meetings**

No joint committee meetings were held.
COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,  
MAY 17, 2019  
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)  

Senate  
No meetings/hearings scheduled.  

House  
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Members’ Day Hearing: House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology”, 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.
Next Meeting of the Senate
3 p.m., Monday, May 20

Senate Chamber
Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Daniel P. Collins, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Next Meeting of the House of Representatives
9 a.m., Friday, May 17

House Chamber
Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 5—Equality Act.
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