The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker: WASHINGTON, DC, July 23, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MADELEINE DEAN 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 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HOPE REMAINS FOR PEACE

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, today we will be taking up a resolution to denounce the BDS movement, the boycott, divestment, and sanctions against Israel.

This region is not unfamiliar to me, as I have been there twice, in both Israel and Palestine. I do not support the BDS movement.

When I was last in Palestine, I asked my dear friend, divestment, and sanctions against BDS is up.

We have a right to ask if sectioning off 2 million people in Gaza, with over a million people needing food assistance and 95 percent not having access to clean water, will ever lead to peace, or why not allowing Members of Congress to go into Gaza from Israel is smart. What don’t they want us to see by not allowing us in?

We have a right to ask why it makes sense to have a major highway with a giant wall in the middle of it with one side for Palestinians and the other for Israelis, as it looks like something we have judged poorly previously in history.

We have a right to ask if a bullet directed at a child is an equivalent response to a thrown rock.

I am not saying that Hamas, the organization that has been recognized by the United States as a terrorist organization, is innocent or pure—anything but. But, obviously, not all Palestinians are Hamas by any stretch of the imagination.

If we really want peace in the region, where we will never have to send young men and women from our country to risk their lives, then we need a government in Israel that respects human rights more and works more aggressively towards peace.

I was told a resolution advocating for a two-state solution would be up today as well, a resolution I support; but apparently it is not, and that is a mistake. Instead, only this resolution opposing BDS is up.

And while I do not support BDS, I cannot support this resolution as worded. My hope is that we will have real peace in this region someday, that we will have a two-state solution where both Israelis and Palestinians will live in peace, both internally and with each other. But this resolution won’t do that.

Madam Speaker, I just wish real efforts toward peace were what we were debating today.
HONORING HENRY LOZANO

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, on July 19, surrounded by loved ones, the city of Los Angeles lost a giant. His name was Henry Lozano.

Madam Speaker, I simply don’t have enough time to recount all of Henry’s achievements or the profound impact he had on our district and on the Golden State. His list of accomplishments is pretty impressive.

He was a Korean war veteran, serving as a Marine corporal in the 1950s; a fierce workers’ advocate as a labor leader for UAW Local 509; chief of staff to Congressman Ed Roybal; an adviser to Xavier Becerra, the current attorney general of California and the former Congressman for the district I now represent.

Congressman Ed Roybal was the first Latino elected to Congress from California since the 1800s, a founder of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Oftentimes, on the shoulders of giants, and people think I am referring just to the elected officials who came before me; but, more often than not, it is the people who surround those elected leaders, like Henry Lozano, the ones who are their advisers, their confidantes, the people who try to keep them true to their word and to their core and to their principles.

Henry was that type of individual. He cared deeply about the Latino community and empowering them in a time where we oftentimes felt marginalized. He came up during the seventies and the eighties and the nineties.

I did not work with Henry directly, but I got to know him. Back in 2004, at the Democratic National Convention, I was introduced to Henry by a mutual friend, and he said that Henry was a legend within the Latino community on the east side of Los Angeles. He said he was the one who helped, really, mentor countless elected officials and wannabe elected officials like myself.

I befriended Henry, and Henry gave me quite a bit of advice. Most importantly, he wanted to make sure that I would remain truthful and remain committed to the community that I would one day represent.

I got to visit him just before he passed in the hospital. He looked pretty good to me. We talked, and the first thing he asked me about is what did I think. I thought he was referring to the Presidential election, but, in the end, it was really about a local city council race.

He said that politics is always local, and you should always think about the people first.

Henry will be missed. He had a profound impact on so many, and I am one of them. So I hope that we will keep his memory alive.

HONORING BARBARA TORRES

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I have sad news to report regarding someone else we lost on the east side of Los Angeles.

She was a labor union leader, an activist, and a daughter of East Los Angeles. Her name was Barbara Torres.

Barbara passed away at the young age of 39, but she left a life of meaning. She was always about, even though she didn’t have a car. She gave so much to people who had so little, even though she didn’t have much herself.

She fought against the biggest opponents, even small even when she was small in stature. She would often be the first one into a fight because she always had one saying: “If we fight, we win.” That really sums up Barbara Torres.

She was the champion of the little guy and the underdog, because she was the little guy and the underdog. She understood that the system can sometimes be against the people who need the most help, but she was always there and never gave up faith.

She valued her community, but we also valued her back.

Yesterday, we put Barbara Torres to rest. At her funeral service was the mayor of Los Angeles, Eric Garcetti, myself, Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson, State Senator Maria Elena Durazo, Assembly Member Reggie Jones-Sawyer and the head of the California Democratic Party, Rusty Hicks.

For somebody who did not have a title in the end, who was not of wealth or meaning, but somebody who showed up every single day for every fight, she left an impact. She will definitely be missed because we know that she made California, Los Angeles, and this country a better place to live.

PRESEVE FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I stand today to celebrate the life of Corporal William "Bill" McMillan, III. Corporal McMillan was a combat medic serving in Iraq when he was killed by a roadside bomb on July 8, 2008. The death of Corporal McMillan prompted his father, Lloyd, and Brad, his older brother, to write a poem about his sudden death entitled "The Mission of the Last Patriotic Soldier" like this: As your Stryker rolls, you remember many missions through this long, tough fight.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CORPORAL WILLIAM "BILL" McMILLAN, III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Corporal William “Bill” McMillan, III. Corporal McMillan was a combat medic serving in Iraq when he was killed by a roadside bomb on July 8, 2008.

All Americans have a constitutional right, guaranteed by the First Amendment, to freedom of speech, to petition their government, and to participate in boycotts.

Speech in pursuit of civil and human rights at home and abroad is protected by our First Amendment. That is one reason why our First Amendment is so powerful. With a few exceptions, the government is simply not allowed to discriminate against speech based on its viewpoint or its speaker.

The right to boycott is deeply rooted in the fabric of our country. What was the Boston Tea Party but a boycott? Where would we be now without the powerful boycotts led by boycotts in the 1950s and 1960s, like the Montgomery bus boycott and United Farm Workers grape boycott.

Some of this country’s most important advances in racial equality and workers’ rights have been achieved through collective action protected by our Constitution.

Americans of conscience have a long and proud history of participating in boycotts specifically to advocate for human rights abroad. Americans boycotted Nazi Germany in response to dehumanization, imprisonment, and genocide of Jewish people. In the 1980s, many of us in this very body boycotted South African goods in the fight against apartheid.

Our right to free speech is being threatened with this resolution. It sets a dangerous precedent because it attempts to delegitimize certain people’s political speech and to send a message that our government can and will take action against speech it doesn’t like.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court has, time and time again, recognized that expressive conduct is protected by the Constitution, from burning a flag to baking a cake. Efforts to restrict and target that protected speech run the risk of eroding the civil rights that form the foundation of our democracy.

All Americans have the right to participate in boycotts, and I oppose all legislative efforts that target speech.

Madam Speaker, I urge Congress, State governments, and civil rights leaders from all communities to preserve our Constitution, preserve our Bill of Rights, and preserve the First Amendment’s guarantee of freedom of speech by opposing H. Res. 246 and antiboycott efforts wherever they arise.
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You know the last task will come, last work to be done, then home. All right! You will mount up to take that last patrol with fellows all well tried; That honor roll of troopers you have come to know with love and pride. You have all talked, laughed, wept, and fought hard, side by side. Many times we’ve watched them play, work, fight, and bleed. You’ve patched them up, cheered them on, and sent them back to lead. You’ve been there for them in the dust of day and in the cold of night. Then on to the next patrol, with that honored roll. Back one more time to fight. You remember this report was out. They were all about, and they had planted one to three. On late guard, near break of day, an IED you see they start to lay. You call Sarge, “Hey! Look close over there. Can you see?” Sarge runs right out, and starts to shout, “That’s it!” And you do the follow me! Later, you patch the enemy then work smart, fight tough, to get yourself free. You ask, “Is this the last patrol? Is this it forever for Sarge and me?” Experience kicks in. You both fight hard and win. Clearly, the last patrol it’s not. You and your team will see lots more patrols in those all-out attacks. As you’ve grouped the next day, the General praises your brave acts. You and Sarge got four, and the team got nine more, in those all-out attacks. Your team did its job. They fought hard and did so very well. You’ve sent the enemy on their last patrol, their justly deserved death knell. Now, you are rolling on this new daytime mission. The light is oh so bright. Your patrol is off to guard the convoy, mission, that is in sight. You laugh at stories told as along you roll and grab a snack. All right! Then that flash of light, that blast of might, your eyes they see now closed so tight. For four, the last patrol has come. The rest for a moment numb, a truly terrible sight. Later, the caisson rolls. The cannons boom. Overhead, the Blackhawks fly. We honor you as we stand in place. But we don’t tell you why. We find some comfort as we hear “Amazing Grace,” our eyes very far from dry. It was a one-way ticket, but we know you’re in a better place. Now, you are with our dear Lord and holy master. You have passed from last patrol to honored guard of God’s most holy pasture.

FOCUS ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN DISCUSSIONS WITH PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. SHERMAN, Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan, came to Washington this weekend, the chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, it is appropriate that I comment upon what has occurred so far in the bilateral discussions, and I look forward to meeting the Prime Minister later today.

What we need is the approach taken by the Trump administration. First, as to Afghanistan, the hearts and minds of the Afghan people are critical to our success in what has been our longest war. Tens of thousands of Americans have worked to get the hearts and minds of the Afghan people on our side, building schools and hospitals, under very dangerous conditions.

Now, the President takes this high-profile opportunity as an opportunity to say that he might kill 10 million Afghans, or was thinking about it, or raises the possibility that we would use nuclear weapons to destroy Afghanistan.

This does untold harm to our efforts in Afghanistan to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people.

What the President should have done is talk about the Durand Line and how Afghanistan should accept this border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, a border that Afghanistan disputes but that the whole world accepts.

As to Kashmir, it is surprising that the Prime Minister of Pakistan wants America to arbitrate or mediate. That has been the position of Pakistan for decades. But then, the President said in Osaka, last month, Prime Minister Modi asked the United States to arbitrate or mediate the Kashmir dispute.

That is utterly preposterous, and it is embarrassing that we have a President who wouldn’t realise how preposterous that statement is. Of course, the record has been set straight by Prime Minister Modi.

Third is what the President didn’t say. He didn’t make a major issue over Dr. Afridi, the doctor who was critical in helping us find and kill Osama bin Laden. Bin Laden was hiding a mile away from the military academy of the Pakistani Army, their West Point. We have not demanded that the Pakistanis keep Bin Laden be in jail, but we do insist that the one Pakistani who helped us find Bin Laden be released from Pakistani jail.

The President barely raised the issue. In fact, he didn’t voluntarily raise it at all. This is not just a humanitarian concern. It is also a strategic national security concern because who will help us fight terrorism if we leave Dr. Afridi behind?

In a news interview, Prime Minister Khan suggested there might be a trade, where Afridi was released and a terrorist named Dr. Siddiqui released by the United States.

No friend of ours would demand that we release a terrorist in order for them to release a hero, but we have to be practical, and we have to get Dr. Afridi released.

Finally, the President failed to mention with the Prime Minister of Pakistan the situation as to human rights. Hundreds of individuals in Sindh have been forcibly disappeared by Pakistani authorities.

A prime example of that is a boy who was abducted 14 months ago, in broad daylight. He is still missing.

It is time for the Prime Minister of Pakistan to provide information about Aqib Chando. Where is he? Produce him in court or release him. What is his fate?

Of course, we need information about hundreds of others who have disappeared, including Murtaza Junejo, Shahid Junejo, Ayoub Kandhro, and Inas Dayo.

I want to mention Dr. Anwar L Ashari, a friend of mine who was shot dead in Sindh in 2015 while working with the Sindh United Party, a party of which he was one of the leaders. Pakistan has not adequately investigated that brutal murder, and it is time for Pakistan to do so.

Finally, we focus on the issue of forced conversions in Sindh, young Hindu and Christian girls forced to convert to Islam and forced to marry men many decades their senior. The Pakistani Government needs to stop this pernicious practice. They need to do more. That is why nine of my colleagues joined with me in sending a letter to the President, urging a focus on human rights in Sindh in these bilateral discussions.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. SHERMAN, Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today. Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day. We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people.

Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty. May they be instruments of justice for all Americans.

We are grateful for the success of the recent negotiations between the President and congressional leaders on the debt limit and budget caps deal and ask Your blessing on them and on those now charged with moving the business of government and the national economy forward.

May all that is done within the people’s House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
I continue to meet with Utahns about their healthcare concerns, and I recently had a conversation with moms of kids with type 1 diabetes, who explained to me how the high cost of insulin is affecting their child’s treatment.

We have a bipartisan consensus that our healthcare system needs work, so it is past time that we act on bipartisan solutions that lower Americans’ costs and ensure their access to quality, affordable healthcare.

For the People Agenda in Action

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, last year, the American people embraced the Democrats’ For the People agenda: lower healthcare costs, raise wages, and clean up corruption. Americans hate corruption. They hate the idea that people are cutting the line, breaking the rules, and getting ahead, cheating on the system. They want to see us clean that up in Washington. And they sent us last year with a very, very powerful message. Three things, they said:

The first was: Make it so that I can get to the ballot box in America without running an obstacle course. Make it easier to register and vote in this country.

And in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, we did that. We put that proposal forward to strengthen voting.

The second thing they said was: When you get to Washington, behave yourselves. It is that simple. Be ethical, be accountable, and answer to the people.

So we put ethics reforms into H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

And the last thing they said was: When you get to Washington, don’t get tangled up in the money. Remember where you came from. Work for us, not the special interests and the insiders and the lobbyists.

And we fixed that in H.R. 1. That was part of the For the People agenda.

I count myself among the many Michiganders, from all communities and stations of life, who know room 218 is the place to go when you have a particularly thorny problem to solve or need advice on a sensitive matter. You just have to be ready because the judge dispenses his wisdom unvarnished. Judge Cohn’s work ethic is legendary. In any room, he is generally both the most well-read person on history, philosophy, culture, and also, somehow, the most up to date on current affairs, as he devours numerous newspapers and websites every day.

It is hard to overstate Judge Cohn’s impact on the law and the people who have passed through his courtroom, whether they be defendants, attorneys, or staff. He has left an indelible imprint on so many lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Judge Cohn on 40 years of service and in wishing him continued success.

BUILDING BLOCKS OF STEM ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1665) to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Building Blocks of STEM Act:"

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Science Foundation is a large investor in STEM education and plays a key role in setting research and policy agendas.

(2) While studies have found that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age develop positive attitudes toward science and are more likely to pursue STEM expertise and careers later on, the majority of current research focuses on increasing STEM opportunities for middle school-aged children and older.

(3) Women remain widely underrepresented in the STEM workforce, and this gender disparity extends down through all levels of education.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING EARLY CHILDHOOD STEM EDUCATION RESEARCH.

In awarding grants under the Discovery Research PreK-12 program, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consider the age distribution of a STEM education research and development project to...
improve the focus of research and development on early childhood education.

SEC. 4. SUPPORTING FEMALE STUDENTS IN PRE-KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN SCIENCE EDUCATION.

Section 305(d) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–5(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RESEARCH.—As a component of improving participation of women in STEM fields, research funded by a grant under this subsection may include research on—

“(A) the role of teacher training and professional development, including effective pedagogical strategies to encourage teachers to participate in such training and professional development, in encouraging or discouraging female students in prekindergarten through elementary school from participating in STEM activities;

“(B) the role of teachers in shaping perceptions of STEM in female students in prekindergarten through elementary school and discouraging such students from participating in STEM activities;

“(C) the role of other facets of the learning environment, willingness of female students in prekindergarten through elementary school to participate in STEM activities, including learning materials and text-books, classroom arrangements, use of media and technology, classroom culture, and gender composition of students during group work;

“(D) the role of parents and other caregivers in encouraging or discouraging female students in prekindergarten through elementary school from participating in STEM activities;

“(E) the types of STEM activities that encourage greater participation by female students in prekindergarten through elementary school; and

“(F) the role of mentorship and best practices in finding and utilizing mentors;

“(G) the role of informal and out-of-school STEM learning opportunities on the perception of and participation in STEM activities of female students in prekindergarten through elementary school; and

“(H) any other area the Director determines will carry out the goal described in paragraph (2)(C).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 1665, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act.

Employment in computer and information technology jobs is projected to grow faster than any other occupation between the years of 2016 and 2026. Despite the opportunity for good, high-paying jobs when they graduate, women earned only 19 percent of undergraduate computer science degrees in 2016.

Disturbingly, the ratio of women to men earning computer science degrees actually declined between 2006 and 2016. H.R. 1665 devotes resources to ensure girls in prekindergarten and elementary school teachers are exposed to STEM activities and encouraged to pursue STEM studies from a young age, before many are dissuaded or discouraged from doing so.

The legislation includes a focus on computer science education to help ensure we will have the talent to fill the jobs of the future. We must act now to increase the participation of women in STEM, and it starts with the focus on early childhood education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, Representatives STEVENS and BAIRD, for their leadership in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, research shows that early exposure to science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and computer science has positive impacts on a broad spectrum of student outcomes. For example, early math knowledge not only predicts later math success; it also predicts later reading achievement.

Studies have also found that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age develop positive attitudes toward science and are more likely to pursue STEM expertise and careers.

H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act, directs the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood and to award grants to encourage young girls to pursue computer science learning.

Across the country, the share of STEM jobs has expanded significantly, with STEM employment increasing from 9.7 million to 17.3 million from 1990 to 2018.

Data suggests that this trend will continue, and the U.S. is struggling to meet the demand. To meet it, we must engage children—particularly young girls—in STEM in early childhood and sustain that interest as they grow.

More graduates with STEM degrees means more advanced American technology and a more robust economy.

But it is not just about the economy. STEM graduates have the potential to develop technologies that could save thousands of lives, jump-start a new industry, or even discover new worlds.

By supporting more hands-on STEM engagement for younger ages, we are supporting and investing in America's future.

In the 115th Congress, the House passed this legislation unanimously, and I hope it will do so again today. I want to thank Representative BAIRD and Representative STEVENS for reintroducing this bipartisan bill and moving it forward.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act, which supports STEM education research focused on early childhood education.

There is a lot of discussion about the gender disparity in the STEM workforce and the leaky pipeline that widens the gap as women and girls continue through school. Although women make up half of the U.S. workforce, they make up less than a quarter of those employed in STEM occupations.

The building blocks of STEM Act addresses these disparities by ensuring an equitable distribution of STEM education research funding for projects focused on young children and helping us
understand why girls are encouraged or discouraged from participating in STEM activities.

It also ensures that the National Science Foundation grants are awarded to entities that are working in partnership, such as research universities with local education agencies, to increase participation in computer science education.

Computer science is particularly struggling to recruit and retain women, who make up less than 18 percent of the computer science workforce. The number is trending down, not up.

This has a ripple effect on our country's ability to fill the high-skilled jobs of today and tomorrow. We need the next generation of young women to pursue STEM degrees, and we are not seeing the numbers we need.

It is critical that we continue to work on STEM opportunities for middle-school-aged children and older, but we also need to ensure our Federal resources start at the beginning and support research on STEM education of younger children. I am proud that the bill is to start children off on the right foot by teaching STEM concepts and principles at an early age. Research shows that kids as young as 1, 2, or 3 are capable of absorbing STEM concepts. Children have a natural curiosity that can be fostered into an interest in science, technology, engineering, math, and computer science.

Equally important is ensuring that we get more girls involved in the STEM fields so that we can have as many people as possible contributing to the knowledge base of our society. H.R. 1665 directs the NSF to fund research and studies that focus on early childhood and young women in STEM. At the K-12 level, it ensures that we are laying the groundwork to develop young innovators in STEM. Hoosiers know that to grow our Nation, we need everyone involved. This bill helps to ensure that we are preparing students to fill the jobs of the future, continuing America's global leadership in science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill. Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

The love of learning starts young, and the Building Blocks of STEM bill promotes this by prioritizing a focus on early childhood STEM education. It gives us the opportunity to encourage girls to get and stay engaged in STEM, helping to improve our educational programs and diversify the STEM workforce.

I, again, thank Representative BAIRD and Representative STEVENS for reintroducing this bipartisan bill. As the House did in 2015, I encourage this body to support and pass this legislation unanimously.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the Members on both sides of the aisle for their support of this bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill (H.R. 2397) to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation, and for other purposes, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2397
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 “American Manufacturing Leadership Act”.

SEC. 2. CHANGES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF MANUFACTURING USA PROGRAM. Section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278) is amended by--

(A) in the section heading, by striking “NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION” and inserting “MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK”;

(B) by striking “centers for manufacturing innovation” each place it appears in subsections (a)(3)(B), (b)(1), (d), (g), and (i) and inserting “Manufacturing USA institutes”;

(C) by striking “center for manufacturing innovation” each place it appears in subsections (d)(1), (d)(4)(E), (g), and (h) and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”;

(D) by striking “center” each place it appears in subsections (d)(2), (d)(4)(E), and (d)(5) and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”;

(E) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM” and inserting “MANUFACTURING USA PROGRAM”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program” and inserting “Manufacturing USA Program”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “(i) to contribute to the development of regional manufacturing innovation clusters across the Nation;”;

(D) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “Networking for Manufacturing Innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA Network”;

(E) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION” and inserting “MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Network for Manufacturing Innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA Network”; and

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION” and inserting “MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a center for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “a Manufacturing USA institute”;

(ii) by striking “and” in the place it appears in subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting “agency head”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a center for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”;

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING LEADERSHIP ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2397) to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
(ii) by striking subparagraph (E); (iii) by redesigning subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively, and moving the margins of such clauses (as so redesignated) two ems to the right; (iv) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ‘‘Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include’’ and inserting the following: ‘‘(A) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute shall include; (v) in clause (c) (as so redesignated), by striking ‘‘cost, time, and risk’’ and inserting ‘‘cost, time, or risk’’; (vi) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end following ‘‘addressing workforce needs through training and education programs at all appropriate education levels, including programs on applied engineering’’ the following: ‘‘(vii) as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: ‘‘(v) Development of roadmaps or leveraging of existing roadmaps with respect to technology areas being pursued by that Manufacturing USA institute that take into account the research and development undertaken at other Manufacturing USA institutes and Federal agencies with respect to such areas.‘‘; and (x) by adding at the end the following: ‘‘(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include such other activities as the agency head, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to, or are affected by, advanced manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).’’; and (D) in paragraph (3)— (i) by amending subparagraph (A) by striking ‘‘centers for manufacturing innovation’’ and inserting ‘‘Manufacturing USA institutes’’; (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘center for manufacturing innovation’’ and inserting ‘‘Manufacturing USA institute’’; and (iii) by adding at the end the following: ‘‘(C) APPLICATION.—Effective beginning on the date of enactment, and inserting ‘‘agency head’’; and (D) in paragraph (4)— (i) by adding after paragraph (3) the following: ‘‘(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall conduct a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise from within and outside of the sector being considered; and (ii) ensure that the technology focus of a Manufacturing USA institute does not substantially duplicate the technology focus of any other Manufacturing USA institute.’’; (ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ‘‘Secretary’’ and inserting ‘‘agency head’’; and (iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows: ‘‘(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall develop and implement metrics-based performance standards to assess the effectiveness of activities funded in making progress toward the purposes of the Program, including the effectiveness of Manufacturing USA institutes in advancing technology readiness levels or manufacturing readiness levels.’’; and (iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘the Secretary shall’’ and all that follows through ‘‘and insertions the following: ‘‘(E) in paragraph (5)— (i) in subparagraph (E)— (II) shall be eligible for renewal of that award made to a Manufacturing USA institute that take into account the research and development undertaken at other Manufacturing USA institutes and Federal agencies with respect to such areas.‘‘ and inserting ‘‘(ii) an assessment of the extent to which the institute has made progress in achieving the purposes described in subsection (a) and carrying out the activities which the institute has made progress in achieving the goals specified in the national strategy, and industry utility of the Program; (iii) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program; and (iv) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program; (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘Competitive, Merit Review’’ and inserting ‘‘agency head’’; and (iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows: ‘‘(E) GRANT PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES FOR MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES WITHOUT FEDERAL FUNDING.—The Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to Manufacturing USA institutes that are no longer recognized as such under subsection (c)(3)(C) to carry out workforce development, outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers, and other activities that— (i) are determined by the Secretary to be in the national interest; and (ii) are designed to help develop and expand manufacturing capability through— (A) significant outreach to, participation of, and engagement of small- and medium-sized manufacturers and other activities as the agency head, in coordination with the appropriate agency head, shall require each recipient of funding pursuant to clause (i).’’; and (iv) by striking ‘‘the Secretary’’ and inserting ‘‘agency head’’; and (A) in paragraph (1)(A)— (i) by striking ‘‘The Secretary’’ and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ‘‘Each agency head shall require each recipient of financial assistance from that agency under subsection (d)(1) and any other institute to annually submit to the appropriate agency head a report’’; and (ii) by adding at the end the following: ‘‘Each agency head shall submit such reports to the Secretary.‘‘; and (B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows: ‘‘(B) ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.— (A) ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the implementation of the Program during the most recent 3-year period, including an assessment of the progress made towards achieving the goals specified in the national strategy, and industry utility of the Program required under section 102(b)(7) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622(b)(7)).’’; and (B) (C) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report— (i) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program; (ii) an assessment of the extent to which the Program has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);
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"(iii) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to improve the Program; and

(iv) an assessment as to whether any prior recommendations for improvement made by the Comptroller General have been implemented or adopted.'; (12) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "subsection (e)" and inserting "subsection (k)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall collaborate with Federal agencies whose missions contribute to, or are affected by, advanced manufacturing to identify and leverage existing resources at such Federal agencies to assist Manufacturing USA institutes in carrying out the purposes of the program specified in subsection (a)(2). Such existing resources may include programs—

"(A) at the Department of Labor relating to labor and apprenticeships;

"(B) at the Economic Development Administration relating to regional innovation, such as the Regional Innovation Strategies program;

"(C) at the Department of Education relating to workforce development, education, training, and retraining;

"(D) at the Department of Defense relating to programs or authorities of the Department of Defense;

"(E) at the Food and Drug Administration relating to biopharmaceutical manufacturing;

"(F) at the National Science Foundation, including the Advanced Technological Education program;

"(G) at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to procurements, workforce development, education, training, and retraining; and

"(H) additional programs that the Secretary determines are appropriate to support the activities of existing Manufacturing USA institutes.'; and

(13) by adding at the end the following:

"(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) AGENCY HEAD.—The term 'agency head' means the head of any Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code), excluding the Department of Defense, that is providing financial assistance for a Manufacturing USA institute, including the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Energy.

"(2) REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.—The term 'regional innovation cluster' has the meaning given such term in section 27(f)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722(f)(1)).

"(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(1) NIST.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

"(2) RESERVATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) the Secretary shall reserve not less than $5,000,000 for the National Office of the Manufacturing USA Program established under subsection (f).

"(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For Manufacturing USA institutes operated by the Department of Energy, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy—

"(A) $70,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022; and

"(B) $84,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024.'.

SEC. 3. INCREASED EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL INNOVATION WITHIN AND EXTENSION OF REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.


(1) in subsection (b)(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(1) Developing relationships at the local level to build supply chains and use existing capabilities of entities operating on that level to bring economic growth to suburban and rural areas.‘; and

(2) in subsection (g)(2) by striking "2019" and inserting "2024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that the amendment be in order. I ask unanimous consent to include everything on H.R. 2397, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act.

I thank Ms. STEVENS for her leadership in introducing this bipartisan bill and for her commitment to developing legislation that will help strengthen America’s manufacturing base.

I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have worked with us to develop and advance this important legislation.

Back in 2014, I was proud to support the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act that established the Manufacturing USA program. That bipartisan bill was sponsored by Tom Reed and Joe Kennedy and was signed into law by President Obama.

Since its inception 5 years ago, the Manufacturing USA program has grown to support 14 manufacturing institutes focused on a variety of technology areas, ranging from 3D printing to groundbreaking energy-saving manufacturing processes.

H.R. 2397 would ensure the continued success of the Manufacturing USA program by reauthorizing the program for another 5 years and by allowing agencies to renew funding for institutes after reviewing the institutes’ progress on clear performance goals.

This bill also strengthens the ability of the institutes to leverage existing programs all across the Federal Government to improve their role in regional innovation, education and training, defense technology procurement, and other activities.

Today, manufacturing remains a vital component of our Nation’s economy and national security. H.R. 2397 will help to grow our manufacturing industry and to bring along with it many good-paying jobs for our workforce.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This legislation reauthorizes and expands the bipartisan Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act of 2014.

Nationally, manufacturing supports nearly 13 million American jobs, or roughly 9 percent of the workforce, and represents about 11 percent of the American economy. Most of these firms are small manufacturers, supporting local economies by providing well-paying jobs.

Technology will continue to change this sector dramatically. Today’s manufacturing floor looks far different from the assembly lines of the past, and the skills needed by manufacturing workers will continue to change.

Innovative processes, such as additive manufacturing, are transforming the future of manufacturing. It is essential that these technologies are transferred to and adopted by all U.S. manufacturers so that we remain globally competitive and the number one destination for companies looking to carry out advanced manufacturing.

With manufacturers in the United States performing 61 percent of all private sector R&D in the Nation, it is important that we capitalize on these investments and reauthorize the network of public-private partnerships established in this act, which bolster manufacturing innovation.

This bill includes important reforms to better coordinate centers for manufacturing innovation funded by all relevant agencies and incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office to improve management. This bill also prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small and medium-sized manufacturers.

I thank Representative STEVENS and Representative BALDERSON for introducing this legislation and for their work in ushering it through the Science Committee on a bipartisan basis. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I would note to my colleagues that I have no other speakers so, as I reserve my time, when the gentlewoman is prepared, I will close.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have been joined by my colleagues to introduce H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON,
Ranking Member LUCAS, Representatives BALDERSON and GONZALEZ, and the sponsors of the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, Representatives KENNEDY and REED, for their partnership in leading this legislation and for being such great champions for advanced manufacturing.

Today is a great day. It is a great legislative day and a great day for American manufacturing, for innovation, for our workforce, and for the effectiveness of our Federal Government to advance, grow, and compete.

Today, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act reauthorizes the Manufacturing USA program through bipartisan support and the willpower of our Federal Government.

What began in Youngstown, Ohio, as a pilot initiative, the vision of a lab that would usher in 3D printing applications, workforce training programs, and the transfer of new technologies across the country and into the supply chain, is now one of the 14 institutes encompassing various research concentrations. Those include Lightweight Innovations for Tomorrow Institute located at the University of Illinois, Illinois, REMADE Institute in Rochester, New York; Digital Manufacturing Institute in Chicago; and PowerAmerica in North Carolina for battery technology.

This work is in my blood, and it is part of why I came to Congress. It is also imperative for our role in global competition and for the investment in industrial policy and strategy vis-a-vis sound economic policy.

We will ensure that Manufacturing USA can continue to contribute to the growth of our domestic advanced manufacturing base and an advanced manufacturing workforce to fill the high-skilled jobs of the future.

AMLA authorizes agencies to renew their current institutes for an additional period of funding following a fair review of the institutes’ progress. It also strengthens the important partnership between Manufacturing USA and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, as well as other relevant programs across the Federal Government.

Finally, the bill authorizes funding to allow the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, and the Department of Energy to continue funding their current institutes and stand up at least one additional institute in fiscal year 2020 and each year thereafter.

The real strength of these institutes lies in the consortium model, with the private partners contributing at least 50 percent of the funding.

In 2017 alone, Manufacturing USA raised almost $180 million in investments from the private sector from nearly 1,300 manufacturers, universities, community colleges, government labs, and NGOs.

They are only able to do this because the Federal Government sets the table and provides support in the planning, development, management, and operation of each institute.

Manufacturing USA institutes provide critical U.S. global leadership in advanced manufacturing.

The institutes serve as a unique collaborative platform for industry and academia to engage in best-in-class expertise to solve challenges and usher in new innovations for you.

The program is making, I believe, incredible strides in workforce development for the future and existing workforce. For example, in 2017, the LIFT institute in Detroit reached over 160,000 students across the country through innovative web-based curricula, as well as in-person training programs. And the Manufacturing Institute in Chicago, the digital manufacturing lab, has used a taxonomic approach to codifying job roles specific to the changing nature of advanced manufacturing brought on by the Internet of Things.

The United States will never be able to compete by bringing back the manufacturing of yesterday. We can celebrate our manufactured heritage as we landed on the Moon—as we usher in the innovations to improve the lives and outcomes of our manufacturing base for the next 50 years.

The American Manufacturing Leadership Act has already been endorsed by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the American Society for Mechanical Engineers, the Bipartisan Policy Center, and the American Association of Manufacturing Institutes.

To the small and midsized manufacturers, to the suppliers, to the complex web of craftsmanship, to the future engineer, to the computer programmer, to the student dreaming in Livonia, Michigan, about what they are going to do, this is for you. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her extraordinary leadership on this issue for years, for the effort that she led on getting this passed in Congress several years ago, and her entire staff, the staff on both sides of the aisle when this bill was initially passed.

I also want to thank the great工作 of STEVENS for her incredible enthusiasm and dedication to workers across Michigan, across her district, but for never losing sight of what manufacturing means for this country, what this country was built on, and the men and women who make it all possible.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, when I introduced the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, it was not just for the people in my district. They were workers from Fall River to Taunton, to Milford, to Newton, who built more than just products on factory floors. They built entire communities; they built communities; and they built families.

Those same workers have made this legislation, this national manufacturing network, successful over the past 5 years because of the ideas they brought, their ideas, their determination, and their passion and pushed our manufacturing industry forward. They have refused to leave anyone behind.

Centers like the Advanced Functional Fabrics of America, based at MIT, the research now is focused on defense and health but has consequences in a broad variety of additional innovations, has over 100 members from various states across this country pioneering new technologies that will make their way into American homes and make our soldiers and troops safer along the way.

By collaborating with new local academia, especially with community colleges and vocational-technical schools, those workers are passing their skills, their expertise and experiences to a new generation of men and women who will follow in their footsteps.

The roots of this legislation continue to expand deep into communities, from Cambridge to Youngstown to Detroit and San Jose. American workers will build new companies, stronger communities, and secure families from the abundant resources that we produce together.

Above all else, the workers who lift our economy to great heights on factory floors deserve an economy that works just as hard as they do for our Nation. I urge all my colleagues to support this reauthorization.

I congratulate Ms. STEVENS for work well done, and I thank the chairwoman again.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I rise again in support of H.R. 2387, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This bipartisan legislation takes important steps to reform the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

It requires greater coordination among the centers for manufacturing innovation and incorporating GAO recommendations on the management of these centers. Most importantly, this bill prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers.

These public-private partnerships combine the technical knowledge base supported by our excellent universities and research institutions with innovation leadership supported by our private industries, both large and small. These centers provide the U.S. with the opportunity to lead the world in advanced manufacturing competitiveness.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I simply urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.
Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

The effect of the opioid epidemic on communities across our country is clear. Research from the CDC shows that, on average, 130 Americans die every day after overdosing on illegal opioids. In 2017, approximately 1.7 million Americans had a substance abuse disorder related to opioids. Those statistics are staggering, and the effects of this problem on our communities is heartbreaking.

While past and ongoing research conducted by the National Science Foundation has greatly increased our knowledge of this addiction, more work, of course, is needed. The basic research authorized in H.R. 3153 will extend and expand our understanding of opioid addiction and its impact on our communities and allow us to develop more effective evidence-based policies to address this epidemic.

I commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, for their leadership on this good, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment, or EFFORT, Act identifies gaps that exist in research of the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction and authorizes the National Science Foundation to support research grants in these areas.

This legislation will help drive research to understand one of the most important issues facing our country: How do we stop the opioid addiction crisis?

Congress must do all we can to combat opioid abuse and the continuing increase in opioid-related deaths. In 2017, more than 70,000 people died from drug overdoses, and approximately 68 percent of those deaths involved opioids. With my home State of Virginia being a leading States in opioid prescriptions, I believe supporting programs intended to improve our understanding of the science of addiction and combat this crisis is just common sense.

I thank Representative JENNIFER WEXTON and Representative JIM BAIRD for their bipartisan work on this bill. Opioid addiction affects too many in our communities, and I applaud this effort to support more basic research in the science of addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this body to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding and for her leadership on the very fine bills we have before the House here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 3153, the bipartisan EFFORT Act, which would expand federal research on opioids.

Since 2011, more than 200 people in the northern Shenandoah Valley of Virginia have lost their lives due to an opioid overdose. Some of the highest numbers of children being born in Virginia with neonatal abstinence syndrome have been from my district.

But these numbers don't tell the heartbreaking devastation the opioid crisis has wrought for families who have lost their mother, their father, and others for generational loss of their child. Meanwhile, our law enforcement officers and first responders are struggling with the trauma and burnout that comes from being on the front line of so many tragic and needless deaths of their friends and neighbors.

Tens of thousands of Americans and more than 1,000 Virginians are dying every year from overdoses. Addiction is an illness, and fighting the crisis effectively requires adequate research and funding. The EFFORT Act will help to do this by directing the National Science Foundation to support research on the science of opioid addiction.

The NSF has done an exceptional job in establishing some of the foundational understanding on opioid addiction, including research regarding the use of technology to address the crisis, the secondary effects on families, and options for addictive therapeutics for pain. And while this research has significantly increased our understanding of addiction, research gaps remain in a wide range of disciplines, including, for example, social and behavioral issues such as stigma, socioeconomic status, or treatment accessibility.

The NSF has a unique ability to help us close some of these gaps and, in turn, to help us develop solutions. By expanding the NSF's research on opioid addiction both within the agency, as well as jointly with the National Institutes of Health when needed, we can more effectively integrate clinical and basic research, obtain better understanding of the science of opioid addiction and its impact, and have a more comprehensive approach to tackling the crisis.

As a founding member of the bipartisan Freshmen Working Group on Addiction, I have worked to be a strong advocate for addiction prevention and recovery efforts, and I am pleased to have introduced this legislation with my fellow freshman colleague from Indiana, Dr. BAIRD. I ask him for his leadership on this issue, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.
Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act, also known as the EFFORT Act.

The opioid crisis has, tragically, destroyed the lives of many Hoosiers. According to the most recent available data from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, in 2017, drug overdose deaths in Indiana increased by 22½ percent from the previous year. Indiana’s 2017 rate of overdose deaths at over 29 per 100,000 was significantly higher than the national average.

This epidemic does not discriminate, and we must use evidence-based policy to ensure the health and well-being of current and future generations. The National Science Foundation’s research has increased what we know about addiction, and while this research is at the top of its class, gaps still remain in the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction.

I hope we can see an end to this crisis soon, and I am proud that Congress is taking action to fight back.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

I have no additional speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, both of whom I have the privilege of working with on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for their excellent leadership on this bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in passing it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume. I have no additional speakers.

I rise again in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

Opioid addiction knows no economic or political boundaries. It affects all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD for their bipartisan leadership on this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speeches. I would like to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank all of the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle and wish to recommend that we pass the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3153.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBATING SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCIENCE ACT OF 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 36) to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.
Sec. 4. Research grants.
Sec. 5. Data collection.
Sec. 6. Responsible conduct guide.
Sec. 7. Interagency working group.
Sec. 8. National academy.
Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the report issued by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”—

(A) sexual harassment is pervasive in institutions of higher education;

(B) the most common type of sexual harassment is gender harassment, which includes verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey interest, hostility, and degrading attitudes about members of one gender;

(C) 58 percent of individuals in the academic workplace experience sexual harassment, the second highest rate when compared to the military, the private sector, and Federal, State, and local government;

(D) women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience sexual harassment and to feel unsafe at work than White women, White men, or men who are members of such groups;

(E) the training for each individual who has a doctor of philosophy in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields is estimated to cost approximately $500,000; and

(F) attrition of an individual so trained results in a loss of talent and money.

(2) Sexual harassment undermines career advancement for women.

(3) According to a 2017 University of Illinois study, among astronomers and planetary scientists, 18 percent of women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups and 12 percent of White women skipped professional events because they did not feel safe attending.

(4) One paper reports a 55 percent increase in employment at institutions of higher education due to sexual harassment.

(5) Research shows the majority of individuals do not formally report experiences of sexual harassment due to a justified fear of retaliation or other negative professional or personal consequences.

(6) Reporting procedures with respect to such harassment are inconsistent among Federal science agencies and have varying degrees of accessibility.

(7) There is not adequate communication among Federal science agencies and between such agencies and grantees regarding reports of sexual harassment, which has resulted in harassers receiving Federal funding after moving to a different institution.
SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.
In this Act:
(1) ACADEMIES.—The term “Academies” means the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.
(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Science Foundation.
(3) FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY.—The term “Federal science agency” means any Federal agency with an annual extramural research expenditure of over $100,000,000.

(4) FINDING OR DETERMINATION.—The term “finding or determination” means the final disposition of a matter involving a violation of organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court of law.

(5) GENDER HARASSMENT.—The term “gender harassment” means verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey hostility, objectification, exclusion, or second-class status about one’s gender, gender identity, gender presentation, sexual orientation, or pregnancy status.

(6) GRANTEE.—The term “grantee” means the legal entity to which a grant is awarded and that is accountable to the Federal Government for the funds awarded.

(7) GRANT PERSONNEL.—The term “grant personnel” means principal investigators, co-principal investigators, postdoctoral researchers and other personnel selected by a grantee, cooperative agreement, or contract under Federal law.

(8) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(9) SEXUAL HARASSMENT.—The term “sexual harassment” means conduct that encompasses—
(A) unwelcome sexual advances;
(B) unwanted physical contact that is sexual in nature, including assault;
(C) created sexual work environment, including sexual comments and propositions for sexual activity;
(D) conditioning professional or educational benefits or consequences of, sexual harassment and gender harassment involving individuals in the STEM workforce, including students and trainees; and
(E) retaliation for rejecting unwanted sexual attention.

(10) STEM.—The term “STEM” means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science.

SEC. 4. RESEARCH GRANTS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a program of grants, on a competitive basis, to institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations (or consortia of such institutions or organizations):
(1) to expand research efforts to better understand the factors contributing to, and sequences of, sexual harassment and gender harassment affecting individuals in the STEM workforce, including students and trainees; and
(2) to examine interventions to reduce the incidence and negative consequences of such harassment.
(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities funded by a grant under this section may include—
(1) research on the sexual harassment and gender harassment experiences of individuals in underrepresented or vulnerable groups, including racial and ethnic minority groups, disabled individuals, foreign nationals, sexual and gender-minority individuals, and others;
(2) the development and assessment of policies, procedures, trainings, and interventions, with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment, conflict management, and ways to foster respectful climates;
(3) research on approaches for remediating the negative impacts and outcomes of such harassment on individuals experiencing such harassment;
(4) support for institutions of higher education to develop, adapt, and assess the impact of innovative, evidence-based strategies, policies, and approaches to policy implementation to prevent and address sexual harassment and gender harassment;
(5) research on alternatives to the hierarchical and dependent relationships, including but not limited to the mentor-mentee relationship, in academia that have been shown to create higher levels of risk for sexual harassment and gender harassment; and
(6) establishing a center for the ongoing compilation, maintenance, and analysis of campus climate survey data.

SEC. 5. DATA COLLECTION.
Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall convene a working group, composed of representatives of Federal statistical agencies—
(1) to develop questions on sexual harassment and gender harassment in STEM departments to gather national data on the prevalence, nature, and implications of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education; and
(2) to include such questions as appropriate, with sufficient protections of the privacy of respondents, in relevant surveys conducted by the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics and other relevant entities.

SEC. 6. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT GUIDE.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to update the report entitled “On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research” issued by the Academies. The report, as so updated, shall include—
(1) updated professional standards of conduct in research;
(2) standards of treatment individuals can expect to receive under such updated standards of conduct;
(3) evidence-based practices for fostering a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment;
(4) methods, including bystander intervention, for identifying and addressing incidents of sexual harassment and gender harassment; and
(5) professional standards for mentorship and teaching with an emphasis on preventing sexual harassment and gender harassment.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In updating the report under subsection (a), the Academies shall take into account issues raised in the report issued by the Academies in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering in Medicine” and other relevant studies and evidence.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the contract under subsection (a), the parties to such agreement, shall submit to the Director and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the report referred to in such subsection, as updated pursuant to such subsection.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, acting through the National Science and Technology Council, shall establish an interagency working group for the purpose of coordinating Federal science agency efforts to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment involving grant personnel. The working group shall be chaired by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (or the Director’s designee) and shall include a representative from each Federal science agency with annual extramural research expenditures of over $1,000,000,000, a representative from the Department of Education, and a representative from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF WORKING GROUP.—The interagency working group established under subsection (a) shall coordinate Federal science agency efforts to implement the policy guidelines developed under subsection (c)(2).

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF OSTP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(1) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an inventory of policies, procedures, and resources dedicated to preventing and responding to reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at Federal agencies that provide legal definitions to which institutions of higher education must comply; and
(2) not later than 6 months after the date on which the inventory is submitted under paragraph (1), in consultation with outside stakeholders and Federal science agencies, develop a uniform set of policy guidelines for Federal science agencies;

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall include guidelines that require—
(1) grantees to submit to the Federal science agency or agencies from which the grantees receive funding reports relating to—
(A) administrative action, related to an allegation against grant personnel of any sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, that affects the ability of grant personnel or their trainees to carry out the activities of the grant; and
(B) findings or determinations against grant personnel of sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, or executive orders, including any findings or determinations related to reports submitted under subparagraph (A) and any disciplinary action that was taken;
(2) the sharing, updating, and archiving of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment from grantees submitted under paragraph (1) with relevant Federal science agencies on a quarterly basis; and
(3) the extent practicable, ensure consistency among Federal agencies with respect to the policies and procedures for receiving reports or conducting investigations related to reports submitted pursuant to paragraph (1), which may include the designation of a single agency to field reports so submitted.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall consider guidelines that require or incentivize—
(1) grantees to periodically assess their organizational climate, which may include the use of climate surveys, focus groups, exit interviews, or exit interviews;
(2) grantees to publish on a publicly available website the results of assessments conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), including reports of misconduct, including gender and race, ethnicity, disability status, and sexual orientation;
(3) grantees to make public on an annual basis the number of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at each such institution;
(4) grantees to regularly assess and improve policies, procedures, and interventions to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment;
(5) each grantee to demonstrate in its proposal for a grant award, cooperative agreement, or contract that a code of conduct is in place for the re-integration of individuals who have experienced sexual harassment and gender harassment; and
(6) the diffusion of the hierarchical and dependent relationships between grant personnel and their trainees;
(7) each grantee and Federal science agency to have in place mechanisms for the re-integration of individuals who have experienced sexual harassment and gender harassment; and
(8) grantees to work to create a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment.
(i) FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION.—Each Federal science agency shall—
(1) develop or maintain and implement policies with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment that are consistent with policy guidance in section (c)(2) and that protect the privacy of all parties involved in any report and investigation of sexual harassment and gender harassment except to the extent necessary to carry out an investigation; and
(2) broadly disseminate such policies to current and potential recipients of research grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts awarded by such agency.
(g) FERPA.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall ensure that such policies and requirements are consistent with the requirements of section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly referred to as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”).
(h) SUNSET.—The interagency working group established under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. NATIONAL ACADEMIES ASSESSMENT.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to undertake a study of the influence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education on the careers advancement of individuals in the STEM workforce.
(b) FUNDING.—The Director shall—
(1) the state of research on sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;
(2) whether research demonstrates a change in the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;
(3) the progress made with respect to implementing recommendations promulgated in the Academies consensus study report entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”;
(4) grantees to focus their efforts with respect to decreasing sexual harassment and gender harassment in such institutions.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director to carry out this Act, $17,500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to re-vise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 36, the bill that is now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas? There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Ranking Member Mr. LUCAS, for joining me in introducing this bill and for his commitment to expanding access to STEM studies and careers.

This bill is a product of more than a year of activity by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. We heard from many experts about the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM, factors that have enabled it, the impact it has on the lives and careers of so many talented young scientists and engineers, and the loss to our Nation when they leave research altogether.

We also learned of some best practices for universities, scientific societies, and Federal agencies to begin to bring transparency and accountability to this challenge.

Federal science agencies have an important role to play, because they have the responsibility to ensure that all federally-funded researchers, including students, are able to carry out their research in safe environments at all times.

However, agencies need universities to be partners in that area and effort, and that partnership starts with universities reporting to their funders when a student or researcher is brave enough to come forward with an allegation of sexual harassment.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the National Science Foundation for its bold leadership in implementing a reporting policy, and NIH and NASA for their own more recent efforts. Unfortunately, other agencies have been slow to respond.

H.R. 36 directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to issue uniform guidance to all Federal science agencies to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment involving grant personnel.

Unfortunately, too many women have been driven out of STEM careers due to a culture of harassment and abuse.

H.R. 36 takes the first steps to address this problem. The bill directs the NSF to expand research efforts to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce.

Additionally, it directs the NSF to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment.

The bill also supports the adoption of uniform guidance across the Federal science agencies to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment involving grant personnel.

There is an established legal process in place within higher education and in the workplace for handling claims of sexual harassment. I cannot stress this enough: This bill does not alter that process.

What this bill does is to create a uniform policy for universities and research institutions to report to Federal science agencies when administrative action is taken that impacts the ability of a researcher to carry out a grant.

Pervasive sexual harassment in the scientific community discourages women from critical work in good-paying jobs and hurts American competitiveness.

It is unacceptable for taxpayer dollars to fund researchers who are guilty of harassing students or colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the stakeholders, especially the university community, for working with the committee staff to improve this legislation. I believe the revised bill strikes
the right balance of protecting due process and privacy, while making sure that Federal science agencies can act if a Federal research grant or the personnel supported by that grant is impacted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way to move this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. H.R. 3196 takes the first steps towards addressing the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM fields, which is driving women out of STEM careers and damaging U.S. competitiveness.

The legislation sends a strong message to the scientific community that misconduct will not be tolerated, and it sends a message to women who are in STEM studies and careers that we support them. I look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and stakeholders to advance this legislation and make sure it is meeting the intended goals.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill. I thank members of the full committee for their work on this bill. I recommend passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

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

Ms. JOHNSON, 3196, the bill now under consideration, will be known as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3196, which, after today’s consideration, will be known as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act.

I thank Representative GONZÁLEZ-Colón for joining me in introducing this bill.

Dr. Vera Rubin was a trailblazing astronomer, who dedicated her life to advancing our understanding of the cosmos. She was also a tireless advocate for women in science, and she was well known for her mentorship of aspiring women astronomers. Today would have been Dr. Rubin’s 91st birthday, but, sadly, she passed away on Christmas Day in 2016.

During the 1970s, Dr. Rubin published the best set of measurements of the galaxy rotation to date. Her data revealed something surprising. The stars orbiting in the outer regions of the galaxies were moving much faster than expected. Dark matter, first proposed by Hubbles Law in 1933, was her way to explain the observed motion.

Dr. Rubin’s work helped to convince the broader astronomy community of the existence of dark matter and revolutionized the way we understand the universe. Instead of being dominated by light-emitting matter, Dr. Rubin’s work revealed that most of the universe is made up of a mysterious and invisible substance called dark matter.

The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, or LSST, is an 8-meter telescope currently under construction in Chile. Funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, LSST will conduct an unprecedented survey of the night sky. The data collected by this telescope will enable scientists to build on Dr. Rubin’s pioneering work and probe the nature of dark matter.

Dr. Rubin’s exemplary science and her sterling character will drive scientific discovery and inspire girls and women in STEM for decades to come.

While Dr. Rubin has already claimed a well-deserved place in history, H.R. 3196 will further elevate her story by designating one of the world’s premier research facilities as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory.

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

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

Ms. JOHNSON, 3196, the bill now under consideration, will be known as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act. This bill honors the contributions of the late Dr. Vera Rubin, an astronomer who made groundbreaking discoveries in the field of dark matter and contributed to the realization that the universe is more complex and more mysterious than was ever even imagined.
I agree with Chairwoman JOHNSON that it is fitting that the House honor Dr. Rubin today on what would have been her 91st birthday. Dr. Rubin was a pioneer and lifelong advocate for women in science, serving as a mentor, supporter, and role model for many women astronomers.

The new Large Synoptic Survey Telescope under construction in Chile, funded by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, will photograph the entire sky every few nights. One of the goals of the project is to study the nature of dark matter and dark energy.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Representative GONZALEZ-COLON for their leadership and for working with stakeholders to update this legislation.

Naming the observatory in honor of Dr. Rubin is a fitting tribute to her contributions to the field, and I hope it will inspire future generations of women in astronomy. This bill designates the Vera C. Rubin Observatory, given her remarkable contributions to the field of dark matter and advocacy for the equal treatment and representation of women in science, it is only appropriate that we honor Dr. Rubin this way.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Representative GONZALEZ-COLON for their leadership in introducing this bill. I am hopeful that this will ensure that Dr. Rubin’s legacy lives on and continues to inspire young women to pursue careers in STEM.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico for cosponsoring this bill, and I thank the full committee for supporting it. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3196, the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act, of which I am the co-lead alongside Chairwoman JOHNSON.

Dr. Rubin exemplified perseverance and tenacity in science. As a woman scientist, she encountered many obstacles during her academic and professional career. As a student, her application to Princeton University was denied because, at the time, women were not allowed to enroll in the astrophysics graduate program of this institution. Similarly, years later, she had problems accessing the Palomar Observatory in California, one of the most iconic scientific facilities in the world, also because she was a woman. Experiences such as these would be enough to discourage a young student and scientist. Still, Dr. Rubin persevered, demonstrating exceptional intellectual capabilities and character.

Dr. Vera Rubin changed the way we understand the universe. Her groundbreaking work on dark matter and galaxy rotations remain at the forefront of STEM research in the field of astronomy. Her legacy will undoubtedly continue to influence future generations of scientists and will hopefully be memorialized in the new Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) Observatory under construction in Chile. I am very much looking forward to the great work this facility will produce by researchers, like Dr. Rubin.

I am immensely proud of this bill. Especially as these would be enough to discourage a young student and scientist. Still, Dr. Rubin persevered, demonstrating exceptional intellectual capabilities and character.

(4) minimizing freshwater withdrawal and consumption;

(5) increasing water use efficiency;

(6) utilizing nontraditional water sources with efforts to improve the quality of the water from those sources;

(7) minimizing deleterious impacts on water bodies, groundwater, and waterways;

and

(8) minimizing seismic impacts;

(9) considering the effects climate variability may have on water supplies and quality for energy generation and fuel production; and

(10) improving understanding of the energy-water nexus.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a strategic plan identifying the research, development, and demonstration needs for Department programs and projects to carry out subsection (a). The strategic plan shall include technical milestones for achieving and assessing progress toward the objectives of subsection (a).

(2) SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) new advanced cooling technologies for energy generation and fuel production technologies;

(B) performance improvement of existing cooling technologies and cost reductions associated with using those technologies;

(C) innovative water reuse, recovery, and treatment technologies in energy generation and fuel production, including renewable energy;

(D) technology development for carbon capture and storage systems that utilize efficient water use design strategies;

(E) technologies that are life-cycle cost effective;

(F) systems analysis and modeling of issues relating to the energy-water nexus; and

(G) technologies to treat and utilize wastewater and produced waters discharged from natural gas, coal, and other substances to be used as an energy source.

(H) advanced materials for the use of nontraditional water sources for energy generation and fuel production;

(I) biomass production and utilization and the impact on hydrologic systems;

(J) technologies that reduce impacts on water from energy resource development;

(K) energy efficient technologies for water distribution, treatment, supply, and collection systems;

(L) technologies for energy generation from water distribution, treatment, supply, and collection systems; and

(M) the flexible operation of water infrastructure to provide essential grid reliability services;

(N) modular or energy-water microgrid systems that can provide energy and water resources in remote or disaster recovery areas;

(O) recovering energy in the form of biofuels, bioproducts, and biopower from municipal and industrial wastewaters, and similar organic streams; and

(P) any other area of the energy-water nexus that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) COLLABORATION AND NONDUP lication.—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall coordinate and avoid duplication—

(A) with other Federal agencies operating related programs, if appropriate; and

(B) across programs of the Department, including with those of the National Laboratories.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 34, the Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019.

I first thank my friend, Mr. Lucas, who joined me in introducing this legislation, which calls attention to the critical link between energy and water. This bill implements the Department of Energy to ensure due consideration of water issues in its research, development, and demonstration programs.

As we all know, especially those of us who represent Texas, Oklahoma, and other southwestern and western States, we have limited water resources that must be distributed appropriately to our large energy industries, agricultural communities, and rapidly growing populations. We have experienced crippling droughts in recent years, so it is vital that we do as much as possible to use this commodity wisely.

However, not many people are aware of the importance of water to energy generation and, similarly, the crucial role that energy plays in delivery of safe, sanitary water to our constituents.

The Energy and Water Research Integration Act encourages research into energy technologies that would improve and minimize the energy and water production, and also establishes a mechanism for Federal agencies to work with State and local governments and other stakeholders to advance our understanding of what is known as the "energy-water nexus." In addition, the bill requires a regularly updated strategic plan to guide these efforts. These are important, positive steps towards using our limited resources in the most efficient and effective way possible.

I am pleased that these issues have already received serious attention so far this Congress, with the committee hosting a hearing on this bill in March and two markups, one at the subcommittee level and one before the full committee. Our hearing witnesses and other crucial stakeholders, including the Department of Energy, were able to contribute and shape the legislation to the well-vetted proposal that we are finally considering today. I hope that we can demonstrate a strong, sustained commitment to research and development in this vital area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 34, the Energy and Water Research Integration Act. This legislation is a product of bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee efforts to improve our understanding of the critical relationship between the U.S. energy and water sectors.

The production of energy is dependent on reliable sources of water, and the distribution of clean water is dependent on the availability of energy. No matter what the future U.S. energy market looks like, integrating these
two systems is essential. But this is no simple task.

Both water and energy management are often impacted by many regional challenges and resources and require careful consideration of local factors. For example, electricity in Oklahoma, agricultural use, and the single largest driver of water consumption in the State. But that same agricultural industry also creates a source of energy through biofuels.

Additionally, natural gas production, which is key to the development of a cleaner U.S. energy market, relies on horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, processes which require large volumes of water. But these processes can also produce water, enabling reuse of this resource through fluid lifecycle management.

The Energy and Water Research Integration Act will help prioritize research and development on critical relationships between energy and water systems. By helping America's researchers develop tools and technologies to improve our Nation's energy efficiency, environmental stability, and economic growth.

I also applaud the work that many Federal agencies, including the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, are already doing to improve the efficiency of our energy water systems, and to see the increasing prioritization of this work. Including the multiagency Water Security Grand Challenge and the recently announced DOE Energy-Water Desalination Hub. But we, in Congress, must also do our part.

Because of the complex relationship between energy and water systems, this will require a multidisciplinary approach. At every step of the R&D process there is a need to facilitate interactions between chemists, engineers, geologists, and legislators, and to encourage collaboration between the Federal Government, industry, universities, and local stakeholders.

I believe this legislation, introduced by Chairwoman JOHNSON and myself, can help to streamline and prioritize this work. The programs authorized in this legislation will leverage the worldwide, early-stage research programs and unparalleled facilities at our national labs and enable the development of next-generation technologies that will improve the efficiency and production in both the energy and water sectors.

I thank my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, particularly Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for continuing to prioritize important research and development programs that will make America stronger, cleaner, and keep us globally competitive. I am grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with the Members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues to guide this important and bipartisan work.

H.R. 34 prioritizes critical research to help improve the way we use energy and water.

I again want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for her leadership on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

H.R. 34 is a work in progress. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY VETERANS HEALTH INITIATIVE ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 617) to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 617

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 "Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term "National Laboratory" has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 1801).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to advance Department of Energy expertise in artificial intelligence and high-performance computing in order to improve health outcomes for veteran populations by—

(a) conduct basic research in modeling and simulation, machine learning, large-scale data analytics, natural language processing, and predicative analysis in order to develop novel or optimized algorithms for prediction of disease treatment and outcomes;

(b) develop methods to accommodate large data sets with variable quality and scale, and to provide insight and models for complex systems;

(c) develop new approaches and maximize the use of algorithms developed through artificial intelligence, machine learning, data analytics, natural language processing, and predictive analysis, and develop new algorithms suitable for high-performance computing systems and large biomedical data sets;

(d) advance existing and construct new data enclaves capable of securely storing data sets provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense, and other sources; and

(e) promote collaboration and data sharing between National Laboratories, research entities, and user facilities of the Department by providing the necessary access and secure data transfer capabilities.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY VETERANS HEALTH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a research program in artificial intelligence and high-performance computing, focused on the development of tools to solve big data challenges associated with veteran's healthcare, and to support the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs in areas of data, artificial intelligence, high-performance computing, and national laboratories.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) conduct basic research in modeling and simulation, artificial intelligence, high-performance computing, and data analytics, including the development of novel or optimized algorithms for prediction of disease treatment and outcomes,

(2) develop new approaches and maximize the use of algorithms developed through artificial intelligence, machine learning, data analytics, natural language processing, and predictive analysis, and develop new algorithms suitable for high-performance computing systems and large biomedical data sets,

(3) advance existing and construct new data enclaves capable of securely storing data sets provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense, and other sources; and

(4) promote collaboration and data sharing between National Laboratories, research entities, and user facilities of the Department by providing the necessary access and secure data transfer capabilities.

(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program required under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) enter into memoranda of understanding with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other Federal agencies and entities to carry out collaborative agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other entities in order to maximize the effectiveness of Department of Energy research and development to improve veterans' healthcare,

(2) consult with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other Federal agencies as appropriate; and

(3) ensure that data storage meets all privacy and security requirements established by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and that access to data is provided in accordance with relevant Department of Veterans Affairs data access policies, including informed consent.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act,
the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, a report detailing the effectiveness of—

(1) the interagency coordination between each involved in the research program carried out under this section;

(2) collaborative research achievements of the program; and

(3) potential opportunities to expand the technical capabilities of the Department.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out research, development, and demonstration activities to develop tools to apply to big data that enable Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, non-profit research organizations, and industry to better leverage the capabilities of the Department to solve complex, big data challenges. The Secretary shall carry out these activities through a competitive, merit-reviewed process, and consider applications from National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, Federal agencies, non-profit organizations, or industry at National Laboratories; and

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the research, development, and demonstration activities authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) utilize all available mechanisms to prevent duplication and coordinate research efforts across the Department;

(2) establish multiple user facilities to serve as data enclaves capable of securely storing data collected by Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, or industry at National Laboratories; and

(3) promote collaboration and data sharing between National Laboratories, research entities, and user facilities of the Department by providing the necessary access and secure data transfer capabilities.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report evaluating the effectiveness of the activities authorized under subsection (a).

(d) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out section $27,000,000 during the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act. This bill authorizes the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs to address large and complex data challenges associated with veterans' healthcare issues.

H.R. 617 also authorizes the Department of Energy to support activities that will better enable other Federal agencies to leverage the Department's capabilities in developing advanced data analytics tools for a broad range of applications.

I would like to thank the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for working with us to improve this legislation. I would also like to thank the bill's sponsor, Mr. NORMAN, for his hard work on this bill.

Before I began my career in politics, I worked as a chief psychiatric nurse for the Dallas VA Medical Center in Dallas, Texas. I saw firsthand the unique healthcare needs of the veteran community. I believe the bill before us today will be a positive step toward tackling some of the critical problems that the VA is currently facing.

I strongly support this bipartisan bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative NORMAN's bill, H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act.

This bill authorizes a critical and ongoing partnership between the Department of Energy and the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the way we care for those and care for our veterans. This partnership, known as the MVP-Champion initiative, allows DOE to support the VA in analyzing healthcare data.

H.R. 617 formally authorizes this program, allowing VA researchers to gain access to DOE's high-performance computing research facilities and significant resources, including DOE's extensive expertise in data analysis and complex modeling.

The VA currently collects genomic and healthcare data, including the deepest levels of DNA sequencing that allows for high-quality genomic research, from veterans who have volunteered for the program. This data is then securely transferred to DOE, where it is stored and analyzed in a secure site at DOE's Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

This partnership and exchange of data benefits both DOE and the VA. The rich and expansive dataset provided by the VA presents an incredible opportunity to train DOE's next-generation computing capacities to solve complex challenges; and with what they learn from this analysis, the VA can improve and better target health treatments for veterans.

This data can help the VA make discoveries about the causes of various diseases and develop diagnostics to move more quickly to detect them in veterans. It will also help the VA develop more effective treatments and improve treatment for critical medical needs.

In return, by giving DOE access to such a large database of information, the VA will help DOE researchers improve their ability to develop next-generation computing systems, algorithms, and models, capacities that are critical in maintaining U.S. science and technological leadership.

These enhanced capacities can then be applied in support of DOE's core mission areas and has the potential to enhance expertise in everything from biosciences and material designs to maintaining our nuclear weapons stockpile.

With the next generation of supercomputers right around the corner, most notably, the computing systems that DOE expects to field in 2021, DOE will be able to tackle even bigger challenges after gaining expertise in solving big data problems like this.

In short, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act will improve the healthcare for those men and women who have served our country. It also maximizes Federal resources for facilitating collaboration, and gives other agencies, academia, and industry the chance to benefit from the Department of Energy's R&D expertise.

I want to thank Representative NORMAN for championing this important collaboration, along with the basic research that will support our veterans and American innovation.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their support of the all-important VA.

I rise in support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act.

This legislation authorizes a partnership between the Department of Energy—the DOE—and the Department of Veterans Affairs—the VA—to conduct collaborative research in computing, artificial intelligence, and big data science in order to improve healthcare for all of our veterans.

The VA hosts one of the largest and most valuable health datasets. Through its voluntary data collection program, entitled the Million Veterans Program, MVP, the VA has collected
Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act, introduced by my colleague Congressman RALPH NORMAN from South Carolina.

I think this bill is very simple, but very essential at the same time. It essentially authorizes collaboration between the Department of Energy and the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a program that facilitates computing capabilities to process data on health issues affecting all of our veterans. The bill will subsequently support the Veterans Administration with identifying potential health risks and challenges that our communities have.

I think it is important because combining those processing capabilities with health information compiled by the VA will help us to better understand the health issues related to our veterans and the general population as well and ensures that both agencies will remain at the forefront of scientific and medical research.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill on behalf of our veterans. Actually, we have more than 90,000 veterans registered in Puerto Rico, and we are very grateful to Congressman RALPH NORMAN for introducing this bill.

I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their great work together on behalf of the scientific community and our veterans.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close, since I have no additional speakers.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, H.R. 617 harnesses the power of DOE's supercomputers to revolutionize the way we care for America's veterans.

I want to thank Representative NORMAN for his leadership on this bill. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Speaker. I would like to close by simply thanking all of the members of the full committee, as well as the staff, and to urge passage of this legislation, H.R. 617.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 617, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
exclude the State of Israel and the Israeli people from the economic, cultural, and academic life of the rest of the world;

Whereas the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement is one of several recent political movements that undermines the possibility for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by compelling companies alone to encourage the Palestinians to reject negotiations in favor of international pressure;

Whereas the founder of the Global BDS Movement, Ahed Tamimi, has denied the right of the Jewish people in their homeland, saying, “We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestinian land. We are not a self-out Palestinian, will never accept a Jewish state in Palestine.”;

Whereas the Global BDS Movement targets not only the Israeli government but also Israeli academic, cultural, and civil society institutions, as well as individual Israeli citizens of all political persuasions, religions, and ethnicities, and in some cases even Jews of other nationalities who support Israel;

Whereas the Global BDS Movement does not recognize, and many of its supporters explicitly deny, the right of the Jewish people to national self-determination;

Whereas university-based Global BDS efforts are the goals of the university and global cultural development, which thrive on free and open exchange and debate, and it is out to the intimidation and harassment of Jewish students and others who support Israel;

Whereas the Global BDS Movement promotes principles of collective guilt, mass punishment, and group isolation, which are destructive of prospects for progress towards peace and a two-state solution;

Whereas similar tools aimed at promoting racial justice and social change have been used effectively in the United States, South Africa, and other parts of the world;

Whereas in contrast to protest movements that have sought racial justice and social change, the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel is not about promoting coexistence, civil rights, and political reconciliation but about questioning and undermining the very legitimacy of the country and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representa-
tives—
(1) opposes the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement (BDS Movement) targeting Israel, including efforts to target United States companies that are engaged in commercial activities that are legal under United States law, and all efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel;

(2) affirms the Constitutional right of Israelis and Palestinians to return to direct negotiations as the only way to achieve an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

(3) affirms the Constitutional right of United States citizens to free speech, including the right to protest or criticize the policies of the United States or foreign governments;

(4) supports the full implementation of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-206; 128 Stat. 8075) and new efforts to enhance government-wide, coordinated United States-Israel scientific and technological cooperation in civilian areas, such as with respect to energy, water, agriculture, alternative fuel technology, civil-

ian space technology, and security, in order to counter the effects of actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(5) supports the full implementation of a workable, negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states—a democratic Jewish State of Israel, and a viable, democratic Palestinian state—living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recogni-
tion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentle-
man from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include ex-
traneous material on H. Res. 246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle-
man from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thank-
ing the sponsor of this resolution, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. WAGNER. I am grateful for their bipartisan leadership.

Mr. Speaker, there are 339 cosponsors of this resolution. Let me say that again: 339 cosponsors for this measure opposing the global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement that undermines the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

Support for Israel in Congress is an issue that has been like candy for our friends in the press that cover our work. Frankly, this issue has been po-
liticized in a way that I find ugly and is ultimately harmful to the U.S.-Israel relationship. It is time that leaders stop playing politics with our relations with the Jewish state.

When the fog clears, and the bullies on their pulpits end their tirades, what you see with this measure is a real bi-

partisan reflection on how this body re-
gards our country’s relationship with and support for our opposi-
tion to BDS. Almost 80 percent of House Members are cosponsors, and we are here debating it under suspension of the rules.

What this resolution says is simple. It says that support for BDS and sup-
port for a two-state solution just aren’t compatible. Let me explain why, and I hope this explanation will also help to address some of the concerns about this measure.

Opposing BDS isn’t about opposing any individual’s right to protest or boycott. The right of any person to express views like that is enshrined in our Constitution. That sort of free ex-
pression is a pillar of American democ-

racy, and this resolution says so. Let me read from it:

“Whereas it is a hallmark of American democracy for citizens to petition the United States Government in favor of or against United States foreign pol-

cy;”

“Whereas the United States Con-
stitution protects the rights of United States citizens to articulate political views, including with respect to the policies of the United States or foreign govern-
ments.”

That is in this resolution. It couldn’t be any clearer, Mr. Speaker.

Throughout history, protests, boy-
cotts, and movements like that have played an important role in driving important change. The resolution says that, too:

“Whereas boycotts and similar tools aimed at promoting racial justice and social change have been used effec-
tively in the United States, South Af-
rica, and other parts of the world.”

But here is the thing about the global BDS movement: I don’t believe it promotes racial justice or social change at all. It promotes a one-sided view of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that seeks to marginalize Israel and that would deny the Jewish people the right of national self-determination, a right proclaimed by none other than the United Nations.

Many of us have been fighting for years to advance a future for the Israelis and Palestinians of two states for two peoples living side by side in peace and security. Building that fu-
ture will require hard work and conces-
sions.

The BDS says that the onus is entirely on Israel. All concessions have to come from Israel, and the Palestinians should reject negotiations and just allow international pressure to build on Israel.

That is not how negotiations work, and it is no way to promote peace. That is why this movement is so count-
terproductive, in my view.

Do you want to criticize a govern-
ment? That is your right. Do Israel and want to stop buying products from a certain country? That is also your right.

But participating in an international commercial effort that undermines Israel’s legitimacy and scuttles the chances of a two-state solution isn’t the same as an individual exercising First Amendment rights.

I continue to believe that a two-state solution that guarantees self-deter-
mination for both Jews and Palestin-
ians—not one or the other—is the best way to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I believe that the over-
whelming majority of our colleagues in this body agree with me, and Congress has said so before in bipartisan resolu-
tions.

Today, we have the opportunity to reiterate that point and to warn against something that would derail that solution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the resolution for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forego action on H.Res. 246, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperation with which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Nadler, Chairman.

House of Representatives, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Chairman ELLIOT ENGEL.
Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Engel: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, “Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.” This bill was sequentially referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (“Science Committee”) on March 21, 2019.

The Science Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 in order to expedite floor consideration. This is, however, not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Science Committee over this subject matter. Additionally, thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chairwoman.

House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Nadler: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this resolution.

I acknowledge that provisions of the resolution fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the resolution does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the measure that fall within your jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely, Eliot L. Engel, Chairman.

House of Representatives, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions targeting Israel.

Because you have been working with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in H.Res. 246 that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of H.Res. 246 so that it may proceed expedited through the House floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.Res. 246 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.Res. 246 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would request that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.Res. 246.

Sincerely, Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 246. This is a bipartisan resolution I introduced with BRAD SCHNEIDER, JERRY NADLER, and ANN WAGNER to oppose BDS and efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel, which is now up to 350 cosponsors.

We must combat the BDS movement targeting our great ally in the Middle East. The BDS movement seeks to harm Israel today, tomorrow, and well into the future.

It is an American value to be able to express legitimate, reasonable criticism of any government in the world, including our own. The BDS movement, though, is different, and we must resist the blatant anti-Semitism injected throughout BDS and the delegitimizing of Israel.

We must educate and all be aware of the toxic, anti-Semitic words of the founder of BDS and how we have so many Jewish students on college campuses right here in the United States from coast to coast targeted with blatant anti-Semitism in the name of BDS.

Congress needs to make a very strong, bipartisan statement against BDS, and this resolution does just that. In addition, we should also enact legislation with teeth.

In February, the Senate passed anti-BDS legislation, S. 1, with a strong, bipartisan vote. This bill, if passed, will require the State and local governments to adopt laws to divest public funds from entities that boycott Israel. Lead Republican McCaul already has a bill in the House, H.R. 336, that is identical to S. 1 and contains the anti-BDS legislation.

I strongly encourage the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor as well so that not only are we making a strong statement, but we are also doing something about it.

I am grateful to House leadership for bringing H. Res. 246 to the floor today, for Chairman Engel’s work and his team’s work in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to lead Republican McCaul and his team.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big deal. I am honored to work with you on this important effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Nadler), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 246. This resolution, modeled on legislation passed...
by the New York City Council, is fully consistent with the First Amendment and affirms the rights of those who support the global BDS movement to voice their opinions. Importantly, it also puts Congress on RECORD rejecting this misguided and deceptive movement that is progressive in its conduct nor pro-peace in its ultimate mission.

BDS proponents advocate for a complete boycott of Israeli businesses, individuals, and institutions—including academics, students, which are supposedly to be bastions of intellectual freedom—hypocritically seeking to deny all Israeli citizens the same rights and freedoms that BDS supporters claim that they themselves are denied. Not only does the movement, at times, invoke anti-Semitic tropes and seemingly promote violence, it unfairly blames one party in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and does nothing to promote direct negotiations to achieve a solution, which is the only path to a fair peace.

In fact, the founder of the movement, when asked whether BDS would end when Palestinians were able to establish their own state, flatly says “no.” That tells you everything you need to know, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of promoting peace and a two-state solution, the mission of BDS is clear: to delegitimize Israel, regardless of its policies or conduct, and to deny the Jewish people, the right of national self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I applaud Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. ZELDIN for sponsoring this important resolution. I especially thank Chairman Eliot ENGEL for his very eloquent comments a moment ago.

Not wishing to be redundant, I will just say this because I associate myself with their strong and persuasive remarks: The great former Soviet refusenik and religious prisoner Natan Sharansky, who testified at two of about a dozen hearings that I have chaired on combating anti-Semitism, proposed what he called a simple test to help us distinguish legitimate criticism of Israel from anti-Semitism. Sharansky called it the three Ds, de-nationalization, double standard, and delegitimization.

When the three Ds are advanced, we know that anti-Semitism is the issue. The BDS movement denounces Israel and, by extension, Jews, who are always cast in the role of oppressors who are always in the wrong. In so doing, it applies a double standard, whereby Israel is always wrong and the oppressed Palestinians are always in the right, regardless of whether groups such as Hamas are engaging in terroristic acts upon Israeli citizens. The objective of this is to delegitimize the State of Israel, to deny its very right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud them on this bill, and I hope this vote is unanimous. Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in support of H. Res. 246, of which I am the sponsor. This resolution does four things. First, it affirms the vital relationship between the United States and Israel, our most important ally in a complicated region of the world.

Second, it reiterates our unbreakable commitment to Israel’s security.

Third, it restates Congress’ strong, bipartisan support for a negotiated two-state solution.

Lastly, it makes clear that Congress opposes the global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, or BDS, movement that seeks to delegitimize Israel; opposes a two-state solution; and pushes the cause of peace for both Israelis and Palestinians further out of reach.

It has been our country’s long-held policy that the best path to ensuring Israel’s long-term security as a democratic and Jewish state, and realizing the Palestinian people’s aspirations for a state of their own, is through a negotiated two-state solution.

The global BDS movement, on the other hand, denies the Jewish people’s connection to the land of Israel; refuses to accept the basic idea of a Jewish state; and seeks to delegitimize Israel in international forums, on college campuses, and in global commerce.

But don’t take my word for it. The founder of the global BDS movement, Omar Barghouti, has said as much: “We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian, rational Palestinian, not a sellout Palestinian, will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine.”

When the global BDS movement supporters chant, “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free,” these are not words of peace. This is a call for the destruction of the entire State of Israel and the elimination of the Jews from the land—all the land, not just Gaza and the West Bank.

That is why it is so important that we take a stand today and vote to condemn the global BDS movement.

Let me also be clear: This resolution explicitly recognizes that boycotts have a long tradition in this country, including the civil rights movement, efforts to end apartheid in South Africa, and other matters. However, not all boycotts seek just ends.

Such is the case of the BDS movement that seeks to delegitimize Israel and the destruction of the Jewish state.

I am proud that this resolution has gained 350 cosponsors, including more than three-quarters of the Members of both parties. I would like to thank the leadership of my Democratic colleague Congressman Jerry NADLER as well as the leaders of our Republican colleagues, Representatives Lee ZELDIN and Ann WAGNER.

This strong, bipartisan support sends a clear, united message that this Congress not only supports the Jewish, democratic State of Israel and two states as the path to peace for both Israelis and Palestinians but that at the same time we condemn efforts to delegitimize and block the path to peace.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the esteemed Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate both of my colleagues from New York, the distinguished gentlemen, Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ENGEL, for their strong leadership in standing up against this BDS movement.

I think we all know what it is designed to do. It is designed to delegitimize Israel as a Jewish state and to undermine their economy, which ultimately goes to the heart of trying to bring down Israel by people who have been against a Jewish state and expressed anti-Semitism for decades. We all need to stand up against that, and so this resolution is incredibly important.

As my other colleague just mentioned, our nations had a rich history of using boycotts to promote freedom. There are other boycotts that have been displayed to undermine freedom, and that is really where the BDS movement is in a very different category. I think we all need to make that distinction.

If a boycott is being used to advance freedom, that is one we should support; but if a boycott is being used to undermine the very freedoms that exist in the only real elected democracy in the Middle East, we all need to rise up against that as people who respect that great tradition, that great love between the United States and Israel, an unbreakable bond, one that brings Republicans and Democrats together. We need to continue that tradition.

But I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that, as we are talking about why we need to oppose the BDS movement with this resolution, words are hollow if we don’t follow it up with action. So, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, hopefully, we get an overwhelming, maybe unanimous, vote on this resolution.

It is long past time that the Democratic leadership of this House bring up H.R. 336 by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul), the bill that actually puts teeth in the law to stand up against the BDS movement all around the world.

Here, even, sometimes in Congress or in other states, but in other countries
where they are trying to advance this movement, we need teeth—words and action. So these are words today. We need to follow it up with H.R. 336, real action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we stand strong.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. MORPHY).

Mrs. MORPHY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the State of Israel. It is a home for the Jewish people, and a sanctuary from anti-Semitism. Israel is a thriving democracy, and its citizens have made enormous contributions to our global society.

The U.S. has no better friend than Israel. And, yes, on occasion, our two governments will disagree on certain policies, as all sovereign nations do, but our strong alliance is rooted in shared values, shared security interest, and a deep historical connection.

I also believe the Palestinian people have the right of self-determination to a better future, and should have their own state. I support direct negotiations between the parties leading to two states living together in peace and security.

I support this bipartisan resolution because the BDS movement makes a just peace harder, not easier. It unfairly vilifies Israel, blaming it, and it alone, for this complex conflict.

American citizens have the right to boycott, and boycotts often promote positive change, but the BDS movement is misguided and harmful, and Congress should say so unequivocally.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, and a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 246 and to voice my relentless opposition to the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign that seeks to delegitimize the State of Israel and deny the Jewish people—and only the Jewish people—the right to self-determination.

This resolution reminds us that boycotts have previously used as tools for social justice in this very country. But BDS doesn’t seek social justice. It seeks a world in which the State of Israel does not exist.

It is not incompatible to support a strong, secure Jewish State of Israel and to support human rights, dignity, and prosperity for the Palestinian people. It is incompatible, however, to support BDS and claim to support two states for two people when BDS envisions Palestine from the river to the sea, and the other rejection of the Jewish State of Israel.

You simply will not, and cannot, achieve lasting peace and security for both Israelis and Palestinians and work toward a two-state solution if you support a movement that seeks to delegitimize the very existence of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. WAGNER, for bringing this resolution to the floor today. I strongly support their efforts.

I strongly support this resolution condemning BDS, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note, really, from coast to coast, we are hearing stories of students on college campuses, in the name of BDS, being targeted with blatant anti-Semitism.

For example, at New York University, after the student government passed a resolution supporting BDS, the Bronfman Center for Jewish Life was temporarily closed in response to threatening Twitter posts by a student who expressed ‘‘a desire for Zionists to die.’’

A University of Michigan professor refused to write a letter of recommendation for a qualified student solely because she wanted to study abroad in Israel.

At Warren Wilson College, an invited speaker stated: ‘‘Jews are doing the same thing to the Palestinians as the Nazis did to the Jews.’’

A Yik Yak posting at the University of California read: ‘‘Gas them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew.’’

More globally, University of Durban in South Africa called for the expulsion of Jewish students who did not support the BDS movement at the university.

It is really important for people who may just be getting familiar with what BDS is to know that, right now, we have so many Jewish students who are being targeted with this blatant anti-Semitism, and that is why today’s statement sends such a powerful message.

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

Mr. ENTTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMANN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMANN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to pass this resolution which opposes efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel through the global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement. This resolution reiterates that there is a viable pathway to peace: through direct negotiations to achieve two states for two people.

If implemented, the BDS movement would blacklist Israeli businesses, devastate the Israeli economy, and create doubt about Israel’s legitimacy among the next generation. That undermines any possibility of achieving a lasting peace.

The global rise of anti-Semitism is manifesting itself in many terrifying ways, and the BDS movement—in fact, the movement, in total, makes the argument that Israel is the bad guy on humanitarian issues, on human rights.

It is important to note, Israel has a long history of LGBT protections and women’s rights. In fact, the movement, in stark contrast to its Middle East neighbors.

Regardless of ethnicity or religion, there are broad freedoms in Israel, including the right to vote, freedom of speech, equal access to education and the workplace, and no special restrictions on the way women dress. By law, women are protected from discrimination.

In fact, Israel’s declaration of independence grants all Israel’s inhabitants equality of social and political rights, irrespective of religion, race, or gender. Even Palestinians in the autonomous regions have voting rights and receive social services.

Under Israeli jurisdiction, some 350,000 Palestinian residents in Jerusalem receive certain civilian welfare, health, and municipal services. In other parts of the Middle East, it is a monarchy with no voting rights whatsoever.

Hamas has repeatedly denied humanitarian aid offered by Israel. In May 2018, when there were clashes on the border, Gaza refused two truckloads of aid from Israel to relieve medical shortages.

There are so many falsehoods that have been perpetrated by supporters of the BDS movement, and that is, again, another reason why today’s resolution is such a powerful statement.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), my very good friend.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the BDS campaign has been heralded by critics and enemies of
Israel as a penalty for what they claim is Israel’s oppression of the Palestinian people. Nothing could be further from the truth.

These critiques and enemies of Israel are, in reality, simply adding the BDS campaign to their arsenal of weapons to try and isolate, weaken, delegitimize, and, ultimately, destroy the State of Israel, as they have for decades.

For over 70 years, Israelis have faced repeated terrorism, bombs detonated on public buses, in cafes, and at religious observances. This terrorism has been beaten back by a nation simply trying to defend itself and persevere under withering attacks.

So now Israel’s enemies have adopted a new strategy. BDS is an anti-Semitic movement, plain and simple.

The founder of BDS, Omar Barghouti, said it very clearly: “...we oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian... will ever accept a Jewish state.”

The goals of BDS are clear. Just read their words.

Israel shall not and cannot yield. And we in the United States must stand with our ally that shares our values and has also worked with us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong bipartisan support of this bill.

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

Mr. SUOZZI just pointed out one quote. Earlier, we heard another quote from the BDS founder. I will share one more. He also stated—and this is the founder of the BDS movement: “Many of the methods of collective and individual ‘punishment’ meted out to Palestinian civilians at the hands of young, racist, often sadistic and ever impervious Israeli soldiers... are reminiscent of the common Nazi practices against the Jews.”

The list goes on and on. As people out there are listening to this debate, becoming familiar with what the BDS movement is, just understand and take heed of the words from the BDS movement founder, Omar Barghouti.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan solution opposing the boycott of Israel and supporting a two-state solution.

I want to thank Chairman Engel for his excellent leadership on this important issue and Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for bringing this resolution to the floor.

With this bill and 349 cosponsors, it is very clear that Members of both parties support our vital ally, Israel, the leading democracy in the Middle East, because our countries share common interests and fundamental values, and Israel’s security is key to America’s security.

However, the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, BDS, Movement seeks to delegitimize Israel and deny its right to exist as a Jewish state.

As Mr. SUOZZI, my colleague, just so aptly said, the founder of BDS, Omar Barghouti, said it very clearly: “Definitely, most definitely, we oppose a Jewish state. No Palestinian, rational Palestinian, not a sell-out Palestinian, will ever accept a Jewish state.”

That exactly captures what we are fighting here today. There are few clearer examples of bias and double standards than the BDS movement. No other democratic country faces a global boycott.

BDS is also fundamentally incompatable with a two-state solution, which I strongly support. BDS seeks to punish only Israel, and it rejects direct negotiations in favor of unilateral strategy. That is why it is so important that Congress goes on record opposing BDS and other harmful efforts to single out and delegitimize Israel.

Standing up for the U.S.-Israel relationship should not be a partisan issue. That is why the members of the Problem Solvers Caucus are proud to support this resolution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. This resolution was introduced by our colleague Congressman SUOZZI, along with Congressman LEE ZELDIN, Chairman JERRY NADLER, and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER.

They have all done an excellent job. Nothing in this resolution would prevent anyone, in any way, from being able to engage in free speech. That is not what this is about, and we must not allow false attacks on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, today, we must continue to make sure that confronting anti-Semitism and supporting a two-state solution remain bipartisan priorities.

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

BDS supporters also claim that the BDS movement is nonviolent. The BDS movement does not distance itself from Hamas, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization. BDS supporters, individually, are not distancing themselves from Hamas, and their criticism is focused on attacking Israel and, in many cases, the Jewish people specifically.

Two Fridays ago, Fathi Hammad, a senior Hamas official, called upon Palestinian terrorists to single out and delegitimize Israel and, in the diaspora “are still preparing. They are trying to prepare. They are warming up. A long time has passed with them warming up. All of you 7 million Palestinians abroad, enough of the warming up. You have Jews everywhere who must attack every Jew on the globe by way of slaughter and killing, if God permits. Enough of the warming up.”

Where are all the supporters of BDS condemning these remarks? This is two Fridays ago, calling for the murder of every Jew in the world.

During a closed meeting in October 2017 between Hamas chief Sinwar and Gazan youth about reconciling with the Fatah movement, Sinwar stated that the time spent discussing recognition of Israel is over and that now Hamas will, instead, discuss when they will wipe out Israel.

Hamas uses women and children as human shields. They deny humanitarian aid to their own people. They incite violence. They have launched rockets into Israel, killing innocent civilians. They have declared that jihad is an obligation. That list goes on.

The Palestinian Authority, not only do they incite violence, but they financially reward terror, by policy. If you kill an Israeli or an American, you get a reward from the Palestinian Authority, not only do they incite violence, but they financially reward terror, by policy. If you kill an Israeli or an American, you get a reward from the Palestinian Authority, not only do they incite violence, but they financially reward terror, by policy. If you kill an Israeli or an American, you get a reward from the Palestinian Authority, not only do they incite violence, but they financially reward terror, by policy. If you kill an Israeli or an American, you get a reward from the Palestinian Authority.
Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for speaking today, as well as Chris Smith and Minority Whip Scalise. This is something that we are very passionate about.

We also believe that the strong statement that the BDS movement has gone forward today with this vote is not the last step of this Chamber’s speaking out. I really hope that we all can work together in a bipartisan fashion to figure out how to do something about it, to be able to pass legislation with teeth.

Today is nothing short of progress, and it is something for all of us to be proud of around our country and around the world because it should be an American value to stand strong, shoulder to shoulder with our great ally, our greatest ally in the Middle East in Israel. It is a beacon of hope, freedom, liberty, and opportunity.

Americans, in our day-to-day lives, don’t even realize just how much we are using Israeli technology, American companies using Israeli technology. We probably have used it multiple times just today.

You can’t boycott Israel and, at the same exact time, spend your entire day using Israeli technology. You can’t boycott Israel and travel to Israel.

We are going to call out the hypocrisies that exist. Ultimately, as we flush this out, let’s work together. This is about advocacy. It is also about education.

When I came to Congress in 2015, honestly, there were a lot of Members of Congress that, if you asked them, “Where do you stand on the BDS movement?” their answer would have been, “What is BDS?”

Now, in 2019, here we are, July 2019, coming together. We know what BDS is: Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement. We know it is filled with anti-Israel hate. We know it is about advocacy. It is also about education.

I plead with all of my colleagues, if we can all work together as we move past this great vote today, that we can next pass legislation that has teeth in it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, Brad Schneider, Jerry Nadler, Ann Wagner, the 350 cosponsors, and, hopefully, everyone today voting “yes.” I thank lead Republicans McCaul on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This is a resolution for us all to be proud of. We should all vote “yes,” tell all of our constituents about it, and re-double our efforts to do something about it right after that vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, Brad Schneider, Jerry Nadler, Ann Wagner, the 350 cosponsors, and, hopefully, everyone today voting “yes.” I thank lead Republicans McCaul on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This is a resolution for us all to be proud of. We should all vote “yes,” tell all of our constituents about it, and re-double our efforts to do something about it right after that vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, Brad Schneider, Jerry Nadler, Ann Wagner, the 350 cosponsors, and, hopefully, everyone today voting “yes.” I thank lead Republicans McCaul on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This is a resolution for us all to be proud of. We should all vote “yes,” tell all of our constituents about it, and re-double our efforts to do something about it right after that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
It is important that we clearly state our opposition to the BDS movement, as this non-binding resolution with 349 cosponsors before us does. However, it is even more important that we take strong legislative actions to defend Israel. As harmful as this growing movement is, sadly, it is not new.

Over 40 years ago, the Arab League began its boycott of Israel. In response to this boycott, Congress passed a law that makes it illegal to participate in foreign boycotts of U.S. allies. Today, the Global BDS movement seeks to pressure Israel by using Israel's participation in the global economy, in academic exchanges, and in cultural activities as leverage. For example, the BDS movement tries to pressure recording artists from performing in Israel. It tries to keep students from studying abroad in Israel. It tries to keep consumers from purchasing Israeli goods.

Not only is the BDS movement antithetical to the values of openness and exchange shared by the United States, Israel, and free democracies all over the world, it is antithetical to peace. As threats to U.S. allies, including Israel, evolve over time, we must update our policies to effectively stand with our partners. In weakening the BDS movement it endangers the national security of the United States.

I introduced a real legislative solution in January—H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act. This bill has direct policy implications by allowing state and local governments to adopt laws to divest public funds from entities that boycott Israel. Additionally, it would sanction the Assad regime and its backers for their malign activities, and strengthen our support for Israel and Jordan.

While I support today’s resolution, I regret that we are not considering H.R. 336 instead. The Senate companion to H.R. 336, S.1, was the first bill the Senate considered this Congress, demonstrating how urgent it was. It passed with robust bipartisan support.

But, neither S.1, nor my House companion H. R. 336, have received consideration in this body. Standing up for Israel has never been a difficult decision for the United States Congress. It wasn’t difficult for Senator CHUCK SCHUMER when he voted in favor of S.1, and it wasn’t difficult for over half of the Democrats and nearly all Republicans in the Senate when they too supported the bill.

Just as we passed the original anti-boycott act 40 years ago, we must update our laws to protect our interests. When foreign entities foster boycotts against Israel in the United States, they are interfering in U.S. policy, and it is appropriate for our government to respond.

We take a first step today by publicly acknowledging BDS is dangerous and anti-Semitic; but tomorrow we must take real actions—and advance the real policies in my bill—to protect Israel and combat the BDS movement.

I want to thank Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. WAGNER, Mr. NADLER, Chairman ENGEL and the Foreign Affairs Committee Membership for their bipartisan work to counter this threat to our friend and ally Israel.

I sincerely hope all Members vote in favor of this resolution that shows our solidarity with our friend and ally Israel, and hope we can vote on my bill this week.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, peaceful dissent and the protesting of injustice are the right of all Americans guaranteed by the Constitution, and the expression of a policy, it is a cause that speaks. H. Res. 246 renounces the peaceful promotion of human rights, self-determination, and justice on behalf of Palestinian people living under Israeli military occupation. At the same time, this resolution completely ignores the Netanyahu government's popular, dehumanization, and subjugation of Palestinian people at the root of this peaceful movement.

The State of Israel is a sovereign nation, an ally of the United States, and a military power that occupies Palestinian lands for the benefit of Jewish settlers. H. Res. 246 originally claimed that the use of voluntary boycotts, divestment, and sanctions “undermines the possibility of a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.” I am pleased that this language has been removed.

I am also pleased that resolving clause 3 was added to affirm the Constitutional right of U.S. citizens to free speech, including “the right to protest or criticize the policies of the United States or a foreign government.”

Israel cannot be delegitimized by any outside entity, it is a nation-state that is self-governed and makes its own laws, its own policies. Sadly, and I say sadly because I want peace and security for the Israeli people, it is the actions of the Netanyahu government that delegitimizes Israel’s standing in the world community.

Today’s Washington Post ran a headline: “Israeli demolition of Palestinian homes provokes outcry.” Is this the action of a nation seeking peaceful negotiations? Is the annexation of Palestinian lands or the military detention and torture of Palestinian children an effort to seek a negotiated peace agreement?

Under Prime Minister Netanyahu, Israel is engaged in a systemic, violent, and repressive strategy to annex Palestinian lands and permanently displace the Palestinian population, not negotiated peace or a two-state solution. Shamefully, the President of the United States and the U.S. ambassador to Israel are enabling this effort in a reversal of decades of bipartisan U.S. foreign policy.

Actions by Congress, like passing H. Res. 246, which ignore reality and effectively support military occupation, violations of international humanitarian law, and the subjugation of the Palestinian population, does not strengthen Israel, but it does damage the standing of the U.S. House in the eyes of the world.

It is time for Congress to exercise real American leadership that is based on our values and the belief that Israel deserves peace and security, and at the same time the Palestinian people deserve justice, equality, and an end to the repression and occupation. H. Res. 246 offers nothing but the perpetuation of the status quo, repression, and conflict. I am voting to oppose H. Res. 246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution. H. Res. 246, as amended.

The question was taken.
TITLE III—JUSTICE FOR UNITED STATES VICTIMS OF PALESTINIAN TERRORISM

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Facilitation of the settlement of disputes.

Sec. 303. Modification to consent of certain parties.

SECTION 101. COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, shall oversee civilian science and technology programs on a joint basis with Israel.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—The Coordinator, in conjunction with the heads of relevant Federal Government departments and agencies and in coordination with the Israel Innovation Authority, shall oversee civilian science and technology programs on a joint basis with Israel.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coordinator shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the implementation of this section.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SECTION 102. COOPERATION ON DIRECTED ENERGY CAPABILITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities that address threats to the United States, deployed forces of the United States, and Israel. Any activities carried out pursuant to this authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and the national security interests of the United States and the national security interests of Israel.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(1) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to acquire and own property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive semiannual reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(b) SUPPORT IN CONNECTION WITH ACTIVITIES.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide maintenance and sustainment support to Israel for the directed energy research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (a)(1). Such authority includes authority to install equipment necessary to carry out such research, development, test, and evaluation.

(2) REPORT.—The support described in paragraph (1) may not be provided until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report setting forth a detailed description of the support to be provided.

(c) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The support described in paragraph (1) may not be provided unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that an amount of support to be provided under subsection (a)(1) will contribute to such support—

(A) an amount equal to not less than the amount of support to be so provided; or

(B) an amount that otherwise meets the best efforts of Israel, as mutually agreed to, by the United States and Israel.

(d) LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an appropriate research and development entity of a military department as the lead agency of the Department of Defense in carrying out this section.

(e) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees on a semianual basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent semianual report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii). The report shall be submitted to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SECTION 103. COOPERATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in accordance with the agreement entitled the “Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel on Cooperation in Science and Technology for Homeland Security Matters”, dated May 29, 2008 (or successor agreement), and the requirements specified in paragraph (2), shall establish a grant program at the Department to support—

(A) cybersecurity research and development; and

(B) demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.

(A) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in carrying out a re-
grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report that contains—
(a) a description of how the grant funds were used by the recipient; and
(b) an evaluation of the level of success of each project funded by the grant.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection only for projects that are not to be declassified by both the United States and Israel.

(i) TERMINATION.—The grant program and the advisory board established under this section terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this section. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 104. REPORT ON POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND IMPACT TO THE UNITED STATES OF ESTABLISHING A JOINT UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report examining the potential benefits and impact to the United States of establishing a joint United States-Israel Cybersecurity Center of Excellence based in the United States and Israel to leverage the experience, knowledge, and capacity of Israel’s national institutions of higher education (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), private sector entities, and government entities in the area of cybersecurity and protection of critical infrastructure (as such term is defined in subsection (a) or (b) of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), for purposes of not only the United States and Israel, but also of the other nations in the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa with similar natural gas finds.

(h) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN ENERGY CO-OPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that cooperation between the United States and Israel for the purpose of research and development of energy sources would be in the national interest not only to the United States and Israel, but also of the other nations in the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa with similar natural gas finds.

SEC. 107. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS AMONG THE UNITED STATES, ISRAEL, AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

SEC. 106. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It should be the policy of the United States Agency for International Development to cooperate with Israel in order to advance common goals across a wide variety of sectors, including energy, agriculture and food security, democracy, human rights and governance, economic growth and trade, education, environment, global health and water and sanitation.

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to enter into memoranda of understanding with Israeli entities, joint United States-Israel entities, and other entities to advance common goals on energy, agriculture and food security, democracy, human rights and governance, economic growth and trade, education, environment, health, water and sanitation, with a focus on strengthening mutual ties and cooperation with nations throughout the world.

SEC. 108. JOINT COOPERATIVE PROGRAM RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING POLICY.

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022.

SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN ENERGY CO-OPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Energy and Israel’s Ministry of Transportation should engage in an annual policy dialogue to implement the 2016 Memorandum of Cooperation signed by the Secretary of Energy and the Israeli Minister of Transportation.

(e) COOPERATION ON SPACE EXPLORATION AND SCIENCE INTELLIGENCE.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall continue to work with the Israel Space Agency to identify and cooperate by pursuing peaceful, space exploration and science initiatives in areas of mutual interest, taking all appropriate measures to protect sensitive information, intellectual property, trade secrets, and economic interests of the United States.

(f) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL BINATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUND.

SEC. 110. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN ENERGY CO-OPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that that the Department of Energy and Israel’s Ministry of Transportation should engage in an annual policy dialogue to implement the 2016 Memorandum of Cooperation signed by the Secretary of Energy and the Israeli Minister of Transportation.

It is the sense of Congress that that the Department of Energy and Israel’s Ministry of Transportation should engage in an annual policy dialogue to implement the 2016 Memorandum of Cooperation signed by the Secretary of Energy and the Israeli Minister of Transportation.
of 1977, as added by paragraph (1)(C), $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022.

(3) REPORT.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the benefits to the United States and to Israel of opening an office in Israel for the Office of International Programs.

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this paragraph, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(iii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(4) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION RELATING TO DESALINATION TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on research and development cooperation with international partners, such as the State of Israel, in the area of desalination technology as required under section 9(b)(3) of the Water Desalination Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 16991 note).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(5) RESEARCH AND TREATMENT OF POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should seek to explore collaboration between the Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Centers and Centers of Excellence for Traumatic Stress Disorders in the prevention and treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder.

(i) DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022 to establish a bilateral cooperative program with Israel to promote the development of health technologies, including health technologies described in paragraph (2), with an emphasis on collaboratively advancing the use of technology, personalized medicine, and data in relation to aging.

(2) TYPES OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES.—The health technologies described in this paragraph may include technologies such as artificial intelligence, biofeedback, sensors, monitoring devices, and kidney care.

(3) OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of International Programs of the Food and Drug Administration should seek to explore collaboration with Israel through the Office of International Programs.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner, acting through the head of the Office of International Programs of the Food and Drug Administration, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the benefits to the United States and to Israel of opening an office in Israel for the Office of International Programs.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this paragraph, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions in the Senate.

SEC. 204. WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving information that Israel is under an existing or imminent threat of military attack, the President may waive the requirements of this Act and direct the immediate transfer to Israel of such defense articles or services the President determines to be necessary to assist Israel in its defense against such threat. Any notification or request to carry out this paragraph shall not be subject to any limitation in law, or provision of any bilateral agreement, relating to the amount of United States assistance authorized to be made available to Israel.

(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after a transfer of defense articles or services pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (1), the President shall provide a notification in writing to Congress of the details of such transfer, consistent with the requirements of section 38 of this Act."

SEC. 205. SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.

Section 531(k) of the Security Assistance Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–280, 114 Stat. 856) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘2002 and 2003’’ and inserting ‘‘2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024’’;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘equal to—’’ and inserting ‘‘not less than—’’; and


SEC. 206. JOINT ASSESSMENT OF QUANTITY OF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS FOR USE BY ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to conduct the joint assessment, in agreement with the Government of Israel with respect to the matters described in subsection (b), of the quantities of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel to combat Hezbollah in the event of a sustained armed confrontation between Israel and Hezbollah.

(b) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—The matters described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The quantity and type of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel to combat Hezbollah in the event of a sustained armed confrontation between Israel and Hezbollah.

(2) The quantity and type of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel in the event of a sustained armed confrontation with other armed groups and terrorist organizations such as Hamas.

(c) USE BY ISRAEL.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Joint Committee on Foreign Relations, in the House of Representatives, a report on the quantities of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel to combat Hezbollah in the event of a sustained armed confrontation between Israel and Hezbollah.

(d) USE BY UNITED STATES.—The President may determine to use any quantities of precision guided munitions that are transferred to Israel under the authority of this Act for the defense of Israel or to combat armed threats to the United States.

(e) USE BY ISRAEL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Joint Committee on Foreign Relations, in the Senate, a report on the quantities of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel to combat Hezbollah in the event of a sustained armed confrontation with other armed groups and terrorist organizations such as Hamas.
appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the joint assessment.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 207. TRANSFER OF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS TO ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h), the President is authorized to transfer to Israel precision guided munitions from reserve stocks for Israel in such quantities as necessary for legitimate self-defense of Israel and is otherwise consistent with the purposes and conditions for such transfers under the Arms Export Control Act of 2022 (22 U.S.C. 7001).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Except in the case of an emergency as determined by the President, not later than 90 days before making a transfer under subsection (a), the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the transfer of the precision guided munitions—

(1) does not affect the ability of the United States to maintain a sufficient supply of precision guided munitions;

(2) does not harm the combat readiness of the United States or the ability of the United States to meet its commitment to allies for the transfer of such munitions;

(3) is needed by Israel to counter the threat of rockets in a timely fashion; and

(4) is in the national security interest of the United States.

SEC. 208. SEVENTH CONGRESS ON RAPID ACQUISITION AND DEPLOYMENT PROCEDURES.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should prescribe procedures for the rapid acquisition and deployment of precision guided munitions for United States counterterrorism missions, or to assist an ally of the United States, including Israel, that is subject to direct missile threat.

SEC. 209. EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Subsection (d) of section 12001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–181; 117 Stat. 1011) is amended by striking “after September 30, 2020” and inserting “after September 30, 2024.”


SEC. 210. ELIGIBILITY OF GREAT FOR THE STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCLUSION TO CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROL TREATY LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Israel has adopted high standards in the field of export controls.

(2) Israel has declared its unilateral adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

(3) Israel is a party to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925; and


(b) Conclusion of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8603 note) directs the President, consistent with the commitments of the United States under the Strategic Partnership Act, to take steps so that Israel may be included in the list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception under section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the requirement for a license for the export, re-export, or in-country transfer of an item subject to controls under the Export Administration Regulations.

(b) REPORT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION.—

(1) In operations after 90 days before making a transfer under subsection (a), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception under section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the requirement under section 740.20(b)(2) of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8603 note).

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF LOAN GUARANTEES TO ISRAEL.

Chapter 5 of title I of the Emergency War-time Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11; 117 Stat. 576) is amended under the heading “Loan Guarantees to Israel”—

(1) in the matter preceding the first proviso, by striking “‘September 30, 2020’” and inserting “‘September 30, 2025’”;

(2) in the second proviso, by striking “‘September 30, 2020’” and inserting “‘September 30, 2025’”.

SEC. 212. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE III—JUSTICE FOR UNITED STATES VICTIMS OF PALESTINIAN TERRORISM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Justice for United States Victims of Palestinian Terrorism Act”.

SEC. 202. FACILITATION OF THE SETTLEMENT OF TERRORISM-RELATED CLAIMS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS TO FACILITATE THE RESOLUTION OF ANTI-TERRORISM ACT CLAIMS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The President, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, develop and initiate a comprehensive process for the Department of State to facilitate the resolution and settlement of covered claims.

(b) ELEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS.—The comprehensive process developed under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of State shall publish a notice in the Federal Register identifying the method by which a national of the United States, or a representative of a national of the United States, who has a covered claim, may contact the Department of State to give notice of the covered claim.

(2) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall meet (and make every effort to continue to meet) with any national of the United States, or any specialized agency thereof, or accepts such standing, outside an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians; or

(b) beginning on the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of this subpart, the term ‘defendant’ means—
...shall be considered to be in the United States that is not specifically exempted by paragraph (4)(A) or (D) of this subsection.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES AND LOSSES ARISING—Notwithstanding paragraph (4)(A) or (D), any activity undertaken exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United States; or

(5) Rule of Construction—Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other law (including any treaty), any office, headquarters, premises or other facility or establishment used exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United States; or

a court may not consider—

(a) any facility, headquarters, premises or other facility or establishment within the territory of the United States that is not specifically exempted by paragraph (4)(A) or (D) of this subsection.

(b) any facility, headquarters, premises or other facility or establishment used exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United States; or

(c) any activity undertaken exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United States.

§ 401. 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 ‘‘PAY-As-You-Go Legislation’’ for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such a statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTWRIGHT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGLE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEITZLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. R. 1837.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act.

I want to start by thanking Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON for their extraordinary leadership in crafting this measure. This is another piece of bipartisan legislation that underscores the vitality and bipartisanship of the U.S.-Israel relationship.

The centerpiece of this bill is a provision that writes into law the 10-year memorandum of understanding President Obama signed with Israel before he left office. The legislation also enhances U.S.-Israel cooperation on a wide range of issues, from helping veterans confront issues with PTSD, to advancing space cooperation, to developing new ways to get clean water.

In addition, it includes two pieces that argue that we must rejoin the fold of nations.

Convinced that future acceptance of U.S. assistance could bankrupt the Palestinian Authority through litigation, Palestinian Prime Minister Ramzi Hamdallah informed Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that the Palestinian Authority will decline U.S. aid when ATCA takes effect. Comparing the $655 million judgment in Waldman (equivalent to 13 percent of the Palestinian Authority’s 2018 budget) to $60 million in security funding it receives from the U.S., its decision was obviously inevitable.

So, ATCA will not achieve its purpose of enabling terror victims to collect money from the Palestinian Authority or PLO through litigation. Since the Palestinian Authority has forewarned that it still won’t have personal jurisdiction over it.

Meanwhile, ATCA will harm Israeli security, given an end to INCLE funding for the Palestinian Authority, the implementation of the U.S. Security Coordinator. Under U.S. supervision since 2005, the Palestinian Authority Security Forces (PASF) have transformed into a professional entity that works closely with Israel to maintain law and order in Palestinian cities and foil terrorism. Israeli security chiefs are universal about the importance of this security coordination. In remarks, to the Israeli cabinet earlier this month, outgoing Israeli army chief of staff Lt. Gen. Gadi Eisenkot government’s critical role in the PASF. Belatedly, the Israeli government has weighed in with the ‘Trump administration, asking for an ATCA fix to preserve security coordination, “a top priority Israeli national security interest.”

ATCA will also undermine U.S. foreign policy vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Neither President Trump nor subsequent presidents will be able to use aid as a tool to facilitate future Palestinian-Israeli peace.

Clearly, as the U.S. Agency for International Development prepares to lay off local staff and abandon nearly completed infrastructure projects in the West Bank, the Palestinian people whose national interests are harmed, too, when worsening Palestinian quality of life fosters extremism and a hardening of attitudes toward the U.S. and Israel.

Compounding its deleterious impact, ATCA may apply to foreign states, impacting allies in the Middle East (think of Egypt and Jordan) and beyond. It could also apply to humanitarian NGOs.

Members of Congress are working with the Trump administration to explore other options. The best choice is revocation of Section 4, which triggered this crisis while failing to help terrorist attack victims. A national security waiver for the President is another possibility. It is suboptimal since President Trump slashed ESF funding to Palestinians before ATCA and appears unlikely to reinstate it, though a future president could. Exempting only INCLE funding is better than nothing, but would transmit the message to Palestinians that the U.S. cares only about security and not their welfare. (They are complementary; we must care about both.)

If Congress cannot engineer a fix by Janurary 31—a real danger, even likelihood—Congress must at minimum delay ATCA’s implementation. This time bomb is ticking, and if

awarded the plaintiff $655.5 million (tripled the damages suffered), only to have a circuit court rule on appeal that the court lacked personal jurisdiction over the PLO. To address this perceived oversight, ATCA stipulates that a defendant consents to personal jurisdiction if it accepts the types of aid the U.S. government has given the PA: food assistance, ESF grants, and international narcotics control and law enforcement (INCLE) aid.

Recognizing that future acceptance of U.S. assistance could bankrupt the Palestinian Authority through litigation, Palestinian Prime Minister Rami Hamdallah informed Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that the Palestinian Authority will decline U.S. aid when ATCA takes effect. Comparing the $655 million judgment in Waldman (equivalent to 13 percent of the Palestinian Authority’s 2018 budget) to $60 million in security funding it receives from the U.S., its decision was obviously inevitable.

So, ATCA will not achieve its purpose of enabling terror victims to collect money from the Palestinian Authority or PLO through litigation. Since the Palestinian Authority has forewarned that it still won’t have personal jurisdiction over it.

Meanwhile, ATCA will harm Israeli security, given an end to INCLE funding for the Palestinian Authority, the implementation of the U.S. Security Coordinator. Under U.S. supervision since 2005, the Palestinian Authority Security Forces (PASF) have transformed into a professional entity that works closely with Israel to maintain law and order in Palestinian cities and foil terrorism. Israeli security chiefs are universal about the importance of this security coordination. In remarks, to the Israeli cabinet earlier this month, outgoing Israeli army chief of staff Lt. Gen. Gadi Eisenkot government’s critical role in the PASF. Belatedly, the Israeli government has weighed in with the ‘Trump administration, asking for an ATCA fix to preserve security coordination, “a top priority Israeli national security interest.”

ATCA will also undermine U.S. foreign policy vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Neither President Trump nor subsequent presidents will be able to use aid as a tool to facilitate future Palestinian-Israeli peace.

Clearly, as the U.S. Agency for International Development prepares to lay off local staff and abandon nearly completed infrastructure projects in the West Bank, the Palestinian people whose national interests are harmed, too, when worsening Palestinian quality of life fosters extremism and a hardening of attitudes toward the U.S. and Israel.

Compounding its deleterious impact, ATCA may apply to foreign states, impacting allies in the Middle East (think of Egypt and Jordan) and beyond. It could also apply to humanitarian NGOs.

Members of Congress are working with the Trump administration to explore other options. The best choice is revocation of Section 4, which triggered this crisis while failing to help terrorist attack victims. A national security waiver for the President is another possibility. It is suboptimal since President Trump slashed ESF funding to Palestinians before ATCA and appears unlikely to reinstate it, though a future president could. Exempting only INCLE funding is better than nothing, but would transmit the message to Palestinians that the U.S. cares only about security and not their welfare. (They are complementary; we must care about both.)

If Congress cannot engineer a fix by Janurary 31—a real danger, even likelihood—Congress must at minimum delay ATCA’s implementation. This time bomb is ticking, and if

awarded the plaintiff $655.5 million (tripled the damages suffered), only to have a circuit court rule on appeal that the court lacked personal jurisdiction over the PLO. To address this perceived oversight, ATCA stipulates that a defendant consents to personal jurisdiction if it accepts the types of aid the U.S. government has given the PA: food assistance, ESF grants, and international narcotics control and law enforcement (INCLE) aid.

Recognizing that future acceptance of U.S. assistance could bankrupt the Palestinian Authority through litigation, Palestinian Prime Minister Rami Hamdallah informed Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that the Palestinian Authority will decline U.S. aid when ATCA takes effect. Comparing the $655 million judgment in Waldman (equivalent to 13 percent of the Palestinian Authority’s 2018 budget) to $60 million in security funding it receives from the U.S., its decision was obviously inevitable.

So, ATCA will not achieve its purpose of enabling terror victims to collect money from the Palestinian Authority or PLO through litigation. Since the Palestinian Authority has forewarned that it still won’t have personal jurisdiction over it.

Meanwhile, ATCA will harm Israeli security, given an end to INCLE funding for the Palestinian Authority, the implementation of the U.S. Security Coordinator. Under U.S. supervision since 2005, the Palestinian Authority Security Forces (PASF) have transformed into a professional entity that works closely with Israel to maintain law and order in Palestinian cities and foil terrorism. Israeli security chiefs are universal about the importance of this security coordination. In remarks, to the Israeli cabinet earlier this month, outgoing Israeli army chief of staff Lt. Gen. Gadi Eisenkot government’s critical role in the PASF. Belatedly, the Israeli government has weighed in with the ‘Trump administration, asking for an ATCA fix to preserve security coordination, “a top priority Israeli national security interest.”

ATCA will also undermine U.S. foreign policy vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Neither President Trump nor subsequent presidents will be able to use aid as a tool to facilitate future Palestinian-Israeli peace.

Clearly, as the U.S. Agency for International Development prepares to lay off local staff and abandon nearly completed infrastructure projects in the West Bank, the Palestinian people whose national interests are harmed, too, when worsening Palestinian quality of life fosters extremism and a hardening of attitudes toward the U.S. and Israel.

Compounding its deleterious impact, ATCA may apply to foreign states, impacting allies in the Middle East (think of Egypt and Jordan) and beyond. It could also apply to humanitarian NGOs.

Members of Congress are working with the Trump administration to explore other options. The best choice is revocation of Section 4, which triggered this crisis while failing to help terrorist attack victims. A national security waiver for the President is another possibility. It is suboptimal since President Trump slashed ESF funding to Palestinians before ATCA and appears unlikely to reinstate it, though a future president could. Exempting only INCLE funding is better than nothing, but would transmit the message to Palestinians that the U.S. cares only about security and not their welfare. (They are complementary; we must care about both.)

If Congress cannot engineer a fix by Janurary 31—a real danger, even likelihood—Congress must at minimum delay ATCA’s implementation. This time bomb is ticking, and if
Congress can’t defuse ATCA in time, it must at least reset the clock.  

[From NPR, Jan. 31, 2019]  

OPINION: Here’s Why U.S. Aid to Palestinians Must Continue  
(By Dana Stroul, Daniel B. Shapiro)  

Is U.S. assistance to the Palestinians an indulgence we can do without? Will its elimination leave Israelis, Palestinians and U.S. interests better off? Unless Congress and the Trump administration act quickly, we are about to find out.

Since 1993, the United States has provided more than $5 billion in assistance to the West Bank and Gaza. This generosity continued across Republican and Democratic administrations, with bipartisan Congressional support, despite ups and downs in the peace process and despite occasional fits of violence. But members of Congress, including many of Israel’s strongest supporters on both sides of the aisle, have long understood the value of these assistance programs, considering the moribund peace process uncompleted.

The current funding crisis runs contrary to clearly expressed Congressional intent. Last year, large bipartisan majorities passed the Taylor Force Act, which, by withholding some U.S. aid, aimed to compel the Palestinian Authority to end, among other things, its practice of providing payments to families of convicted Palestinian terrorists. But Congress also voted resoundingly to maintain key elements of assistance, including humanitarian aid, people-to-people programs, medical services and other programs with no direct connection to the Palestinian Authority.

The Israeli government, for its part, was clear in its support for the Taylor Force Act’s intent to end assistance that could even indirectly subsidize the Palestinian Authority’s payments to terrorists’ families. But there was never Israeli support for the current U.S. government-projected programs acknowledged to maintain a modicum of stability in the West Bank and prevent a full-scale humanitarian crisis in either the West Bank or Gaza.

In other words, the Taylor Force Act’s passage underscored bipartisan Congressional support for continuing U.S. assistance to the Palestinians. Trump officials, who took an axe to the entire program, citing the Taylor Force Act, have misinterpreted the meaning of the law.

The Israeli national security establishment remains painfully aware that it will face the burden—financial, security, and otherwise—of addressing a full-scale collapse in the West Bank or Gaza if the U.S. steps away or loses all influence and credibility with the Palestinians. And if they lose cooperation with the Palestinian security forces, Israeli security forces will find themselves in the far worse position of needing to directly intervene in the midst of threats in Palestinian-populated areas, rather than working through the U.S.-funded multilateral construct.

If all parties remain stuck on the current course, the biggest losers will be innocent Palestinian civilians and Israel. The winners are those benefiting from instability and the opportunity to point to the U.S. as unreliable and in retreat from the Middle East: Hamas, other assorted terrorists and Iran.

To reverse the current course, here are some steps that the administration and Congress should urgently undertake:

FIX THE ANTI-TERROISM CLARIFICATION ACT

A straightforward legislative fix is hanging fruit. Congressional and administration staff recognize that ending U.S. security assistance to the Palestinian security forces only helps advancing and empowers enemies. In recent days, Israel belatedly added its voice, making clear it wants U.S. aid to the PASF to continue. In fact, Congress and the administration should go further and seize the opportunity in this crisis to permanently protect U.S. security assistance to the Palestinian security forces.

MITIGATE DAMAGE

Walking away from ongoing USAID projects in the West Bank and Gaza—unfinished roads, incomplete water projects, and piecemeal humanitarian and education programs—is a total waste of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Such visible reminders of U.S. abandonment will also inflame local sentiment against the United States. Congress should authorize and explicitly appropriate funds to complete these projects, following a thorough review of the status of U.S. programs in the West Bank and Gaza.

PASS POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE ALTERNATIVES

Even if traditional assistance programs remain blocked, there are positive legislative proposals that preserve space for U.S. influence and enjoy bipartisan support. The Palestinian Partnership Fund Act, introduced in the last Congress, promotes economic development by facilitating Palestinian entreprenuers and companies with counterparts in the U.S., Israel, and the Middle East. An International Fund for Israel-Palestinian Peace, long advocated by the nonpartisan Alliance for Middle East Peace, has enjoyed bipartisan support in past Congresses and would promote people-to-people peace-building activity.

Members of Congress naturally seek Israeli views on the human rights and economic consequences of completely shutting down U.S. assistance programs to the Palestinians. But during the Trump administration, the answers have been murky. After Israel’s election in April, Congress should urgently seek a clear picture of the new government’s views, as members continue to vote on this much-debated set of issues.

Mr. ENGEL, Mr. Speaker, this is a strong bipartisan bill that advances the U.S.-Israel relationship. I, again, want to thank Representatives DEUTCH and WILSON for their leadership, as well as all the other Members who contributed to this fine piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Regional Security Act,” which was sequentially referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology ("Science Committee") on March 21, 2019. I agree to work cooperatively on this bill and the Science Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837, in order to expedite floor consideration. This is, however, not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Science Committee over this subject matter.

Thank you for concluding our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. Additionally, thank you for agreeing to support the appointment of Science Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Sincerely,
Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chairwoman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. Collin C. Peterson,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Peterson: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Agriculture conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
Eliot L. Engel, Chairman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. Eliot L. Engel,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Engel: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. While the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 1837 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should be necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into both the Congressional Record and the Committee Report during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter. I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,
Collin C. Peterson, Chairman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. Frank Pallone, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Pallone: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce under Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Energy and Commerce conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
Eliot L. Engel, Chairman.

House of Representatives,

Hon. Eliot Engel,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Engel: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, as amended, which was also sequentially referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 1837, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the matters contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter in the report on the bill and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1837.

Sincerely,
Frank Pallone, Jr., Chairman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,

Dear Mr. Engel:

I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee to expedite floor consideration does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Veterans’ Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,

Dear Mr. Engel:

I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. As a result of your having consented with us on provisions within H.R. 1837 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I forego further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1837 that falls within our jurisdiction, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1837, and ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the legislative report on H.R. 1837 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,
ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

Chairman, Committee on Veterans’ Affairs,
Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,

Dear Mr. Engel:

I write to you regarding H.R. 1837, the “United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act.”

H.R. 1837 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expedient manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I do not waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1837, which expands our mutually-beneficial Israel partnership to confront the challenges both countries face in 2019 and beyond.

I acknowledge that the United States-Israel partnership is a two-way street. We work together to address concerns within our respective committees.

Sincerely,
MARK TAKANO,
Chairman.

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,

Dear Chairman Thompson:

I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
MARK TAKANO,
Chairman.
cooperate on critical fields like research and development, directed energy, cybersecurity, international development and foreign assistance, treating post-traumatic stress disorder, and developing health technologies.

In terms of our security partnership with Israel, the bill authorizes U.S. foreign military financing to Israel at $3.3 billion per year through 2024, the same levels agreed to in the 2016 U.S.-Israel memorandum. It reauthorizes United States loan guarantees and extends War Reserves Stockpile Authority for Israel.

H.R. 1837 also codifies policies to ensure that the United States can transfer precision-guided munitions and other defense articles to Israel quickly in the event of an emergency. We all know that Israel faces threats on multiple fronts, from Iran, from Hezbollah, Hamas, and others. These adversaries aren’t going to call ahead in the event of an operation that has yielded impactful security and stability in a volatile region.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch), a valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, author of this important bill, and chairman of the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism Subcommittee.

Mr. Deutch. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Engel for yielding the time. Today, we send a clear message that this legislation that provides only cancer treatments to Palestinians in the West Bank. That hospital has lost 25 percent of its funding. Also affected was U.S. funding for the training of Palestinian Security Forces. Today, we cast a vote to expand relations with one of our closest allies; a relationship that is broad and deep; when we stand together with our ally, Israel, in support of security, peace, and democracy.
On September 14 of 2016, the U.S. and Israel signed a memorandum of understanding ensuring $33 billion of military and strategic support over a 10-year period.

It reaffirmed the importance of continuing annual U.S. military assistance to Israel, our cooperative missile defense programs, in addition to other shared economic and technology interests.

The bill before us codifies that assistance for the next 10 years, while providing us with the flexibility to increase or support should Iran be under imminent threat of a military attack.

It strengthens Israel’s qualitative military edge and advances our collaboration on a range of issues, such as cybersecurity and space exploration, as well as authorizing $12 million for the U.S.-Israel Energy Center and, through USAID, advances our common goals of promoting agriculture, education, and trade with other countries around the world.

As our strongest and most capable ally in a turbulent region, Israel is an essential U.S. strategic partner.

Israel is also a target for hostile actors who call for her destruction. Just 2 months ago, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas terrorist groups launched over 600 rockets and mortars at Israeli civilian targets, killing four and wounding eight. May was Israel’s deadliest month in almost 2 years.

In addition to the threat coming from these terrorist groups, Israel faces a threat of a resurgent Iran, whose militias and proxies, from Iraq to Syria to Lebanon, continue to grow in numbers, weapons, and strength.

Just recently, Chairman Deutch and I heard firsthand from Prime Minister Netanyahu some of these complex and serious existential challenges that seek to undermine our strategic ally.

Mr. Speaker, it is now more important than ever that the United States stand with the democratic Jewish State of Israel and what she represents, which is freedom, democracy, and equality in that region. For that, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I want to, first and all, thank the gentlemen from Puerto Rico (Miss González-Colón) for her very eloquent statement and for her deep concern for the State of Israel. I thank her for that leadership.

I would also like to thank, in closing, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Wilson, Chairman Engel, Ranking Member McCaul, and the Foreign Affairs Committee membership for their bipartisan work, and the staff, to ensure that the United States and Israel can work together to resolve all these challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Schneider).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. Israel is our greatest ally in the Middle East, and we work jointly in a number of strategic areas. This bill strengthens our partnership and expands important economic, scientific, and security cooperation between the United States and Israel.

This bill also encourages the United States to designate a new coordinator of U.S.-Israel research and development and establishes a grant program on cybersecurity development. It authorizes R&D on issues, including post-traumatic stress disorder, agriculture, and the development of health technologies, as well as vital security assistance in accordance with the 2016 MOU.

It also provides an important fix that ensures a path to justice for American victims of terrorism and retains our ability to provide vital assistance that promotes security and stability for both Israelis and Palestinians.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. Deutch and Mr. Wilson, for their leadership on this important bipartisan bill.

I urge all my colleagues to vote on this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

The United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act is an excellent bipartisan bill designed to further strengthen the relationship between Israel and the United States, give American victims their day in court, and restore assistance to the Palestinians.

I strongly support this bill. I urge all Members to join me in doing so. Again, this bill has the strong support of the United States and Israel, and I hope for each other.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1837, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PALESTINIAN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM SUPPORT PREVENTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1850) to provide financial assistance with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1850
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 ‘‘Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019’’.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to prevent Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof from accessing its international support networks; and

(2) to oppose Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof from attempting to use goods, including medicine and dual use items, to smuggle weapons and other materials to further acts of terrorism.

SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN PERSONS AND AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES SUPPORTING THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SUCCESSOR THEREOF.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies each foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines—

(A) knowingly assists in, sponsors, or provides significant financial or material support for, or financial or other services to or in support of, the terrorist activities of any person described in paragraph (2); or

(B) directly or indirectly, knowingly and materially engaged in a significant transaction with any person described in paragraph (2).

(2) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is a foreign person that the President determines—

(A) is a senior member of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof;

(B) is a senior member of a foreign terrorist organization designated pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) whose members directly or indirectly support the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof by knowingly engaging in a significant transaction with, or providing financial or material support for, Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or any person described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) directly or indirectly, supports the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof by knowingly and materially assisting, sponsoring, or providing financial or material support for, or goods or services to or in support of, Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or any person described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall not be required to identify a person described in this paragraph (or any affiliate or successor thereof) if—

(i) the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state notifies the
United States Government in advance that it proposes to engage in a significant transaction as described in paragraph (1)(B); and
(ii) the President determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees in a classified form not less than 15 days prior to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state engaging in the significant transaction that the significant transaction is in the national interests of the United States.

(b) NON-APPLICATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to—
(i) an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state which the Secretary of State determines provided significant support for acts of international terrorism pursuant to section 1754(c) of the Export Reform Control Act of 2018, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act of 2018, or any other provision of law; or
(ii) any significant transaction described in paragraph (1)(B) that involves, directly or indirectly, a foreign state described in clause (i).

(c) WAIVER.—
(i) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose two or more of the sanctions described in paragraph (2) with respect to a foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state engaged in a significant transaction pursuant to subsection (a).

(ii) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions referred to in clause (i) are the following:
(A) The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state, and the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall comply with any such direction.
(B) No sales of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) may be made to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state.

(iii) LICENSES FOR EXPORT OF ITEMS.—No licenses for export of any item on the United States Munitions List that include an agency or instrumentality of the foreign state as a party to the license may be granted.

(iv) EXPORTS OF CURRENCY.—No exports may be permitted to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state of any goods or technologies controlled for national security reasons under the Export Administration Regulations, except that such prohibition shall not apply to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.) or the congressional oversight of intelligence activities.

(E) The President shall prohibit any United States financial institution from making any additional credit or financing totaling more than $10,000,000 to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state, except that this subparagraph shall not apply to—
(i) any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.); and
(ii) the provision of medicines, medical equipment, and humanitarian assistance; or
(iii) credit guarantees, or financial assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture to support the purchase of food or other agricultural commodities.

(F) The President may exercise the waiver authority granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property interests in property of a foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state if such property or interests in property are in the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) FOREIGN STATE.—The term ‘‘foreign state’’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code.
(2) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.—The term ‘‘agency or instrumentality’’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code.
(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities and transactions described in subsection (a) that are carried out on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT PROVIDE MATERIAL SUPPORT FOR THE TERRORIST ACTIVITIES OF HAMAS, THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SUCCESSIONARY BODY.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies the following:

(A) Each government of a foreign country—

(i) with respect to which the Secretary of State has determined pursuant to a provision of law; and

(ii) in respect to which the President determines that the government of a foreign country directly or indirectly support international terrorism.

(B) Each government of a foreign country that—

(i) is not identified under subparagraph (A), and

(ii) the President determines engaged in a significant transaction so as to contribute knowingly and materially to the efforts of the government of a foreign country described in subparagraph (A)(i) to provide direct or indirect material support for the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof.

(C) No item on the United States Munitions List that includes an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state is in addition to the items on the list set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, may be exported to the government of the foreign country for a period of one year.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The President shall not be required to apply sanctions with respect
to the government of a foreign country pursuant to paragraph (1)—
(A) with respect to materials intended to be used by United States military or civilian personnel at military facilities in the country; or
(B) if the application of such sanctions would prevent the United States from meeting the timing of any stated commitment to which the United States is a party.
(c) IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS—In subsection (a)(1) of section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184)—The President shall impose the following additional sanctions with respect to each government identified pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A):
(1) The President shall, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the government of the foreign country has any interest.
(2) The President shall, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between one or more financial institutions or by or through any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the government of the foreign country.
(d) WAIVER.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive, on a case by case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement described in subsection (b) or (c) to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a foreign government identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) if the President—
(A) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and
(B) not less than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the waiver and the justification for the waiver.
(2) RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—The President may, on a case by case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for additional periods of not more than 180 days if the President—
(A) determines that the renewal of the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and
(B) less than 30 days before the waiver expires, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the renewal of the waiver and the justification for the renewal.
(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under subsection (b) or (c) with respect to each government of a foreign country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) is in addition to the authority to impose sanctions under any other provision of law with respect to governments of foreign countries that provide material support to foreign terrorist organizations designated pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184).
(f) TERMINATION.—The President may terminate any waiver imposed with respect to the government of a foreign country pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) if the President determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that the government of the foreign country is no longer carrying out activities or transactions for which the sanctions were imposed and has provided assurance that it will not carry out the activities or transactions in the future.
(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities and transactions described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) that are carried out on or after such date of enactment.
SEC. 5. EXEMPTIONS FROM SANCTIONS UNDER SUBSECTION 4 RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.
(a) SANCTIONS UNDER SECTION 3.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under section 3:
(1) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof described in section 4(a)(1)
(2) The provision of humanitarian assistance to a foreign government described in section 3(a)(2), including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.
(b) SANCTIONS UNDER SECTION 4.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under section 4:
(1) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof described in section 4(a)(1)
(2) The provision of humanitarian assistance to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof described in section 4(a)(1), including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.
(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.
(d) TERMINATION.—This Act shall terminate—
(1) 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate thereof are no longer designated as a foreign terrorist organization; and
(2) 180 days after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate thereof is no longer subject to sanctions pursuant to—
(i) Executive Order 12947 (January 23, 1995; relating to prohibiting transactions with terrorist organizations); and
(ii) Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001; relating to blocking properties and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and
SEC. 6. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO CONDUCT GLOBAL FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HAMAS, THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SURVIVOR THEREOF.
(a) REPORT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—
(A) a list of foreign countries that support Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or in which Hamas maintains important portions of its financial networks;
(B) with respect to each foreign country on the list required by subparagraph (A)—
(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and
(ii) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage the foreign government to take adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and
(C) a list of foreign countries in which Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, conducts significant fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities;
(D) with respect to each foreign country on the list required by subparagraph (C) and (ii)—
(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof; and
(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities—
(1) an assessment of the reasons that government is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and
(2) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage the foreign government to take adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and
(E) a list of foreign countries from which Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, acquires surveillance equipment, electronic monitoring equipment, or other means to inhibit communication or political dissent;
(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.
(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the heads of other applicable Federal departments and agencies provide to the appropriate committees a briefing on the disposition of the assets and activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate thereof related to fundraising, financing, and money laundering worldwide.
(c) CONGRESSIONAL REPORT.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—
(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Oversight and Governmental Reform, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and
(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.
SEC. 7. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.
(a) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States.
(b) EXEMPTION AUTHORITY.—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary for the implementation of this Act.
(c) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this Act shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.
(2) GOOD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘good’ means any article, natural or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.
(d) TERMINATION.—This Act shall terminate—
(1) 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate thereof, are no longer subject to sanctions pursuant to—
(i) Executive Order 12947 (January 23, 1995; relating to prohibiting transactions with terrorist organizations); and
(ii) Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001; relating to blocking properties and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and
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American citizens. As recently as May of this year, the group fired hundreds of rockets from Gaza into southern Israel, including at Israeli civilian areas in Tel Aviv. And Palestinian Islamic Jihad is taking credit for a number of terrorist attacks in Israel, including an attack that killed a New Jersey American student in 1995.

Yet both groups, and particularly Hamas, still get cash from abroad. These funds are used to build tunnels into Israel and launch rockets at civilian populations. It is simply disgusting.

No one benefits from terrorism, Mr. Speaker: not Israelis, who just want to live in peace and security; not Palestinians, who want a state of their own but are exploited by these terrorists. A Palestinian state will never be built on the backs of terrorism.

Israel has the right to defend itself. The United States will continue to support that. In the meantime, we must do everything we can to prevent the loss of civilian life. That starts with cutting off the money to Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

This bill will help do just that. It would impose new sanctions on those who support Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the deep pockets that are enabling these groups to wage their campaigns of violence.

Of course, we don’t want to punish innocent civilians, so this measure includes an important exception for humanitarian and medical assistance. This bill is designed to ensure that people in Gaza get what they need and that Hamas does not.

It is a good, straightforward piece of legislation. I am glad the House is considering it today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1850, the Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019.

In so doing, I first want to note Congressman Brian Mast’s great personal sacrifice in the war against terror and how inspirational it is for each and every one of us to see him raise his voice time and again in this great battle of our age.

I also want to thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for his lead co-sponsorship of this legislation.

H.R. 1850 would require the President to report to Congress on those who knowingly provide financial and material support to terrorism groups such as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and then apply sanctions. These groups in particular have vowed to wipe out our ally Israel, and their support of terror is well known.

Beyond that, the legislation would require a listing of foreign countries where Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad engage in fundraising, financing, or money laundering, as well as list those countries which fail to take adequate measures to freeze the assets of these known terror groups.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas, a designated foreign terrorist organization, has killed over 400 Israelis and 25 Americans. Hamas is the hands and feet of Iran, and uses its proximity to threaten Israel with impunity. As a result, the Israelis live in constant fear of Hamas rockets, tunnels, and other means of bringing violence to Israeli citizens.

Esteemed this year, in a single weekend, Hamas fired over 600 rockets into Israel, killing four civilians, including an American.
As part of our close partnership with Israel, the United States has long sought to help Israel counter that threat. We have worked together on development of the Iron Dome aerial defense system. We continue to work together on counter-tunneling technology.

And again, now, with this bill, we will help Israel to counter Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad by denying these groups the use of funds for their terror operations.

For over a year, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch, across multiple administrations, has sanctioned many individuals as well as a select number of foreign entities that are associated with Hamas, all under the general authority of broad executive order.

This bill will codify and standardize those sanctions in statute and require the administration to comprehensively assess whether other supporters of Hamas should be sanctioned who have thus far remained unaffected by their support of this terrorist group.

The bill also requires the President to report on whether foreign governments are supporting Hamas or the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

I also thank my good friend, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, for bringing this bill.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and (two-thirds in the affirmative) the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1850, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1850, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced
that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1327. An act to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2022, and for other purposes.

CALLING ON GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON AND ARMED GROUPS TO RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL CAMEROONIAN CITIZENS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to supplement the report of the Committee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations (H. Res. 358) calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonians, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 358

Whereas many Anglophone Cameroonians have long felt marginalized by official actions and policies of the Government of Cameroon and have begun to seek an alternative form of government, which was the constitutional basis under which English-speaking Southern Cameroonians entered into the union, and replacing it with a unitary state dominated by the Francophone majority;

Whereas, beginning in late 2016, protests organized by lawyers and human rights activists were violently repressed by the Government of Cameroon, leading to numerous deaths and imprisonments, including of journalists, teachers, lawyers, and an Anglophone judge on the country’s Supreme Court;

Whereas the conflict escalated in late September and early October 2017, when Cameroonien security forces brutally cracked down on peaceful Anglophone civil society demonstrators, resulting in dozens of deaths and leaving over 100 injured;

Whereas in late 2018, separatists launched a campaign to pressure school officials in the Northwest and Southwest Anglophone regions to return to school as part of a boycott against the Government of Cameroon, and reportedly began burning school buildings, threatening education officials with violence if they did not comply with a boycott, and kidnapping for ransom children and teachers who defied the boycott;

Whereas numerous human rights monitors have reported armed separatists killing traditional leaders and targeting civilians, including women, children, and the elderly, who are perceived to be supporting or working with the Government of Cameroon, and reports indicate that armed separatists have killed scores of security force personnel;

Whereas the security forces of the Government of Cameroon have attacked medical facilities and health workers in the Northwest and Southwest regions;

Whereas numerous credible reports from human rights monitors, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, have documented the excessive use of force by government security forces against Cameroonien civilians living in the Anglophone regions, including the burning of villages, the use of live ammunition against protesters, arbitrary arrest and detention, torture, and killing of civilians, including women, children, and the elderly;

Whereas the Department of State has expressed serious concern over the manner in which the government has used force to unlawfully restrict the rights to free expression and peaceful assembly protected under the Cameroonien Constitution and international law;

Whereas the government has charged journalists, social activists, members of political opposition parties with terrorism-related crimes and prosecuted them in military tribunals;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon arrested opposition leader Maurice Kamto and roughly 150 members of the Cameroon Renaissance Movement for peaceful protests on January 26, 2019, charging them with crimes that could result in the death penalty and holding their cases at the Military Criminal Chambers, which are civil;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon continued to place bans on Cameroon Renaissance Movement’s attempts to hold peaceful protests, and civil society reported that security forces interfered with MRC registration processes in Yaoundé, Douala, and Bafoussam in February 2019;

Whereas the government of Cameroon has repeatedly restricted freedoms of expression by shutting down the internet, harassing and detaining journalists, refusing licenses to independent media, and intensifying political attacks against the independent press;

Whereas the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated that more than 300,000 Cameroonians were internally displaced in areas affected by the Anglophone conflict;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that more than 32,000 Cameroonians have registered in Nigeria;

Whereas the government of Cameroon has expressly called on the Government of Cameroon to respect the rights, including the right to due process, of 47 Cameroonians forcibly returned in January 2018 from Nigerian custody to Cameroonian authorities, many of whom had reportedly submitted asylum claims in Nigeria; and

Whereas ten of the 47 Cameroonians forcibly returned from Nigeria now face charges before a military court punishable by the death penalty, while the other thirty-seven reportedly remain in detention without charge; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the abuses committed in Cameroon’s Anglophone regions by the Government of Cameroon security forces and armed separatists, including extrajudicial killings and detentions, the use of force against nonviolent civilians and protestors, and violations of the freedoms of press, expression, and assembly;

(2) affirms that the United States continues to hold the Government of Cameroon responsible for upholding the rights of all citizens, holding accountable for crimes or beliefs or the regions in which they reside, in accordance with Cameroon’s international obligations and Cameroon’s own Constitution;

(3) urges all parties, including political opposition groups, to exercise restraint and to ensure that protests remain peaceful;

(4) urges the Government of Cameroon to—

(A) initiate broad-based dialogue without preconditions and make a credible, full faith effort to work with religious and community leaders in the Anglophone region to address grievances and seek nonviolent solutions to resolve conflict and constitutional reforms that would protect minority concerns, such as reconstituting a Federal system;

(B) follow through on the initiatives developed to address grievances, including the Disarmament, Demobilization, Reintegration, and returning of all students to class;

(C) urge the separatist groups to—

(A) engage with Cameroonien government officials, as well as with other separatists, to negotiate and present to the diaspora; and

(B) ensure that detainees are treated fairly and humanely, with proper judicial proceedings, including a registry of those detained by the Cameroonien security forces, and with full access to legal resources; and

(K) ensure that Cameroon’s antiterrorism legislation is used only to prosecute offenses that would be considered acts of terrorism under international legal standards, and cease to use this legislation to sanction activities that are protected by national and international guarantees of freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and association with others; and

(5) urges the separatist groups to—

(A) engage with Cameroonien government officials, as well as with other separatists, to negotiate and present to the diaspora; and

(B) cease all violence and cease attacks on schools, teachers, and education officials, and allow for the safe return of all students to class;

(C) end incitement to violence and hate speech on the part of the diaspora; and

(D) immediately release all illegally detained or kidnapped in the Anglophone Northwest and Southwest regions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.
Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 358.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I want to start by thanking Ms. BASS and Mr. SMITH for bringing forward this resolution, which calls on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the anglophone regions of Cameroon.

Since October 2017, the region has been mired in conflict, with both the Government of Cameroon and armed separatists fighting one another and perpetrating human rights abuses. While armed actors refuse to pursue a negotiated settlement to the conflict, innocent civilians continue to suffer. According to UNICEF, more than 80 percent of the schools in the anglophone regions of Cameroon remain closed, putting at risk the future prospects of children who are being denied access to education. In addition, 1.3 million people, including approximately 650,000 children, are in need of humanitarian assistance.

This resolution urges the Government of Cameroon to respect the fundamental rights of all Cameroonian citizens and follow through on initiatives developed to address grievances in the anglophone region. It also urges separatist groups to engage with Cameroonian government officials, civil society, and religious leaders to express grievances and engage in efforts to resolve the conflict and to stop committing human rights abuses and inciting violence.

For several months, the Swiss Government has been attempting to mediate a peaceful resolution to this crisis, and I am pleased this resolution demonstrates Congress’ strong support for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 358, calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect fundamental human rights and pursue dialogue to resolve the crisis in the anglophone region of that country.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS, the Chair of the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee, of which I serve as the ranking member, for this resolution. It is a bipartisan resolution, and, again, I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that in the last Congress, I chaired a hearing on this Cameroon crisis as it was fast deteriorating, and I made a hearing on peace. Sadly, that effort and all efforts made by the international community have been elusive thus far.

The conflict in Cameroon has its roots in longstanding tensions between that country’s francophone majority and the anglophone minority, concentrated in the northwest and southwest regions.

In 2016, protests by anglophone teachers over marginalization and the lack of government services were met with a heavy-handed response. The government failed to genuinely address those legitimate grievances, which further inflamed tensions.

Brutal fighting between government security forces and local armed groups who called for separatism continues.

Today, there are over 500,000 displaced persons in the anglophone region.

Mr. Speaker, entire communities have been burned to the ground. Humanitarian convoys struggle to reach local populations or are even blocked and attacked by armed groups. Over half of the health facilities and hospitals have been damaged and forced to close. Children have been out of school for over 2 years.

According to the U.S. Department of State’s Human Rights Report on Cameroon from 2018, “Government security forces were widely believed to be responsible for disappearances of suspected anglophone separatists, with reports of bodies dumped far from the site of the killings to make identification difficult.”

This, in turn, is fueling resentment and separatist violence.

This resolution reiterates the U.S. position that all parties must immediately cease all preconditions to the negotiating table without preconditions. The Swiss-led mediation process is a hopeful step in that direction, which deserves support.

I would also note the critical role that has been played by the Catholic church, in particular Cardinal Tumi, in trying to reach common ground, and the need to support such efforts.

Hopefully, by weighing in, Congress can help promote the cause of peace and justice in the Republic of Cameroon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Ms. BASS and Mr. SMITH for their hard work. Again, as I mentioned before, Mr. Smith is always working very, very hard to be on the side of justice.

For too long, the people in Cameroon’s anglophone region have been marginalized by the Cameroonian Government, and since 2017, conflict between the government and separatists have brought chaos and fear to those living in the region.

This resolution supports a negotiated settlement to the conflict that respects the basic human rights of its citizens, so Cameroon can become a country that is more peaceful and stable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 358.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING BENEFITS INFORMATION IN SPANISH AND TAGALOG FOR VETERANS AND FAMILIES ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2943) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 2943

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 “Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act”.

SEC. 2. FACT SHEETS.
(a) THE DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make versions of all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

(b) WEBSITE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish and maintain a publicly available website of the Department of Veterans Affairs that contains links to all fact sheets of the Veterans Benefits Administration, Veterans Health Administration, and of the National Cemetery Administration. The website shall be available by a clearly labelled hyperlink on the homepage of the Department.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit a report to Congress regarding fact sheets described in subsection (a) and details of the Language Access Plan of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The report shall include the to:

(1) What the Secretary determines constitutes a fact sheet of the Department for purposes of this section;

(2) How such fact sheets are utilized and distributed other than on and through the website of the Department;

(3) How such Language Access Plan is communicated to veterans, family members of veterans, and caregivers.

(4) The roles and responsibilities of patient advocates in the coordination of care for veterans with limited English proficiency, family members of such veterans, and caregivers.
Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have a copy of the letter from the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide all VA fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

One of my chief priorities as chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to remove barriers that stand between veterans and their benefits. A language barrier should not prevent veterans from accessing the benefits they earned, and the burden should not be placed on veterans to request and wait for the VA to provide a translator.

Mandating that fact sheets be provided in Spanish and Tagalog will break down a significant barrier that stands in between Latinx and Filipino veterans and their VA benefits.

Mr. CISNEROS' bill, H.R. 2943, as amended, mandates that all fact sheets be available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

Our veterans answered the call to serve from places around the world, including the Philippines and Puerto Rico, where English is not the predominant language. There are communities across the U.S., including in my district, where Spanish is commonly spoken and understood. This fix is easy; it does not come at an increased cost; and it is the right thing to do.

The Department of Veterans Affairs produces fact sheets that explain many VA programs and benefits. The VA fact sheets provide key facts, such as eligibility criteria, documents needed to help support claims, and links to appropriate application forms. These fact sheets explain the process for getting a VA-guaranteed loan, applying for disability compensation, using GI Bill benefits, and obtaining burial benefits for veterans and their surviving family members.

Brochures and fact sheets explain VA healthcare benefits to veterans and caregivers. These fact sheets also educate veterans on the supporting documentation they need to help them apply for benefits so they are correctly identified as eligible or their claims are successfully adjudicated.

During the codel I led to Puerto Rico this past weekend, I met with veterans who told me they are not receiving information on VA programs, and when they receive information, it is in English, not Spanish. The one veteran who received a brochure on the MISSION Act in Spanish said it was incomparable compared to the English materials.

This disparity should not exist. Veterans, regardless of the language they speak or where they live, should be able to understand how to access their benefits easily.

I ask my colleagues to help our veterans who have done so much to serve our country and join me in supporting H.R. 2943, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my bill to ensure we do not overlook veterans and their families who may need these important fact sheets.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important bill. We were just overseas and met with the troops, and we had quite a few servicemembers from Puerto Rico. I would like to say that most of them spoke perfect English, but they may not. They should have access to all the information in their first language.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am also prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time to render my final comments.
Our veterans and their survivors deserve the best care possible. The VA benefits application process can be confusing. Congress has taken action to reduce confusion and ease the application process.

I remember when, only a few years ago, initial claims were taking more than a year. Today, initial disability claims are being completed in less than 160 days. This is, in part, due to streamlining the application process and providing more information to veterans.

As I learned during the codel to Puerto Rico, in emergencies like Hurricane Maria, veterans need to know how the VA can help them prepare for the next storm. They need to know that they can get additional supplies of medication. Veterans need to know where to go in an emergency when communications are disrupted. They also need to know how to apply for assistance and emergency benefits after a disaster like Hurricane Maria because these disasters will happen again.

The VA fact sheet on natural disasters, which tells veterans and their families which website to go to and where to call when their benefits are interrupted due to natural disasters, is only available in English. Yet, both the Philippines and Puerto Rico experience natural disasters like hurricanes, typhoons, and earthquakes.

Mandating that VA fact sheets are made available in more than one language is yet another example of ways we can eliminate barriers for our veterans, streamline the application process, and help them get to the right resources when there is an emergency.

Providing fact sheets in Tagalog and Spanish could even save lives.

Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2943, as amended, and, again, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, women veterans are the fastest growing demographic within the veteran population yet underutilize VA healthcare services. This is primarily due to misperceptions about eligibility and available resources. Many women leaving the military may not realize that they are eligible to use VA services, nor that VA offers extensive gender-specific care, such as mammography; prenatal, maternity, and infertility care; and mental health care that addresses complex trauma, including military sexual trauma, otherwise known as MST, and combat-related post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD.

The VA and U.S. Air Force Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program works to address issues commonly experienced by women veterans when accessing VA care. This successful improvement to the Transition Assistance Program, or the TAP, is jointly run by the USAF and VA. Transitioning women servicemembers can attend an additional day of TAP to learn about women’s healthcare, counseling, and social services available at the VA to ensure that they receive a warm handoff between the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration.

Mr. CISNEROS’ bill would expand the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program to more locations and authorizes the program through the end of fiscal year 2020.

This great legislation has my full support.

Madam Speaker, although women are the fastest growing cohort of veterans, women veterans are less likely to seek care and services at VA. This bill aims to address that and make the VA more accessible and responsive to women veterans.

Madam Speaker, this pilot program educates transitioning servicewomen about VA’s healthcare services. The data collected from this pilot program can be applied to the Transition Assistance Program to better meet the needs of all transitioning servicemembers.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CISNEROS for his hard work on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2942, as amended, the Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health, or HEALTH, for Women Veterans Act.

I thank and congratulate Representative CISNEROS on this very good bill.
Women are joining the armed services in record numbers, Madam Speaker, and are an important part of the military and veteran communities. In recognition of the brave services these women are providing our country, it is incumbent on us to ensure that they are aware of the many benefits afforded to them.

Unfortunately, far too many women veterans are unaware of the healthcare services available for women through the Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Health Administration. That is why VA and the Air Force partnered together to create a Women's Health Transition Training pilot program. The pilot program provides service-women who are on the verge of leaving the military with information about the care they may be eligible to receive from VA, how to enroll in VA, and how to successfully transition to civilian life. It empowers women to make informed decisions about their healthcare by educating them about the benefits available.

As of June 5, there have been 50 pilot sessions, Madam Speaker, and the women who have attended those sessions have reported a 98 percent satisfaction rate.

The Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health for Women Veterans Act would extend the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through fiscal year 2020 to ensure that women leaving the military continue to benefit from it.

This bill is sponsored, again, by Representative Gil Cisneros from California, and I thank the gentleman for his work. It is a very, very important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS), a veteran himself, the author of this legislation, and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I again want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his support on this bill as well.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member ROE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for working with me to ensure my bill passed out of committee and get it to the Senate.

Today, I rise to ask my colleagues for their support on my bill, H.R. 2942, the Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health for Women Veterans Act, introduced with my colleague and fellow veteran, Congresswoman Chrissy Houlihan.

As a Navy veteran, one of my top priorities is ensuring that active service-members transitioning into the civilian world are connected to the VA system and provided the best education and tools needed to succeed.

Despite being the fastest growing cohort in our military community, many servicewomen face unique challenges with their VA benefits. Studies have shown women veterans, on average, connect with the VA nearly 3 years after military service, which can result in higher rates of physical and mental health issues. In a male-dominated VA system, it is not surprising why women veterans often report that they feel uncomfortable seeking women-specific care.

My bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to extend an ongoing initiative with the Air Force and the Transition Assistance Program, which educates transitioning servicewomen about women's healthcare at the VA.

Specifically, the bill would mandate an extension of the program across all military service branches and require a report on the feasibility of making it permanent. Participants of this pilot program report an increased likelihood to use VA healthcare and have shown higher rates of confidence with the VA.

It is time our women service members and veterans receive the care they need, and this bill will do just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my bill to ensure that, when servicewomen transition to civilian life, they are provided with the information that will help them in a commonsense way.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I am prepared to close.

I want to say that this is an outstanding bill. I am glad we worked on this bill because we have a lot of women veterans who need this, and I want to make it permanent. So, again, let’s pass this bill as soon as possible and get it to the Senate.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am also prepared to close.

I will say in my final remarks that I urge all of my colleagues to support our women veterans by joining me in passing this important legislation, H.R. 2942, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
is amended by striking "$12,756" and inserting "$19,733."

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on August 1, 2020. The amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall apply with respect to individuals who have not received the maximum amount of assistance under section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, before such date.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

Section 2102 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding the aggregate amounts specified in subsection (d), a covered veteran may apply for an additional amount of assistance payable under subsection (a) or (b) of section 2101 of this title in an amount that does not exceed half of the amount specified in subsection (d).

(2) In this subsection, a covered veteran is a veteran who—

"(A) is described in section 2101(a)(2) of this title;

"(B) first receives assistance under this chapter on or after October 1, 2020;

"(C) as of the date of the veteran's application for assistance under this subsection, has not recently received assistance under this chapter on or after October 1, 2020; and

"(D) lives in a home that the Secretary determines does not have adaptations that are reasonably necessary because of the veteran's disability.

SEC. 5. IMPROVEMENT TO WORK-STUDY ALLOWANCE PROGRAM.

(a) PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 3485 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "individuals" and inserting "In accordance with paragraph (4), individuals";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) The Secretary shall carry out this section by providing to educational institutions an annual amount for the institution to use to provide a work-study allowance under paragraph (1) to individuals enrolled at the institution.

"(B) With respect to an educational institution that participated in the work-study program under this section during the academic year beginning August 1, 2018, the Secretary shall provide the annual amount to be provided to the educational institution under subparagraph (A) as follows:

"(i) For the academic year beginning August 1, 2020, the amount shall be the total amount the Secretary paid under this section to individuals enrolled at such educational institution during the academic year beginning August 1, 2018.

"(ii) Except as provided by subparagraph (D)(ii), for each academic year beginning on or after August 1, 2021, the amount shall be the total amount the educational institution paid under this section for work-study allowance to individuals enrolled at such educational institution during the previous academic year in which individuals enrolled at such educational institution participated in the work-study program.

"(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Secretary provides an annual amount to an educational institution under subparagraph (A) or (C) that is more than the total amount the educational institution pays to individuals under paragraph (1), the educational institution shall return to the Secretary the unpaid amount and the Secretary shall transfer such amount into the general fund of the Treasury.

"(ii) If the amount provided to an educational institution under subparagraph (B) or (C) is more, but less than 25 percent more, than the total amount the educational institution paid under paragraph (1), and the educational institution plans to participate in the work-study program under this section during the subsequent academic year, the educational institution may retain the amount of the overpayment if the educational institution notifies the Secretary of the amount of the overpayment and the intention to retain such amount. Any amount retained by an educational institution under clause (ii) may only be used by the educational institution to provide work-study allowance to individuals enrolled at the educational institution.

"(iii) At any time an educational institution may request the Secretary to increase the annual amount that the Secretary provides the educational institution under subparagraph (B) or (C).

"(C) Pursuant to section 3690(c), section 3693, and other provisions of chapter 36 of this title, the Secretary shall ensure that educational institutions carry out the work-study allowance program in compliance with this section.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e)(1) of section 3315B of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "subsection (a)(4)" and inserting "subsection (a)(5)".

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, commencing on or after August 1, 2020.

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FRY SCHOLARSHIP TO CHILDREN AND SPOUSES OF CERTAIN DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (12);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraphs (10) and (11):

"(10) An individual who is the child or spouse of a member of the Selected Reserve who dies on or after September 11, 2001, for active duty service other than active duty as a member of the Armed Forces.

"(11) An individual who is the child or spouse of a member of the Selected Reserve who dies on or after September 11, 2001—

"(A) from a service-connected disability; and

"(B) not later than four years after the date of the last discharge or release of that member from active duty or active duty for training.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) apply with respect to any part of an academic year commencing on or after August 1, 2020.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (f) of section 3311 is amended by striking "paragraph (9)" each place it appears and inserting "paragraphs (9), (10), and (11)"

(2) Section 3322 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking both "sections 3311(b)(9) and 3319" and inserting "section 3319 and paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311 of this title;" and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking "section 3311(b)(9)" and inserting "paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311 of this title; and

"(C) in subsection (h), by striking "either section 3311(b)(9) or chapter 35" and inserting "either chapter 35 or paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311".

SEC. 7. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREPARATORY COURSES AS PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR PURPOSES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3315A the following new section:

"§ 3315B. Preparatory courses for licensure, certification, or national tests.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—An individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter shall also be entitled to payment for a preparatory course for a certification or national test that is required or used to enter into, maintain, or advance in employment in a predetermined and identified vocation or profession.

"(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of educational assistance payable under this chapter for a course described in subsection (a) is the lesser of—

"(1) the fee charged for the course; or

"(2) the amount of entitlement available to the individual under this chapter at the time of payment for the course under this section.

"(c) CHARGE AGAINST ENTITLEMENT.—The number of months of entitlement charged an individual under this chapter for a course described in subsection (a) shall be pro-rated based on the actual amount of the fee charged for the course relative to the rate for 1 month payable—

"(1) for the academic year beginning August 1, 2020, $1,460; or

"(2) for academic years commencing on or after August 1, 2021, calculated by multiplying the amount described in subsection (a) by the percentage increase determined under section 3105(h).

(b) CREDIBLE AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of this chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3315A the following new item:

"3315B. Preparatory courses for licensure, certification, or national tests.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3323(g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or "a preparatory course described in section 3315B(a) of this title" each place it appears; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting "or preparatory course", after "test".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to academic years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.
SEC. 8. ADJUSTMENT OF LOAN FEES.
Section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the loan fee table and inserting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Type of loan”</th>
<th>Active duty veteran</th>
<th>Reservist</th>
<th>Other obligor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)(i) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2010)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(ii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2010)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(iii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2009, and before October 1, 2009)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(iv) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2009, and before October 1, 2009)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(i) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after July 1, 2003, and before January 1, 2020)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(ii) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(iii) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(iv) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(i) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed before January 1, 2010)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(ii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after January 1, 2010, and before October 1, 2010)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(iii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after October 1, 2010, and before October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(iv) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(i) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed before January 1, 2010)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(ii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed before January 1, 2010, and before October 1, 2010)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(iii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2010, and before October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(iv) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2020)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Direct loan under section 3711</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Manufactured home loan under section 3712 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Loan to Native American veteran under section 3712 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Loan assumption under section 3714</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Loan under section 3713(a)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEC. 9. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ASSIST BLIND VETERANS WHO HAVE NOT LOST USE OF A LEG IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING.
Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)—
(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “due to—” and inserting “due to blindness in both eyes, having central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of a standard correcting lens. For the purposes of this clause, an eye with a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees shall be considered as having a central visual acuity of 20/200 or less—”; and
(B) by striking subclauses (I) and (II); and
(2) in subsection (b)(2)—
(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and
(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

SEC. 10. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRIKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to re-vise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3504, as amended.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con-sume.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, the Veterans’ Affairs Committee is proud to bring to the floor H.R. 3504, as amended, the Ryan Kules Specially Adapted Housing Improvement Act of 2019, which is named after Army veteran Ryan Kules. Madam Speaker, we are honored to have Ryan with us today.

Ryan’s vehicle was struck by an explosive device in 2005, which took the lives of Sergeant Jerry Mills and Sergeant Donald Hasse, and took Ryan’s right arm and left leg.

He was able to use the VA’s Specially Adapted Housing program to modify his house to suit his needs and the needs of his wife and children. However, the program simply didn’t provide enough assistance, leaving Ryan and his family owing more than $90,000 out of pocket for improvements.

The VA’s Specially Adapted Housing program offers grants to servicemembers and veterans with certain severe service-connected disabilities. The grants assist with building, remodeling, or purchasing an adapted home. However, portions of the program don’t reflect the needs of today’s veterans, which is why I am proud of our work on the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee to make the SAAH program work for today’s veterans.

H.R. 3504, as amended, does this by prioritizing grants for seriously ill veterans, doubling the cap on the total number of grants issued to a veteran, increasing the total applications authorized, and increasing the maximum...
benefit for up to 50 percent of the cost of a specially adapted home.

In addition, this legislation doesn’t stop there. H.R. 3504, as amended, includes legislation from Representative LUJIA regarding expanding the SAH program to cover blind veterans. I was shocked to learn that the existing SAH program only covers blind veterans who also have lost a limb. H.R. 3504, as amended, includes Representative LUJIA’s Housing Access for Blind Veterans Act.

I yield from a blind veteran in Ponce, Puerto Rico, last weekend about some of the challenges that he faces. As Puerto Rico continues to rebuild after Hurricane Maria, allowing disabled veterans, including veterans with visual impairments, to apply for Specially Adapted Housing grants can help repair and improve their homes and lives.

I thank the gentlewoman for her work and Ranking Member ROE’s support.

Also, H.R. 3504, as amended, includes Representative SABLAN’S GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act. This legislation expands the GI Bill to cover preparatory courses for professional tests, allowing veterans to more easily obtain career credentials.

Finally, H.R. 3504, as amended, includes a modernization of the VA’s work-study program, streamlining the payment process to make work-study programs easier for veterans to participate in.

I thank Ranking Member BILIRAKIS and Chairman LEVIN for bringing this legislation to the committee, fully paid for.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3504, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3504, as amended, the Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019.

Our highest calling as a committee is to empower those who have been injured in defense of our country to live independent and productive lives.

The Specially Adapted Housing program, or SAH grant program, is one way to do that, and this bill makes several needed improvements to that program.

SAH grants are awarded to certain severely injured servicemembers and veterans to help them adapt their homes to increase their comfort and independence. It is a quality of life issue, Madam Speaker.

SAH grants can be used to make all kinds of home adaptations, including installing grab bars, wheelchair ramps and lifts, lowering countertops, and widening hallways and doorways.

My bill would make needed improvements to this program and provide prioritization when processing SAH grants for veterans with serious illnesses like ALS.

It would also double the number of times a veteran can use an SAH grant and increase the base amount of funding available to veterans by 15 percent.

Finally, this bill would authorize VA to provide housing grants for veterans 10 years after they use their SAH grants to make additional home improvements as they age. So, of course, they might want to get into a bigger house because their families grow, and they should have that opportunity to do so.

This bill also includes H.R. 3640, the Housing Access for Blind Veterans Act, which was introduced last week by Representative ROE and Representative ELAINE LURIA from Virginia, the chair of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, to provide additional SAH funding to veterans who are legally blind. It is so important that we do this.

I am proud to have named this bill after my friend Ryan Kules, an Army veteran, and I had the privilege of meeting him today and his wonderful family. It is a beautiful family.

On November 29, 2005, while he was serving in Iraq, Ryan’s vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device, an IED, and Ryan sustained multiple injuries, including the loss of his leg and arm. He is a true hero, Madam Speaker.

These injuries made him eligible for the SAH grant program following his separation from service. Many of the ideas in this bill came from Ryan’s own experiences with the SAH program.

I am grateful to Ryan for his service, for his continued advocacy, and for allowing us to use his name for this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Wounded Warriors Project and the Paralyzed Veterans of America for their help with crafting this bill, as well as my friend and original cosponsor Representative MIKE LEVIN from California, who is the cosponsor of this bill and who does an outstanding job in committee, where we work in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, this bill also includes the text of H.R. 3335, the GI Bill Work Study Improvement Act. This bill was introduced by my friend, Representative RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA’s workstudy program.
This is not the first time Congress has expanded GI bill benefit to cover non-tuition expenses. Over the last 75 years, we have broadened the GI bill to cover college admissions test fees, admissions test preparatory courses, and the exam fees for licenses and certifications.

And, while more than 5,700 GI Bill students over the last year and a half used their license and certification exam fees reimbursement benefit, the courses designed to help them pass these tests were not reimbursable. That makes no sense. Not all students pass these exams on the first attempt. If we really want to help our veterans become licensed and certified for demanding careers, let us help them prepare to pass the necessary tests. Let us help them join the more than 25 million veterans and veteran family members who the GI Bill has helped achieve their educational and career goals.

My GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Guard Association, Enlisted Association of the National Guard, AMVETS, National Military Family Association, Association of the U.S. Army, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Fleet Reserve Association, Reserve Officers Association and Paralyzed Veterans of America. I ask my colleagues to support this measure, as well, and H.R. 3504 of which it is a part.

H.R. 3504 expands the VA’s Specially Adapted Housing grant program to reach more veterans who need assistance and improves the Fry Scholarship program to cover more spouses and children of fallen service members.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3504.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Takano) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3504, as amended. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

Ms. Mucarsel-Powell. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 549

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 “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR PURPOSES OF GRANTING TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), Venezuela shall be treated as if it had been designated under subsection (b)(1)(C) of that section, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) PERIOD OF DESIGNATION.—The initial period of the designation referred to in paragraph (1) shall be for a 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ALIENS ELIGIBLE.—As a result of the designation made under subsection (a), an alien who is a national of Venezuela is deemed to satisfy the requirements under paragraph (1) of section 244(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(c)), subject to paragraph (3) of such section, if the alien—

(1) has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) is admissible as an immigrant, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2)(A) of such section, and is not ineligible for temporary protected status under paragraph (2)(B) of such section; and

(3) registers for temporary protected status in a manner established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) CONSENT TO TRAVEL ABROAD.—IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall give prior consent to travel abroad, in accordance with section 244(g)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(g)(3)), to an alien who is granted temporary protected status pursuant to the designation made under subsection (a) if the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security that emergency and extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the alien require the alien to depart for a brief, temporary trip abroad.

(2) TREATMENT UPON RETURN.—An alien returning to the United States in accordance with an authorization described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as any other returning alien provided temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a).

(d) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other fee authorized by law, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to charge an alien a fee for temporary protected status pursuant to the designation made under subsection (a) in an amount not to exceed $50.

(2) Waiver.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit aliens to apply for a waiver of any fees associated with filing an application referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. 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 date of its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. Mucarsel-Powell) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Cline) each will control 20 minutes.

Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.
all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019. This vitally important bill will provide help and support to those who cannot return to their home country of Venezuela.

Years-long political and economic turmoil in Venezuela has resulted in the world’s fastest growing migration, staggering poverty, and chronic shortages of medicine. Millions of Venezuelans are malnourished, and the United Nations estimates that 7 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance. Four million Venezuelans have been forced from their home. Most have remained in the region in neighboring countries, but tens of thousands are here in the United States seeking refuge. It is long past time that the United States show some humanitarian protection for Venezuelans currently living in the United States.

My district has one of the largest Venezuelan populations in the Nation, and I understand very well the crisis in Venezuela.

I came to this country from Ecuador when I was 14 years old, having seen firsthand the damage that authoritarian and corrupt leaders in South America have caused their countries. I have good friends and family who are still there suffering in Maracaibo and in Caracas. They are desperate. I can hear it in their voices every time they update me on the crisis.

In Miami I have met with reporters who have had to flee their home because a free press does not exist in Venezuela. Just yesterday, more rolling blackouts hit the country jeopardizing the lives of hospital patients and sending the country into pure darkness.

Even if Nicolas Maduro, the leader of this brutal narco-regime, were to leave today and the legitimate President, Juan Guaido, were to be sworn in, extraordinary and temporary conditions exist that would prevent Venezuelans from returning safely. Maduro’s regime has plunged Venezuela into catastrophe.

The poverty rate in Venezuela is soaring, and the nation’s health system is near collapse. Just imagine, nearly one-third of Venezuelan physicians have fled the country, and an astounding 79 percent of hospitals are experiencing shortages in supplies to assist the country’s mounting medical needs. This dire situation is only exacerbated by unsolved food and water shortages. Malnutrition is widespread, especially among children and pregnant women. Frequent nationwide blackouts contribute to the deterioration of already impoverished communities. This is one of the worst humanitarian crises that we have seen in the Western Hemisphere.

One thing is clear; we have to help our Venezuelan brothers and sisters in the United States. These conditions in Venezuela warrant a designation of TPS, and through H.R. 549, Congress will take this necessary action.

I commend my colleagues, Representatives Soledad Chavarría and Mario Díaz-Balart for introducing this bill. I thank Representatives Donna Shalala and Debbie Wasserman Schultz, and Chairwoman Lofgren of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship and Chairwoman Nadler of the Judiciary Committee for their support and hard work in helping move this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we stand in solidarity with the people of Venezuela, and I share many of the comments that have been made. But I must rise in opposition to H.R. 549.

H.R. 549 statutorily designates Venezuela for inclusion in the broken program known as Temporary Protective Status. Pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of DHS can designate a country for TPS if there are circumstances that would prevent the safe return of aliens to that country or if a country is temporarily unable to adequately handle the return of its nationals.

When DHS does so, nationals of the designated country who are inside the United States on the date of the designation, whether legally or illegally, may apply to stay here and receive employment authorization. DHS has estimated there are 270,000 such Venezuelan nationals currently in the United States, over 100,000 of whom are here illegally.

TPS is usually initially designated for a period of 18 months and then re-designated in 18-month increments after the Secretary reviews the conditions in the country to determine whether the conditions for the initial TPS designation continue. If the Secretary determines that the country no longer meets the conditions for the TPS designation, the Secretary is required by law to terminate the designation. There are currently over 415,000 TPS recipients from 10 different countries in the United States.

Despite the fact Congress intended TPS to be a temporary protection, over time it has become a permanent, automatically renewed status with some countries being designated for TPS for decades.

For instance, Honduras was initially designated for TPS back in 1999 due to Hurricane Mitch which struck the country in October of 1998. Somalia was initially designated in September of 1991 based on armed conflict.

The current administration applied the law under section 244 of the INA regarding mandatory termination of TPS designation if the conditions no longer exist, and terminated TPS for Sudan, Nicaragua, Haiti, and El Salvador. The DHS Secretary gave those populations at least 12 months to wind down and prepare for departure, but a lawsuit was filed, and activist Federal courts issued an injunction.

I oppose H.R. 549, but do not do so lightly. There is no doubt that the people of Venezuela are suffering. They are in a dire situation as a result of the socialist policies of long-time President Hugo Chavez and his successor Nicolas Maduro.

But I hold out hope for a regime change in Venezuela, and I know the administration is watching this situation closely.

If Congress is, nevertheless, inclined to statutorily designate Venezuela for TPS, we should not do so without reforming the process to ensure renewal is not a rubber stamp; otherwise, we risk being in the same position we are currently in regarding other TPS designations. No other administration will terminate it, and 25 years from now, Members of Congress will call for green cards for Venezuelans here on TPS.

Another concern is that two Federal circuits, the sixth and the ninth, have held the mere grant of TPS to be an admission for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The effect of those rulings is that TPS holders who were meant to be here temporarily can now get a green card pursuant to family or employment-based petition even if they entered the country illegally. Also problematic is the fact that the fee for a TPS application is statutorily capped at $50.

Last week, the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee held a hearing regarding the long wait times for processing immigration benefits applications. Large volume is the biggest driver of longer processing times, but there is also not enough money to hire additional staff. Since it is a fee-funded agency, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services should be allowed to set the fee commensurate with the cost of application adjudication, which is obviously more than the mere $50.

Lastly, I must protest the glaring hypocrisy of designating a country for temporary protective status after the majority recently passed H.R. 6, which created a green card path for 417,000 aliens in the country on temporary protected status. If the majority had its way, Congress would amend the INA to remove the word "temporary" from the TPS statute and just start handing over green cards immediately.

Madam Speaker, I propose H.R. 549. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the concerns Mr.
CLINE has brought up, but I would like to remind him that the Immigration and Nationality Act and this bill provide the authority to terminate TPS for Venezuelans, and Venezuelans, right now, are clearly eligible.

TPS was created specifically for the situations that we are seeing. TPS was created to address situations where extraordinary and temporary conditions in a country prevent its nationals from returning safely.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Madam Speaker, I first commend my colleague from central Florida (Mr. SOTO), for his leadership and his perseverance.

I want to also thank my colleagues from south Florida, many of whom are here today in support of this important piece of legislation.

Look, I know that there are concerns about an immigration system that is absolutely broken in this country, and it is. I know that there are concerns about even TPS. I get that. But we have to take a step back.

What we are dealing with here is a very specific, unique situation, which is why Congress today will have this opportunity to vote on it.

You know the situation. You have heard the situation about the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela. Over 3 million people have fled Venezuela because what was the wealthiest country in South America, because of the radical socialist policies of the two last dictators, now has become among the poorest, where people don’t have access to any basic issues of—whether it is healthcare or even food, medicine.

You know all that, but, you see, there is something else: The extreme repression that is taking place in Venezuela, that is the real reason people are fleeing. That is the reason that Venezuelans are fleeing. That is the reason that the heroes in Venezuela have hit the streets. That is the reason why the government; businesses have come to the forefront leading these heroic people.

And this administration has recognized that fact. This administration—and I am so grateful—has applied tough sanctions against the dictatorship, has shown great solidarity with the people of Venezuela.

So I ask you, let’s not confuse this with all of the issues of immigration and the broken immigration system. Right now, we have a situation on Venezuela, should we be sending Venezuelans back to that dictatorship, or could Congress act in a very specific circumstance to give them the ability to stay here, at least while this dictatorship, this horrific situation is taking place in Venezuela?

That is what we are dealing with. Not the horrors of complications or the messed up parts of the immigration system which has got issues, obviously. It is this very specific issue.

Again, particularly, my colleague, Mr. SOTO, I would just urge my colleagues in the House to take a step back. These are specific circumstances dealing with this dictatorship in Venezuela. The administration has shown solidarity, Congress now has the opportunity to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote.

TPS: MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my colleague. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to pass the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019, which would grant Venezuelan nationals urgently needed temporary protective status in the United States of America.

The Maduro regime has perpetrated egregious human rights abuses, enriching an economic and humanitarian crisis on the people of Venezuela. Venezuelans fleeing starvation, violence, and political persecution have sought refuge in the United States of America.

My district has the largest Venezuelan population in the U.S. So many of my south Florida neighbors know the brutality of the Maduro regime firsthand and fled here seeking safety. Stories of heartbreak: children kidnapped from playgrounds; family members dying of hunger, violence, and lack of medicine; individuals who were jailed for speaking out against the government; businesses confiscated.

Extending TPS will ensure Venezuelans are shielded from the imminent danger of deportation and can obtain work permits.

President Trump has called the Maduro regime a “nightmare of poverty, hunger, and death.” He said in June that he was looking “very seriously” at extending TPS to Venezuela.

But a recent letter from the USCIS stated the administration is simply “monitoring” the situation in Venezuela, something it has done for months.

There was no commitment to extend TPS to Venezuela, and in the meantime, this administration continues to deport Venezuelan nationals, sending them back to the nightmare of the Maduro regime.

This cannot wait any longer. It is past time we support the Venezuelan community and recognize the urgency of extending them TPS.

President Trump could grant TPS to Venezuelans today. He doesn’t need congressional action. So amidst his inaction, the House of Representatives will take action today to protect our neighbors and friends, because their lives are on the line.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation to ensure that Venezuelans are granted this essential protection, and I say “Vive Venezuela.”

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for her remarks and for her sharing the concerns of the president for the socialist regime of Maduro.
I would note that there are very few detained noncriminal Venezuelans with removal orders, and there is no mechanism currently in place for directly removing aliens to Venezuela.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZALEZ-COLON), my friend.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my friend.

Madam Speaker, I am a proud co-sponsor of this bill, essentially allowing Venezuelan nationals living in the United States to be eligible for temporary protected status. This status will extend travel authorization, allow lawful employment, and, ultimately, prevent their removal from the United States.

The crisis in Venezuela is dire. In April, I had the opportunity to travel to Colombia with other Members of Congress to visit a humanitarian center on the border with Venezuela. I saw firsthand the appalling conditions that our Latin American brothers and sisters are enduring, and believe me, it is worse than anyone can imagine.

The problem is not the need experienced in the country are unprecedented and heartbreaking. Over 90 percent of the population is living in poverty; 7 million people need humanitarian assistance; and diseases that have been previously eradicated have, unfortunately, returned.

To make matters worse, there is a shortage of 85 percent of necessary medicines to treat those diseases on the ground, while infant mortality rates have increased by 30 percent and maternal mortality rates have increased by an alarming 60 percent.

This is unacceptable, Madam Speaker.

The main obstacle at hand lies in the hands of Nicolas Maduro and his ruthless dictatorship. He is holding the people of Venezuela hostage, depriving them of basic human rights.

Additionally, the number of Venezuelans migrating to Puerto Rico has doubled since the crisis began and can be expected to continue increasing as long as Maduro remains in power.

I will continue working to move this bill so that Venezuelans can have a temporary safe haven in our country, where they can live freely.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the House needs to do something about this, and I urge my colleagues to do the same and support this bill.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), my colleague.

Ms. SHALALA of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this lifesaving bipartisan legislation to designate temporary protective status for Venezuelans.

Maduro’s evil regime has plunged Venezuela into catastrophe. The once-thriving country is in free fall, with Venezuelans now suffering from the largest economic, political, and humanitarian crisis in the entire hemisphere.

Just in 2018, nearly 30,000 Venezuelans applied for asylum in the United States, becoming the number one country of origin for asylum claimants.

Many Venezuelans have come to south Florida, where they have contributed so much to our diverse community. In my district, there are approximately 17,000 Venezuelan-born residents.

My constituents cannot safely return. A recent U.N. report detailed the shocking government abuses, including extrajudicial killings at the hands of Maduro’s death squads.

Simply stated, granting TPS for Venezuelans is the right thing to do. TPS has bipartisan support in the House and in the Senate. We now have an opportunity to take real action to support those who have fled the crisis caused by the illegitimate, inhumane Maduro regime.

Madam Speaker, I thank my Florida colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as our colleague from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZALEZ-COLON), for their work on this important legislation. I strongly urge a “yes” vote.

Vive Venezuela.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks against the socialist regime of Maduro as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, let’s be clear: Venezuela is one of the most natural-resources-rich nations on the planet, and for oil, in the top five in reserves in the world.

The problem with Venezuela is not its people, other than that they made mistakes in whom they elected. The problem is not the lack of resources, which should empower those people to be wealthy. Rather, the problem in Venezuela is the self-inflicted adoption of socialism.

Let’s be clear about the economic havoc that is now occurring in Venezuela. We have starvation. In one recent study, the average adult over a year has lost 40 pounds in weight loss, in excess of 20 pounds because they could not get the calories needed to sustain their body weight. Results have been catastrophic.

Inflation a few years ago was over 1,000 percent. Today, we have estimates that inflation in Venezuela is as high as 10 million percent. Of course, the currency is worthless and becoming more so.

Venezuela, as a country, has been brought to its knees by the adoption of socialism. In fact, it is international law that many in America now advocate the suppression of free enterprise and the liberty on which it is based, and the replacement of free enterprise and liberty with socialism and the dictatorial nature that is inherent in the adoption of socialist practices. Venezuela is an excellent example of why America must never go socialist.

Let’s go to H.R. 549 and let it relate to what I have just said.

This bill proposes a tsunami of people coming to our country who are ill-equipped to support themselves.

Let’s put that into the perspective of where we are as a nation. We just blew through the $22 trillion debt mark earlier this year. This year, we are looking at a roughly $800 billion deficit.

A deal has been reached that will only increase our deficit by $2 trillion over the next 2 years, pushing our debt up to $22 trillion. This money we do not have, have to borrow to get, and can’t afford to pay back.

Well, let me share some numbers with you: Sixty percent of households will be paying a property tax, and Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare. Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare, living off the hard work of others.

Madam Speaker, I ask for opposing H.R. 549, and that is how I will vote.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, just a couple of quick responses to my colleague.

The only thing that I do agree with is, yes, we do have to put our own house in order. We have an executive in disarray at this moment.

I think that maybe the gentleman is ill-informed. The people of Venezuela did not elect the narco-regime, the authoritarian, dictatorial leader who is Nicolas Maduro. They had fraudulent elections in May 2018.

Please do not insult the people in Venezuela, who are suffering, who have no food, who have no access to medicine. We have seen the worst humanitarian crisis in this hemisphere, and it was not because Venezuelans elected him. Actually, he held fraudulent elections in May 2018.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my colleague.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize one thing: While Maduro has been in charge of Venezuela, Maduro is not the cause of the economic hardship that is now being faced in Venezuela. Rather, it is the people’s adoption of socialism.

Let’s go to H.R. 549. How it relates to what I have just said.

This bill proposes a tsunami of people coming to our country who are ill-equipped to support themselves.

Let’s put that into the perspective of where we are as a nation. We just blew through the $22 trillion debt mark earlier this year. This year, we are looking at a roughly $800 billion deficit.

A deal has been reached that will only increase our deficit by $2 trillion over the next 2 years, pushing our debt up to $22 trillion. This money we do not have, have to borrow to get, and can’t afford to pay back.

Well, let me share some numbers with you: Sixty percent of households will be paying a property tax, and Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare. Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare, living off the hard work of others.

Madam Speaker, I ask for opposing H.R. 549, and that is how I will vote.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my Florida colleague.

The main obstacle at hand lies in the hands of Nicolas Maduro and his ruthless dictatorship. He is holding the people of Venezuela hostage, depriving them of basic human rights.

Additionally, the number of Venezuelans migrating to Puerto Rico has doubled since the crisis began and can be expected to continue increasing as long as Maduro remains in power.

I will continue working to move this bill so that Venezuelans can have a temporary safe haven in our country, where they can live freely.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the House needs to do something about this, and I urge my colleagues to do the same and support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BROOKS), my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, let’s be clear: Venezuela is one of the most natural-resources-rich nations on the planet, and for oil, in the top five in reserves in the world.

The problem with Venezuela is not its people, other than that they made mistakes in whom they elected. The problem is not the lack of resources, which should empower those people to be wealthy. Rather, the problem in Venezuela is the self-inflicted adoption of socialism.

Let’s be clear about the economic havoc that is now occurring in Venezuela. We have starvation. In one recent study, the average adult over a year has lost 40 pounds in weight loss, in excess of 20 pounds because they could not get the calories needed to sustain their body weight. Results have been catastrophic.

Inflation a few years ago was over 1,000 percent. Today, we have estimates that inflation in Venezuela is as high as 10 million percent. Of course, the currency is worthless and becoming more so.

Venezuela, as a country, has been brought to its knees by the adoption of socialism. In fact, it is international law that many in America now advocate the suppression of free enterprise and the liberty on which it is based, and the replacement of free enterprise and liberty with socialism and the dictatorial nature that is inherent in the adoption of socialist practices. Venezuela is an excellent example of why America must never go socialist.

Let’s go to H.R. 549. How it relates to what I have just said.

This bill proposes a tsunami of people coming to our country who are ill-equipped to support themselves.

Let’s put that into the perspective of where we are as a nation. We just blew through the $22 trillion debt mark earlier this year. This year, we are looking at a roughly $800 billion deficit.

A deal has been reached that will only increase our deficit by $2 trillion over the next 2 years, pushing our debt up to $22 trillion. This money we do not have, have to borrow to get, and can’t afford to pay back.

Well, let me share some numbers with you: Sixty percent of households will be paying a property tax, and Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare. Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare, living off the hard work of others.

Madam Speaker, I ask for opposing H.R. 549, and that is how I will vote.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my Florida colleague.

The main obstacle at hand lies in the hands of Nicolas Maduro and his ruthless dictatorship. He is holding the people of Venezuela hostage, depriving them of basic human rights.

Additionally, the number of Venezuelans migrating to Puerto Rico has doubled since the crisis began and can be expected to continue increasing as long as Maduro remains in power.

I will continue working to move this bill so that Venezuelans can have a temporary safe haven in our country, where they can live freely.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the House needs to do something about this, and I urge my colleagues to do the same and support this bill.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), my colleague.

Ms. SHALALA of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this lifesaving bipartisan legislation to designate temporary protective status for Venezuelans.

Maduro’s evil regime has plunged Venezuela into catastrophe. The once-thriving country is in free fall, with Venezuelans now suffering from the largest economic, political, and humanitarian crisis in the entire hemisphere.

Just in 2018, nearly 30,000 Venezuelans applied for asylum in the United States, becoming the number one country of origin for asylum claimants.
Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act.

The situation in Venezuela is dire. It is outrageous, Madam Speaker, that some in this Chamber would blame the horrible situation in Venezuela on the people of Venezuela. It is the Maduro regime that is committing horrific human rights abuses.

People are being killed and tortured. The media has been censored. Opponents of the regime have been imprisoned. The economy is failing. Food is scarce. Essential medicines cannot be found.

The mass corruption and poverty have forced more than 4 million people to flee the country for their lives. I have witnessed desperate Venezuelans crossing the border into Colombia in need of food. I spoke with families who traveled hours and hours to Cucuta for one meal for their children. I saw warehouses filled with food and humanitarian assistance that Maduro refuses to allow in to help his people.

The dreadful living conditions, extreme violence, and persecution warrant extending TPS to Venezuelans living in the United States.

We must stand with the Venezuelan people, the legitimate government of President Juan Guaido, and the return of freedom and democracy. For right now, passing this bill will ensure Venezuelans in the U.S. are protected from being deported to life-threatening conditions.

Madam Speaker, this bill will save lives. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MURPHY), my colleague.

Ms. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I support this bipartisan bill to extend temporary protected status to Venezuelans.

There are over 400,000 Venezuelans living in the United States, and more than half live in Florida. About 200,000 of those people would receive TPS if this bill becomes law. They could work legally, pay taxes, and contribute to our economy for a period of time, without living in fear of deportation.

Venezuela is in absolute crisis, and making Venezuelans in the U.S. go home right now is immoral. In many cases, it could be a death sentence.

Requiring people who have sought refuge in America to return to a failed state violates our core values as a nation.

Let me be clear: Passing TPS is a critical step, but it seeks to treat the symptom of a disease rather than trying to cure the disease itself. The disease is the cruel, undemocratic, and incompetent regime of Nicolas Maduro.

For Venezuela to prosper and for the U.S. to protect its national security, the United States must engage with the legitimate government of Venezuela. We must work with its allies in the region and use all elements of our national power to support the Venezuelan patriots who are fighting to reclaim their country from the regime that has destroyed it.

Then, and only then, will Venezuela be sufficiently stable and safe so these proud Venezuelans can return to the country they love.

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

As was said earlier, there are very few detained noncriminal Venezuelans with removal orders, and there is no mechanism currently in place for directly removing aliens to Venezuela.

Madam Speaker, we stand with the people of Venezuela in their fight against the socialist regime of Nicolas Maduro.

We recognize that only through change in leadership and a change in direction will Venezuela change course and begin to rebound, in terms of adopting economic reforms and abandoning the socialist policies of the Maduro regime.

We stand with the people, and we stand ready to embrace the newly elected President, President Guaido, who will take control of the country.

But this bill, H.R. 549, is a bill that is simply not appropriate for the circumstances right now. This broken TPS system that we have would not be sufficient to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans who would seek to use it.

Suffice it to say, it is similarly to helping people by throwing them a raft full of holes.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 549, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to Mr. CLINE’s concern, once again, TPS is the law of the land. It is under section 241 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. All we are asking is to place Venezuela as a country that is designated under TPS in this bill.

We are talking about people who are suffering. We cannot send them back to a humanitarian emergency.

We wrote a letter to the Trump administration, asking them to grant TPS for Venezuelans. They have the ability to do so at the administrative level right now, but they have refused. They say they are supportive of Venezuelans, but I seriously question that when they disagree with the importance of granting TPS for the thousands of Venezuelans living in this country. We cannot send them back to a brutal regime, to a regime that is actually killing its own citizens.

I would like to express my support for H.R. 549. There is, as I mentioned, widespread poverty and shortages of food and water. The government is in disarray, and we can’t wait any longer. We have to help our Venezuelan brothers and sisters in the United States, and this bill accomplishes just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 549. We must do it. “Lo tenemos que hacer.” This is the moment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 549, as amended.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING AMERICAN VETERANS IN EXTREME NEED ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2908) to exempt from the calculations of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 2908

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 “Honor American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019” or the “HAVEN Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF CURRENT MONTHLY INCOME.

Section 103(a)(A) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B)(i) includes any amount paid by any entity other than the debtor or the debtor’s spouse, on a regular basis for the household expenses of the debtor or the debtor’s dependents (and in the case of the debtor’s spouse if not otherwise a dependent); and

“(ii) excludes—

“(I) benefits received under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); and

“(II) payments to victims of war crimes or crimes against humanity on account of their status as victims of such crimes; and

“(III) payments to victims of international terrorism or domestic terrorism, as those terms are defined in section 2351 of title 18, on account of their status as victims of such terrorism; and

“(IV) any monthly compensation, pension, pay, annuity, or allowance paid under title...
10, 37, or 38 in connection with a disability, combat-related injury or disability, or death of a member of the uniformed services, except that any retired pay excluded under this subsection shall include retired pay paid under chapter 61 of title 10 only to the extent that such retired pay exceeds the amount of retired pay to which the debtor would otherwise be entitled under any provision of title 10 other than chapter 61 of that title.”.

SEC. 3. 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 in accordance with 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The overriding principle of the bankruptcy system is to give people who are overwhelmed with unmanageable debt a fresh start through meaningful financial relief.

The Bankruptcy Code, either directly or indirectly, affects millions of Americans and many types of businesses, from large to small.

The system is supposed to work for everyone, from consumer debtors and small business owners, to family farmers, servicemembers, and veterans, and give them a new pathway to economic prosperity. But as we have heard during a recent oversight hearing held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, the bankruptcy system is not working.

In the context of these concerns, the House Judiciary Committee unanimously passed four bipartisan pieces of legislation to address this concern. These include H.R. 2938, the Honoring American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019, or the HAVEN Act. This legislation, which has been championed by my colleague on the committee, Congresswoman Lucy McBath, addresses a fundamental unfairness in current bankruptcy law that affects veterans receiving disability benefits.

Although Social Security benefits are not treated as income for purposes of the Bankruptcy Code’s means test, veterans’ disability benefits do constitute income under this test, even though, much like Social Security, these benefits are a lifeline to many of its recipients and are otherwise protected from seizure by creditors.

By counting such benefits as income, many veterans become ineligible for debt relief when the court determines that the debtor is subject to Chapter 7 bankruptcy. This is a problem with the Bankruptcy Code’s means test, which requires the court to look at a debtor’s income at a point in time, rather than over a period of time.

By counting such benefits as income, many veterans become ineligible for debt relief when the court determines that the debtor is subject to Chapter 7 bankruptcy. This is a problem with the Bankruptcy Code’s means test, which requires the court to look at a debtor’s income at a point in time, rather than over a period of time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the HAVEN Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the HAVEN Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2938, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3304) to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3304

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 “National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF AMENDMENT.

Section 4(b) of the National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–438; 122 Stat. 5000) is amended by striking “4-year” and inserting “15-year”.

SEC. 3. 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 in accordance with 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under current law, National Guard members and reservists who serve on active duty are, like other active-duty servicemembers, exempt from the Bankruptcy Code’s means test, which determines whether a debtor’s income is too high to have all of his or her debts erased in bankruptcy.

Unless otherwise exempted, servicemembers and veterans must complete the required forms and submit the specified paperwork to satisfy the Bankruptcy Code’s means test.

This requirement even applies to servicemembers who have returned to the United States from active service and, thus, no longer receive combat pay. Under the means test, a servicemember must calculate his or her income based on the average monthly income that he or she received during the six months preceding the filing date of the bankruptcy case, rather than the debtor’s income, which may be less because of the debtor’s noncombat status.

H.R. 3304, the National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019 responds to this concern. This legislation would extend for 1 year the temporary authorization exempting certain qualifying reserve component members of the Armed Services and National Guard members from the Bankruptcy Code’s means test.

This critical protection for National Guard members and reservists must be extended before it expires at the end of the year. H.R. 3304 was unanimously passed out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the bill and I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Cicilline) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Cohen), the sponsor, for his support of this important legislation which would provide National Guard members, Armed Services reservists, and their families continued flexibility to qualify for greater debt relief in bankruptcy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Cohen), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill for reservists and National Guardsmen who protect our country in times of war. We are in the longest war of our Nation’s history.

The bankruptcy bill of 2005 was a bad bill that made it more difficult for people to claim bankruptcy; hurt guardsmen and reservists whose bases are oftentimes surrounded by payday lenders, and they become subject to large loans at high interest rates while in service, having to even file bankruptcy, let alone, respond to debts that they incur on behalf of the American people.

But I want to thank Mr. Cline, a great American, and supporter of reservists and people serving our country, our National Guard and reservists. For being a cosponsor, Representative Madeleine Dean of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Burchee, an outstanding Member of Congress for joining me in reintroducing this bill.

I would like to thank all the National Guard and reservists who protect us, both here and abroad.

I ask for an unanimous passage.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Cohen), the sponsor of the bill, H.R. 3304, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

SMALL BUSINESS REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3311) to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the resolution follows:

H.R. 3311

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 “Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. REORGANIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEBTORS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—SMALL BUSINESS DEBTOR REORGANIZATION

§ 1181. Applicability of other sections

(a) In General.—Sections 101(1), 109(d), 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1115, 1116, 1121, 1123(a)(8), 1123(c), 1127, 1129(a)(15), 1129(b), 1129(c), 1129(e), and 1141(d)(5) of this title do not apply in a case under this subchapter.

(b) COURT AUTHORITY.—Unless the court for cause orders otherwise, paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 1102(a) and sections 1102(b), 1105, and 1129(c) of this title do not apply in a case under this subchapter.

(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR DISCHARGE.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, subsection 1141(d) of this title shall not apply, except as provided in section 1192 of this title.

“§ 1182. Definitions

(a) The term ‘debtor’—The term ‘debtor’ means a small business debtor.

(b) DEBTOR IN POSSESSION.—The term ‘debtor in possession’ means the debtor, unless removed as debtor in possession under section 1186(a) of this title.

“§ 1183. Trustee

(a) In General.—If the United States trustee has appointed an individual under section 586(b) of title 28 to serve as standing trustee in cases under this subchapter, and if such individual qualifies as a trustee under section 324 of this title, that individual shall serve as trustee in any case under this subchapter.

(b) DUTIES.—The trustee shall—

(1) perform the duties specified in paragraphs (2), (5), (6), (7), and (9) of section 704(a) of this title;

(2) perform the duties specified in paragraphs (3), (4), and (7) of section 1106(a) of this title, if the court, for cause and on request of a party in interest, the trustee, or the United States trustee, so orders;

(3) appear and be heard at the status conference under section 1188 of this title and any hearing that concerns—

(A) the value of property subject to a lien;

(B) confirmation of a plan filed under this subchapter;

(C) modification of the plan after confirmation; or

(D) the sale of property of the estate;

(4) ensure that the debtor commences making timely payments required by a plan confirmed under this subchapter;

(5) if the debtor ceases to be a debtor in possession, perform the duties specified in section 704(a) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (6) of section 1106(a) of this title, including operating the business of the debtor;

(6) if there is a claim for a domestic support obligation with respect to the debtor, perform the duties specified in section 704(c) of this title; and

(7) facilitate the development of a consensual plan of reorganization.

(c) TERMINATION OF TRUSTEE SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the plan of the debtor is confirmed under section 1191(a) of this title, the service of the trustee in the case shall terminate when the plan has been substantially consummated, except that the United States trustee may reject a trustee as needed for performance of duties under subsection (b)(v)(C) of this section and section 1185(a) of this title.

(2) SERVICE OF NOTICE OF SUBSTANTIAL CONSUMMATION.—Not later than 14 days after the plan of the debtor is substantially consummated, the debtor shall file with the court and serve on the trustee, the United States trustee, and all parties in interest notice of such substantial consummation.

“§ 1184. Rights and powers of a debtor in possession

(a) In General.—On request of a party in interest, and after notice and a hearing, the court shall order that the debtor shall not be
(b) RESTATEMENT.—On request of a party in interest, and after notice and a hearing, the court may restate the debtor in possession.

§ 1186. Property of the estate

(a) INCLUSIONS.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1111(b) of this title, property of the estate includes, in addition to the property specified in section 541 of this title—

"(1) all property of the kind specified in that section that the debtor acquires after the date of commencement of the case but before the case is closed, dismissed, or converted to a case under chapter 7, 12, or 13 of this title, whichever occurs first; and

"(2) earnings from services performed by the debtor after the date of commencement of the case but before the case is closed, dismissed, or converted to a case under chapter 7, 12, or 13 of this title, whichever occurs first.

(b) DEBTOR REMAINING IN POSSESSION.—Except as provided in section 1185 of this title, a plan confirmed under this subchapter, or an order confirming a plan under this subchapter to the debtor after the date of commencement of the case but before the case is closed, dismissed, or converted to a case under chapter 7, 12, or 13 of this title, whichever occurs first.

§ 1187. Duties and reporting requirements of debtors

(a) FILING REQUIREMENTS.—Upon electing to be a debtor under this subchapter, the debtor shall file the documents required by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1116(1) of this title.

(b) FILING DEADLINES.—A debtor, in addition to the duties provided in this section and as otherwise required by law, shall comply with the requirements of section 301 and paragraphs (2), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of section 1116 of this title.

(c) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT EXCEPTION.—If the court orders under section 1111(b) of this title that section 1125 of this title applies, section 1125(f) of this title shall apply.

§ 1188. Status conference

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), not later than 60 days after the entry of the order for relief under this chapter, the court shall hold a status conference to further the expedient and economic resolution of a case under this subchapter.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The court may extend the period of time for holding a status conference under subsection (a) if the need for an extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 14 days before the date of the status conference under subsection (a), the debtor shall file with the court a statement of the trustee and all parties in interest a report that details the efforts the debtor has undertaken and will undertake to attain a consensual plan of reorganization.

§ 1189. Filing of the plan

(a) WHO MAY FILE A PLAN.—Only the debtor may file a plan under this subchapter.

(b) DEADLINE.—The debtor shall file a plan under section 1111(b) of this title not later than 90 days after the entry for relief under this chapter, except that the court may extend the period if the need for the extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable.

§ 1190. Contents of plan

A plan filed under this subchapter—

"(1) shall include—

"(A) a brief history of the business operations of the debtor;

"(B) a liquidation analysis; and

"(C) a projection of the ability of the debtor to make payments under the proposed plan of reorganization;

"(2) shall provide for the submission of all or such of the earnings of the debtor or any other future income of the debtor to the supervision and control of the trustee as is necessary for the execution of the plan; and

"(3) notwithstanding section 506 of this title, may modify the rights of the holder of a claim secured only by a security interest in real or personal property of the debtor if the new value received in connection with the granting of the security interest was—

"(A) not used primarily to acquire the real property; and

"(B) used primarily in connection with the small business of the debtor.

§ 1191. Confirmation of plan

(A) the plan provides that all of the projected disposable income of the debtor to be received in the 3-year period, or such longer period not to exceed 5 years as the court may fix, beginning on the first distribution date, shall be applied to payments under the plan; or

(B) the value of the property to be distributed under the plan is less, within the time fixed by the court, such portion of the future earnings or other future income of the debtor that is reasonably necessary for the support and reorganization of the debtor and that is not reasonably necessary to be expended—

"(1) for—

"(A) the maintenance or support of the debtor or a dependent of the debtor; or

"(B) a domestic support obligation that first becomes payable after the date of the filing of the petition; or

"(2) for the benefit of creditors to the extent necessary for the continuation, preservation, or operation of the business of the debtor.

"(c) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding section 1129(a)(9)(A) of this title, a plan that provides for the payment of the plan through the plan of a claim of a kind specified in paragraph (2) of section 506 of this title, does not exceed 5 years as the court may fix, unless the court approves a written waiver of discharge executed by the debtor after the order for relief under this chapter, or after the date on which the debtor a discharge of all debts provided in section 1141(d)(1)(A) of this title, and all other debts allowed under section 503 of this title and provided for in the plan, except any debt—

"(1) on which the last payment is due after the first 3 years of the plan, or such other time not to exceed 5 years fixed by the court; or

"(2) of the kind specified in section 523(a) of this title.

§ 1192. Modification of plan

(a) MODIFICATION BEFORE CONFIRMATION.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1123 of this title, the debtor may modify the plan at any time after confirmation of the plan and before substantial consummation of the plan, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of sections 1122 and 1123 of this title, with the exception of subsection (a)(8) of section 1123. After the modification is filed with the court, the plan as modified becomes the plan.

(b) MODIFICATION AFTER CONFIRMATION.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1123 of this title, the debtor may modify the plan at any time after confirmation of the plan and before substantial consummation of the plan, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of sections 1122 and 1123 of this title, with the exception of subsection (a)(8) of section 1123. The plan, as modified under this subsection, becomes the plan only if circumstances warrant such modification and the court, after notice and a hearing, confirms the plan as modified under section 1191(a) of this title.

(c) CERTAIN OTHER MODIFICATIONS.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1123(a) of this title, the debtor may modify the plan at any time within 3 years, or such longer time not to exceed 5 years, as fixed by the court, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of section 1141(b) of this title.

The plan as modified under this subsection becomes the plan only if circumstances warrant such modification and the court, after notice and a hearing, confirms the plan as modified under section 1191(b) of this title.

(d) HOLDERS OF A CLAIM OR INTEREST.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1191(a) of this title, any holder of a claim or interest that has accepted or rejected the plan is deemed to have accepted or rejected, as the case may be, the plan as modified, unless, within the time fixed by the court, such holder changes the previous acceptance or rejection of the holder.

§ 1194. Payments in kind

(a) REORGANIZATION AND DISTRIBUTION BY TRUSTEE.—Payments and funds received by the trustee shall be retained by the trustee until confirmation or denial of confirmation of a plan. If a plan is confirmed, the trustee shall distribute any such payment in accordance with the plan. If a plan is not confirmed, the trustee shall retain any such payments to the extent provided for the payment of the plan.

(1) any unpaid claim allowed under section 503(b) of this title;
“(2) any payment made for the purpose of providing adequate protection of an interest in property due to the holder of a secured claim; and

“(3) any fee owing to the trustee.

“(b) OTHER PLAN.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, except as otherwise provided in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, the trustee shall make payments to creditors under the plan.

“(c) PAYMENTS PRIOR TO CONFIRMATION.—Prior to confirmation of a plan, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to make payments to the holder of a secured claim for the purpose of providing adequate protection of an interest in property due to the holder of a secured claim of less than $10,000 that arose prior to the commencement of the case.”.

“§ 1195. Transactions with professionals

“Notwithstanding section 327(a) of this title, a person is not disqualified for employment under section 327 of this title, by a debtor solely because that person holds a position under section 1125 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(SUBCHAPTER V—SMALL BUSINESS DEBTOR REORGANIZATION

“1191. Inapplicability of other sections.

“1192. Definitions.

“1193. Trustee.

“1194. Rights and powers of a debtor in possession.

“1195. Removal of debtor in possession.

“1196. Property of the estate.

“1197. Duties and reporting requirements of debtors.


“1199. Filing of the plan.

“1200. Contents of plan.


“1202. Discharge.

“1203. Modification of plan.

“1204. Payments.

“1205. Transactions with professionals.”.

SEC. 3. PREFERENCES; VENUE OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.

(a) PREFERENCES.—Section 547(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or the Small Business Administration only for the purposes of complying with the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010” after “as a result of the bankruptcy proceeding”.

(b) VENUE.—Section 1409(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or as a result of the bankruptcy proceeding” after “as a result of a civil action”.  

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TITLE 11.—Title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 101—

(A) in paragraph (51C), by inserting “and has not elected that subchapter V of chapter 11 of this title shall apply” after “is a small business debtor”; and

(B) in paragraph (51D)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(II) by striking “or operating real property or activities incidental thereto” and inserting “or active commercial or business activities of the debtor”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking the period at the end of and inserting a semicolon; and

(ii) by striking “does not include any member” and inserting the following: “does not include any member”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) any debtor that is a corporation subject to the reporting requirements under section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)); or

“(III) any other person that is a debtor solely because that person holds a position under subchapter V of chapter 11 that shall apply.”

(2) in section 521—

(A) in section 566—

(i) by striking “$10,000” and inserting “$25,000”; and

(ii) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 and” after “cases under”; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating subsections (i) through (iv) as sections (j) through (l), respectively; and

(ii) by adding after section (b) the following:

“(i) Subchapter V of chapter 11 of this title applies only in a case under chapter 11 in which a small business debtor elects that subchapter V of chapter 11 shall apply;”

“(ii) in section 322(a), by inserting “1191,” after “1163,”; and

“(iii) in section 326—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “, other than a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 after “7 or 11” and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “In a case”;

“(iv) in section 347—

(A) in paragraph (51C), by inserting “1194,” after “78o(d);”;

(B) in paragraph (51D)—

(i) by inserting “1194,” after “1193,”

(ii) in section 363(c)(1), by inserting “1193, 1194,” after “1104, 1108,”;

(iii) in section 349(a), by inserting “1193, 1194,” after “1102, 1104,”;

(iv) in section 352(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “1193,” after “1102,”; and

(v) in section 362(a), by inserting “1194,” after “1104,”;

“(v) in section 363(c)(1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “In a case”; and

“(vii) in section 547(b), by striking “$10,000” and inserting “$25,000”.

This gap in the Bankruptcy Code is of particular concern because of the important role small-business debtors play in our economy. The Small Business Administration, only about 20 percent of small businesses survive after their first year. It is essential that our bankruptcy system does not punish entrepreneurship and investment by foreclosing opportunities for small businesses to financially reorganize. This gap in the Bankruptcy Code is primarily due to the fact that this process was designed with large, complex corporations in mind, and does not include adequate protections or safeguards for small businesses.

H.R. 3311 addresses this shortcoming by requiring the appointment of a
voting for the bill, and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows: S. 504

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 “Let Everyone Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service Act.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

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

(1) Since the end of World War II, the Federal Government has designated specific periods of war, the dates of which are important for qualification for certain benefits or membership in veterans organizations established by Congress.

(2) In between those recognized periods of war, during so-called peacetime eras, the United States military has been involved in not fewer than 12 non-combat deaths, which are unrecognized by the United States Government as periods of war, resulting in numerous United States personnel combat casualties.

(3) Those 12 unrecognized war eras occurred at the direction of the then President of the United States, with full knowledge and consent of the then Congress.

(4) The first 12 unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel was the Greek Civil War, fought in Greece from 1946 to 1949 between the army of the Government of the Republic of Greece and the Communist Party of Greece.

(5) During the Greek Civil War, one member of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed his life in service to the United States, and five others suffered non-combat deaths.

(6) The second of those unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel was the Chinese Civil War, fought in China from 1946 to 1949 between the Government of the Republic of China and the Communist Party of China.

(7) During the Chinese Civil War, the United States military personnel, trained and transported, and supplied the Kuomintang Government of the Republic of China with approximately $1,430,000,000 in its resistance to the Communist Party of China.

(8) During the Chinese Civil War, 14 members of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, and 15 others lost their lives in the war, and 51 were wounded, resulting in 215 United States military casualties.

(9) The third unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel is known as the Cold War.

(10) The Cold War was a period spanning from approximately 1947 until 1991 when the Soviet Union collapsed.

(11) Although no direct large-scale military fighting occurred, military personnel of the United States and the Soviet Union, active United States military personnel served in multiple regional conflicts during the Cold War, resulting in the deaths of not fewer than 32 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and not fewer than 22 other casualties.

(12) The fourth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel is known as the China Cold War.

(13) The China Cold War started when the Kuomintang-led Government of the Republic of China retreated to the island of Taiwan and lasted until 1972, after President Richard Nixon conducted a landmark state visit to China.

(14) During the military operations of the China Cold War, not fewer than 16 members of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed their lives in service to the United States.

(15) The fifth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Lebanon Crisis of 1961, which involved more than 14,000 United States personnel and resulted in the death of one member of the Armed Forces who sacrificed his life in service to the United States and five non-combat deaths.

(16) The sixth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961.

(17) The Bay of Pigs invasion was a failed military invasion of Cuba undertaken by a United States military group sponsored by the Central Intelligence Agency that resulted in not fewer than one death of a member of the Armed Forces who sacrificed his life in service to the United States and 19 non-combat deaths.

(18) The seventh unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Cuban Missile Crisis, which took place between October 16 and October 28, 1962.

(19) The Cuban Missile Crisis directly relates to homeland protection against the deployment of a Soviet ballistic missile in Cuba.

(20) During the Cuban Missile Crisis, one member of the Armed Forces who sacrificed his life in service to the United States and 19 others died as non-combatants.

(21) The eighth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Dominican Civil War in 1965.

(22) Operations during the Dominican Civil War resulted in the deaths of 27 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, 20 non-combat-related deaths, and 283 wounded.

(23) The ninth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Iran Hostage Crisis, which lasted from November 4, 1979, through January 20, 1981.

(24) During the Iran Hostage Crisis involved military intervention by the United States which resulted in the deaths of 8 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States.

(25) The tenth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Salvadoran Civil War.

(26) The Salvadoran Civil War lasted more than 12 years, through the terms of two Presidential administrations of the United States, and resulted in the deaths of 22 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, 15 non-combat deaths, and 35 other casualties.
The 11th unrecognized war era involving active United States军事 personnel started on April 5, 1986, when the La Belle discotheque in West Berlin, Germany, was bombed, killing 168 American military personnel and wounding 79 other members of the Armed Forces, which triggered what became known as the Libyan Conflict.

The Libyan Conflict led to the 12th unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel, known collectively as the Persian Gulf Conflicts, which lasted from July 24, 1987, through September 26, 1990.

The Persian Gulf Conflicts involved United States military missions to protect Kuwaiti-owned oil tankers which represented the largest United States naval convoy operation since World War II.

The Persian Gulf Conflicts resulted in numerous military operations and the deaths of nearly 2,000 United States military personnel who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and 31 wounded.

Since January 1, 1947, through all of the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel, not fewer than 778 combat and non-combat members of the Armed Forces have sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and not fewer than 797 have been wounded.

Since January 1, 1947, the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel who served on active duty during each of the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel.

The American Legion has grown to become the largest United States veterans organization, with more than 2 million members around the world. The organization, with more than 2 million members around the world, is headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has 13,000 offices, including one in every State, advocating to State and Federal officials.

The American Legion provides invaluable services to its members and supports the community of veterans who sacrificed in service to the United States.

Membership in The American Legion allows veterans to engage in public service activities, such as supporting Boys and Girls Clubs of America, youth mentorship programs, and benefit assistance, career fairs, and employment assistance for veterans.

The American Legion has gone on record many times supporting war eras involving active United States military personnel since the beginning of World War II.

The American Legion has aided, assisted, and comforted the families of the men and women who were called to serve or volunteered to serve during all of the unrecognized war eras and continues to provide support to veterans of those eras.

The American Legion has also been active during the Korean War on January 31, 1955, nearly 100 active United States military personnel have sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and South Korea, and more than 332 people of the United States have been wounded in-country.
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Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support of this process, and, once again, I ask for their support of this legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was asked; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELENE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order: Motions to suspend the rules and Agree to H. Res. 246; Pass H.R. 549; and Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 246) opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 17, answered “present” 5, not voting 12, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 154, not voting 10, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3304) to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken electronically, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 1, to nay 418.
The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 397, REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEmployER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019: PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3239, HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH INHABITABILITY AND BOUNDARY PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT: PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 29, 2019, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. TORRES of California, from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged resolution (Rept. No. 116-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

The Speaker pro tempore. 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.

Ms. CHENEY, Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker and majority leader to immediately schedule this bill to protect babies born alive and to stop blocking this most basic responsibility we have.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentrwoman is not recognized for debate.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF BOEING 737 MAX ACCIDENT VICTIMS

(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, I rise today to extend my sincere condolences to the families who lost loved ones in the Boeing 737 MAX tragedies. One life lost in any accident is one too many, and Congress has a duty to take steps to ensure that future tragedies do not occur.

Last week Mr. Paul Njoroje and Mr. Michael Stumo, who lost loved ones in this tragedy testified before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on how they believe aviation safety can be improved. I commend them for having the courage to testify before the committee under such difficult circumstances.

I personally met with Mr. Stumo and his wife, Nadia, who lost their daughter, Samya, in the Ethiopian Airlines tragedy. I cannot begin to imagine the grief they are experiencing. As a father of three, it terrifies me to think of harm coming to my children, and I would do anything to prevent it.

Madam Speaker, I am committed to a thorough investigation of the 737 MAX airplane to ensure it is safe before airlines resume commercial flights.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO

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

Mr. BAIRD, Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Apollo 11 and the triumph of the human spirit. On July 16, 1969, three Americans boarded a rocket at Kennedy Space Center on Merritt Island, Florida. When they lifted off a few hours later with a flight path toward the unthinkable, humanity was changed forever. Millions of men, women, and children were inspired watching the extraordinary events unfold over the next 4 days as humanity took these first steps on the Moon.

Fellow Purdue University alumnus Neil Armstrong’s words: “That is one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind” will forever define that moment in history. The successful journey to the Moon brought with it a tremendous sense of triumph and pride. Our Nation found a bold, common goal that we reached through American ingenuity and determination.

This is the spirit that carries us forward in exploration and innovation today. Right now we are looking at returning to the Moon within the next 5 years and eventually landing on Mars. Madam Speaker, what has been previously unheard of is now being thrusted into the scope of reality.

It is our responsibility to keep taking giant leaps to challenge what is perceived as impossible, and I look forward to the next chapter of America's space exploration.

RETIRES HAVE EARNED THEIR PENSIONS

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

Ms. KAPTUR, Madam Speaker, this week marks a heroic milestone for millions of America’s retirees as the House...
finally considers the Butch Lewis Act. This bill moves America one step closer to restoring its broken pension promises to 1,300,000 pensioners across our Nation.

Today I met with another 50 retirees from trucking firms, candy manufacturers, miners, and others in Ohio whose futures are at risk in their golden years. Their top concern is economic security.

I heard the stresses they have endured since receiving letters threatening pension cuts of up to 70 percent of their earned pensions. Worry between family members, increased suicides amongst pensioner friends, anxiety, and growing health concerns. This isn’t the retirement hardworking Americans earned.

Valerie Shapler, a retired Roadway Express truck driver, is suffering from brain cancer. She is fighting for her life daily, and why should she have to worry about the pension cuts that she earned?

Vicki Bailey, a widow of a trucker, raised their family but already struggles to survive on her spousal benefits that truncates half with her husband’s passing, and she has her own health issues to worry about.

Jim Baumgartner asked for a prayer.

How can Congress ignore the pleas of millions of hardworking Americans? Pensions have afforded millions of retired middle-class people some economic security in their retirement years. Please let our colleagues join us in broad bipartisan passage of the Butch Lewis Act tomorrow.

HONORING DR. DAKEYAN CHA DRE GRAHAM AS FLORIDA’S 2020 TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Dakeyan Graham for being selected as Florida’s Teacher of the Year. He was chosen out of more than 176,000 teachers to receive Florida’s highest award for public educators.

Known affectionately by his students as Dr. Dre, he has long been driven by his love for teaching and encouraging the word of God. It was an honor to know Pastor Rogers and just to know the legacy that he has left behind in our community. My heartfelt condolences to his family. We thank you for sharing Pastor Rogers with us in the Fort Worth community for so long.

RECOGNIZING ED LOMASNEY OF THE BURTCVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ed Lomasney for his 60 years of dedicated service to the Burtchville, Michigan, fire department.

Mr. Lomasney became a firefighter following in the footsteps of his father, who helped found the Burtchville Fire Department. Over the last 60 years, Ed has served as a volunteer firefighter and has been instrumental in growing the firehouse through his time, resources, and mentorship.

In addition to volunteering with the fire department, Ed worked and retired from DTE Energy. He is a devoted husband to Mary Nell, and loving father to their three children.

For six decades, Ed has been a mainstay of the department, and he will be missed by all. Although Ed may be retiring from the fire department, we all know he will remain involved in the community to make an impact on all of Burtchville.

Madam Speaker, I join the Burtchville community in thanking him for his dedication and his 60 years of service and wish him the best in his retirement.

MISS NEW JERSEY 2019

(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, a few weeks ago, 28 young, impressive women shared their talents in the Miss New Jersey competition. The competition has been around for almost 100 years and since that time has evolved into a fantastic celebration of some of the best young individuals in south Jersey.

The Miss New Jersey competition was the first to offer a talent category, and this past year the competition focused even more on aptitude and intelligence over outward appearance. This year the candidates were able to emphasize their individual styles and their individual passions, and all of the young women spoke about different social impact initiatives that mattered greatly to them.

One of my wonderful spring interns, Alyssa Rodriguez, placed in the top 11 with her platform of social media awareness. She made south Jersey so very proud. Miss Jade Glab of Belmar, New Jersey, was crowned Miss New Jersey with her platform of healthy children, strong America.

We are proud of all the contestants and the intellect and the compassion they bring to all of their communities, and I am most proud of our contestants from south Jersey.

WAYCROSS AREA COMMUNITY THEATER

(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 the Waycross Area Community Theater for its work to support local theater while preserving historical structures in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Using local talent to provide live family friendly musicals, this community theater is truly a gem.

Since 1913, theater has played a large role in the social scene of Waycross, with the Ritz Theater hosting operas there. Noted as one of Georgia’s “finest theater” structures, the Ritz Theater transitioned over time into showing only movies and then, finally, going dormant.

Now, the Waycross Area Community Theater maintains the historic art
deco-style theater with its live productions, and their work has not gone unnoticed. Aside from the crowded audiences, the Fox Theater has awarded grants to the Community Theater over the last 2 years to help preserve the historic Richmond Theater.

Thank you to all who perform shows, attend musicals, and preserve the wonderful theater culture in Waycross, Georgia.

FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3800, the Educational Opportunities and Success Act, the bill introduced last week by my colleague Representative WARREN DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3800 seeks to address a common, yet preventable, issue impacting students from low-income families and first-generation college students. In recent years, applicants to the Department of Education’s Upward Bound program found themselves stuck in financial limbo when their grant applications were rejected due to clerical errors, some errors as insignificant as using the wrong font.

This is unacceptable. I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 3800, a bill that reauthorizes the TRIO programs for 5 additional years.

I am also proud to work with my colleagues across the aisle to support this commonsense legislation that eases the administrative burdens during the application process.

TRIO programs like Upward Bound are critical in ensuring disadvantaged students have a shot at turning the dream of a college education into a reality, and H.R. 3800 has my full support.

CONSENSUS RULE SUBVERTED

(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, Madam Speaker, it has now been 6 legislative days since H.R. 553, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act, was denied a standalone vote.

Democrat leadership subverted their own rules and prevented a vote on this bipartisan legislation, which now has 371 cosponsors, over 86 percent of the Members of the Congress.

Under new rules in this Congress, H.R. 553 qualified for the Consensus Rule, which provides for bills to receive a standalone vote. An article published in The Hill stated today: “The new rule keeps top House leaders from squelching any bill that has at least 290 cosponsors, or two-thirds of the House membership.”

Sadly, the Democrats did just that. They targeted and removed H.R. 553 from the Consensus Calendar.

Democrat leadership should bring this bill to the floor. The time is now to give these rightly deserved benefits to the surviving spouses of service-members and finally end the widow’s tax.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO GARY JOHN ALEKNAVIICH ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. SOTO, Madam Speaker, tonight, I would like to honor Gary John Aleknavich and congratulate him on his upcoming retirement.

Gary John Aleknavich is a U.S. Navy veteran, labor leader, maintenance foreman, journeyman mechanic, and certified welder. He has received a certificate of achievement for completing courses at the Florida International University Center for Labor Research and Studies.

After serving in the U.S. Navy from 1976 to 1979, Gary was hired by Florida Power and Light, and then went on to become an apprenticeship mechanic at the Florida Port Everglades Power Plant. In 1984, he became a journeyman mechanic at the St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, and later became a mechanical certified welder and a nuclear maintenance foreman.

He has held various positions within his local union of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, including treasurer, executive board member, job steward, System Council U-4 delegate, and national convention committee delegate, and served as the Florida Electrical Worker Association’s vice president and executive board member.

Gary has been a member of IBEW since 1980 and even started the process to establish and train IBEW officers and members in the IBEW Code of Excellence training program. He soon became System Council U-4, assistant business manager of IBEW System Council U-4, and was later elected to serve as business manager in 2005, where he ran unopposed for four additional 3-year terms and will retire next month.

There is no question that Gary John Aleknavich has been a leader in his community and a public servant, and one of labor’s strongest members.

Madam Speaker, for that, we thank him.

34TH ANNUAL PARK AND RECREATION MONTH

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

Mr. WESTERMAN, Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate our Nation’s parks.

This July marks the 34th annual Park and Recreation Month, a celebration highlighting the incredible opportunities and benefits that park and recreation agencies provide to their communities.

I, like many Arkansans, grew up enjoying everything that the Natural State has to offer. From hiking and hunting in its forests, to swimming, fishing, and boating on its crystal-clear lakes and rivers, outdoor recreation is an essential part of life for the families of my State. Some of my favorite memories of life were made in the beautiful outdoors of Arkansas, and I am blessed to still be making similar memories today.

Our park and recreation agencies are an important part of our history and offer much to the quality of our future. Theodore Roosevelt once said: “It is an incalculable added pleasure to anyone’s sum of happiness if he or she grows to know, even slightly and imperfectly, how to read and enjoy the wonder-book of nature.”

As a forester and lifelong lover of nature, the wonder-book of nature has always been fascinating to me, and I hope to motivate people to get out and enjoy the natural beauty around them.

In the words of the fictional sitcom character Leslie Knope, “America is awesome.” I encourage everyone to go outside with friends and family to enjoy all the awesomeness our parks have to offer.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALLEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ON BEING NAMED THE DISTRICT OF DISTINCTION

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

Mr. TAYLOR, Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Allen Independent School District for being named a District of Distinction by District Administration Magazine.

Allen ISD serves thousands of students grades K through 12 in a rapidly growing community. In an effort to meeting growing need for quality, Allen ISD launched a STEAM Center to provide a unique learning environment to help foster an interest in STEAM amongst students. The brand-new facility offers students hands-on learning experiences ranging from indoor robotics labs to outdoor discovery gardens.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me today in congratulating Allen ISD, their staff, parents, and students for being named District of Distinction and commend them on their dedication to cultivating a passion in students for learning more about science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics.
DELEGITIMIZING THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND OPPOSING THE BDS MOVEMENT

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

Mr. LaMalfa. Madam Speaker, tonight we voted on a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and oppose the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, BDS, Movement targeting Israel.

I am a cosponsor of this resolution, but the House should also be weighing on whether to condemn these efforts to undermine one of our strongest allies, like the Senate did when they passed a bill to authorize State or local governments to divest assets from entities deploying BDS against Israel.

But, unfortunately, Democrat leadership refuses to let us vote on this bill in the House for fear of fractures within their own party. Just last week, one of their Members actually introduced legislation that supports this hate-fueled BDS movement, even drawing disgraceful comparisons between boycotting Israel now and boycotting Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 1940s.

Let's not forget that the United States and Israel have a long history of working together to achieve stability in the Middle East, the inventions they working together to achieve stability, the progress the United States and Israel have made in the last decades, progress that they have made to improve the lives of their people.

And we need to remember that the United States and Israel have a long history of working together to achieve stability in the Middle East, the inventions they have worked on together, and they remain one of our strongest and most loyal allies today.

Our actions in this Chamber need to unequivocally support that relationship and the lone beacon of freely elected government that is Israel in the Middle East.

As Golda Meir put it:

We will only have peace when they love their children more than they hate us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Wexton). The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to H. Res. 497, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of William P. Barr and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., to produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. Garamendi) is recognized for 6 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. Garamendi. Madam Speaker, given all of the talk that is going on and the investigations and questions about deficits and the like, I thought it would be useful today to start this discussion, which I will spend most of the evening talking about American manufacturing, but I often want to start these discussions with some sense of value: What is our goal? What are we trying to accomplish here?

I keep going back to FDR. At the height of the Great Depression, he said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

And so, last week, the House of Representatives—the Democrats, that is, and maybe just a few Republicans—voted to increase the minimum wage across this country. Over the next 5 years, the minimum wage would rise from, I guess, just over $7 an hour to $15 dollars an hour—not a jump immediately, but over time increase it.

Why do we do that? Well, we are for the people.

That is our goal: for the people; and keeping in mind what FDR said: It is not about whether we add more to those who have much, but, rather, what we do for those who have little.

And so this is so we could have a minimum wage. Why? Because those people who are making $7 an hour across this Nation, they have very, very little, in fact, so little that they cannot have both food and shelter.

And, of course, we talk about healthcare and our goal to expand healthcare to every American so they have insurance, so that the worrying about how they would be paying for their hospital visit or their doctor is set aside and they are able to get the care that they need to lead a healthy and productive life.

That is our goal. We are for the people, and we are going to address this in so many, many ways.

One of the ways that we want to address it is to make sure that America remains a strong manufacturing country.

Many, many years ago in California, I was looking at how to keep the California economy going, and we hit upon the five keys for a successful economy: First of all, a great education system so that your workers are well educated and can handle the questions of the day and the tasks of tomorrow;

Secondly, that there be strong research, and, from that research, you build tomorrow's things. Sometimes that is an app. Sometimes it is a computer. Sometimes it is a ship or perhaps a car, an autonomous vehicle, a drone, whatever, so that your research then moves on into things that you make, and, that is, the manufacturing. That is the creation of wealth.

Some time ago, I was visiting one of the wineries in my district in California, and I was talking about this Make It In America Agenda in manufacturing. And, finally, the owner got up from behind the desk, and he said: Come. I want to talk to that, over the fence. We walked out there and out to his winery, and he said: You know what this is?

I said: Yeah. It is a winery.

He said: No. This is a manufacturing facility. I take grapes, and I turn them into one of the finest wines in the world. So, when you talk about Make It In America, guess what I am making it in America. It includes all of these things, putting a tomato into a can, into a bottle of ketchup. But what we are going to talk about tonight is something far more than that.

I want to really not so much talk about these gentlemen and ladies, but to use them as an example of what America used to make. These gentlemen, three of them, are World War II merchant mariners.

This is an effort we have now under way to provide these mariners, who had the highest death rate of any unit in the armed services during World War II, a Congressional Gold Medal. We now have nearly 300 Members of this House who are signed on to that so that they will get a Congressional Gold Medal.

This is not about a Congressional gold medal; it is about what they were able to do.

America, during the World War II period, was the manufacturing center of the world. And we made ships—literally thousands and thousands of ships—that these gentlemen and so many like them sailed the oceans, provided the material, the personnel to fight that war.

When we met and took this picture, they asked me: Why is it that America doesn't build ships anymore?

I said: Oh, but we build naval ships; we build aircraft carriers; we build destroyers; we build many other kinds of naval ships.

They said: No, No. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about the ships that sail the high seas. Why doesn't America make those ships?

And I said: We can. We can if we write the laws in the proper way to encourage the shipbuilding industry and, just as important, the cargo to go on those ships.

Now, it happens that America is in the midst of a great energy revolution—the green energy, no doubt about it. We are talking about every kind of green energy, from wind to solar, biofuel and biomass, and on and on. And we are doing that.

But, simultaneously, America, over the last decade, has become a major developer and supplier of petroleum products: oil, as a result of fracking in the Bakken area and Texas, California, onshore, offshore. We are a major oil producer.

And simultaneously, we are also a major producer of natural gas. All of these energy supplies, whether they are the green energy or the petroleum energy, are a strategic national asset.

And, as these gentlemen told me: Our ships, during World War II, were a strategic national asset. We had oil tankers, we had cargo vessels, all of them built in America and with American mariners.
We, the mariners, were a strategic asset. And a lot of us died. Our ships were a strategic asset, and the oil that we sent around the world was also a strategic asset.

So, where are we today? Are we making ships? No. We are not. But we could be.

So, this last week, Senator ROGER WICKER—my colleague in the Senate, a Republican from the Gulf Coast—and I introduced, for the second Congress, the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act, taking a strategic national asset, our petroleum and natural gas, and welding it together with the shipbuilding industry, which gives us the strategic ships that we need to move our military around the world and to provide the energy that they need.

So, the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act is now introduced in the Senate, for the second session, last year and again this time around with the new session of Congress.

What we will do is to address this problem: We could buy ships that are made in China, Japan, and Korea, or we can make them in America. If we make the ships in America, we will provide thousands of jobs, not only in the shipyards and the steel industry and the aluminum industry, but also the maritime suppliers, the men, the factories here in the United States that build the pumps, build the engines—the electrical engines, the big diesel engines—that are in these ships or the LNG engines that are in these ships, and all of the electronics.

That entire array of equipment that goes into a ship could be built in America if the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act were to become law.

So, how does it work? Pretty simple. It simply requires that our strategic national asset, the petroleum and the natural gas, be exported on American-built ships. As we ship with American mariners—not all of it, just a small percentage of it, 15 percent of the oil and 10 percent of the natural gas, which will be liquefied natural gas on American-built ships.

What does that mean? That means that American shipyards that are now producing zero commercial oil tankers and zero LNG carriers would, over the next 13 to 15 years, build upwards of 40 ships: 25 to 30 LNG tankers and 10 to 15 oil tankers.

Thousands of jobs would be created in American shipyards, and that strategic national asset, the shipyards themselves, would be able to continue to operate here in the United States. They would continue to be able to have the skills of the big vessels and simultaneously, be better prepared to compete for the U.S. naval ships, giving the American taxpayer a strategic advantage, more competition in the shipyards, more competition when it comes time to build our naval vessels.

There is another aspect of this that I want to bring to your attention. Beyond the shipbuilding and the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act, there is the rest of manufacturing here in the United States.

About 8 years ago, when I first came to Congress, we were looking at this issue based upon my time in California, and I decided, together with STENY HOYER, who is now our majority leader, that we should establish the Make It In America program. We have been working on this for 8 years now, and we are looking at different pieces of legislation. We, the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act was passed by Congress. We have been working on the shipbuilding industry, which gives us the strategic ships that we need to move our military around the world and to provide the energy that they need.

One of the ways we can do this—and we are not going to go into the President’s tariffs right now, but we are going to go at it in a little different way. Here is just an example of about what happened almost a decade ago.

In California, it was time to build the new San Francisco Bay Bridge. The bid went out, and the State of California went out to bid on this thing for the steel in the bridge.

At that time, a Chinese company decided that they wanted to enter the market. Very specialized steel in this bridge in the San Francisco area, so they wanted to enter this market, and they produced a bid that was 10 percent lower than an American steel company.

China got the bid. What did they get? Not only did they get the job, they got a new steel mill, one of the most advanced in the world, and they also had some over 3,000 jobs in China.

At the very same time, New York was building the Tappan Zee Bridge. They said, no, we are only going to buy American steel, and they did, total cost, $3.9 billion. In California, total cost, $3.9 billion over the estimated cost. Why? Because the Chinese steel had problems, the welds and other problems with the steel.

Not in New York. They came in and bid, and there were 7,700 American jobs in the steel industry and in the manufacturing and engineering—just an example today, but certainly current nearly a decade ago.

But this is what happens when our laws or our governments decide that we are going to make it in America, we are going to produce the steel, we are going to build the bridges here in the United States.

So, building on this idea, we have now introduced in both the Senate and the House another Make It In America piece of legislation that is authored in the Senate by Senator TAMMY BALDWIN and here in the House by me.

It basically says that all of this talk about infrastructure, which is critical, that that infrastructure, if it is an American taxpayer dollar that is being used to build that infrastructure—whether that is a power line or a highway or a sanitation system or a water system or an airport—it has great potential. It has great potential, but not so much for these mariners. They are all in their nineties right now. Hopefully, we will be able to get them a Congressional Gold Medal.

For tomorrow’s mariners, for those men and women who will be on ships that will supply the necessary material, oil, gas, or whatever for our military around the world, and will participate in the annual commerce of goods and services that are being transported in and out of America, that next generation of mariners will have the ships, the jobs, and the cargo.

For the People, once again, we are constantly looking for different laws, different ways in which we can advance the well-being of the American public. If it is healthcare, we are looking to lower costs. If it is education, we want to make sure that the cost of college education is affordable. If it has to do with making it possible to make that happen by requiring that your tax dollars be spent on America-made equipment, by requiring that a dollar is being used, that that infrastructure—the steel, the pipe, the electronics, the other elements that are in that infrastructure—that they be made in America.

So it is part of our Make It In America agenda that we have been working on over these years, and we are going to apply it wherever we see an opportunity. If it is in the steel industry for bridges and infrastructure, you bet. You bet, we are going to make sure that it is made in America.

Many of these laws already exist. A couple of years ago, we were able to raise the percentage of American content by a couple of percentage points to about, if I recall, about 65 percent on certain infrastructure projects. But we want to extend that beyond.

And why not go the whole way? Let’s make it all in America. If it is a taxpayer dollar, 100 percent American made. That is our goal. So our Make It in America agenda goes forward from here.

I am going to end with putting this one back up again because this has an opportunity to be a very, very important part. The steel in the ships, the pumps, the pipes, the electronics, the propellers, the drive shafts, the LNG engines—all those things—can be made in America if we have a national policy that simply says the export of a strategic national asset, oil and gas, that that be on American-built ships. Not all of it, 10 percent, 15 percent, 40 ships over the next 15 years. When the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act becomes law.
small percentage of the export of a precio-
cious national resource be on American-built ships with American sailors. I want all of us to keep in mind that there are things that public policy can do to improve the well-being of every American. Our For The People policy includes all of these elements, and we draw your attention to that.

I am looking to my colleagues for continued support on these two pieces of legislation that we will be working on in this session.

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

SUPPORT INCREASED DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, we are here tonight, as the House Energy Action Team, to discuss the numerous economic, national security, and environmental benefits of the American energy renaissance.

The HEAT team will never be supportive of policies that increase electricity prices for consumers, favor foreign producers over domestic, and deter the development and construction of energy infrastructure.

Due to policies that incentivize private investment and production, the United States has become the global leader in natural gas and oil producing, as well as refining. This has given us the ability to export energy to our friends, allies, and countries that want to import U.S. energy.

Energy Secretary Rick Perry recently said, “The United States is not just exporting energy. We are exporting freedom.” I couldn’t agree more.

There is no national security without energy security. We understand that in the Energy Action Team.

Looking at this graph, in 2018, U.S. crude oil production exceeded 11 million barrels per day, surpassing Russia as the world’s largest crude oil producer. The U.S. produced 12.16 million barrels per day of crude in April 2019.

I was just out in North Dakota, in the Bakken. I am amazed at the production going on in that little corner of the world. I say “little,” but the Bakken is huge. It is a tremendous resource for the Nation.

In fact, we are producing more oil and natural gas in the Bakken in North Dakota and Montana than they are in the country of Venezuela, which is known for its natural resources, known for its oil production. They are producing more in the Bakken.

Robust domestic energy production is essential to global leadership in the United States. According to the U.S. Energy Information Institute, natural gas and oil supplied about two-thirds of American energy used in 2016.

Oil and gas will continue to be a prominent source of energy. The Energy Information Institute estimates that fossil fuels will account for nearly 70 percent of the country’s energy used by 2050.

The goal should be to produce, develop, or make fossil fuels available in the United States. Our energy policy is one of innovation, not regulation. That should be the goal, private sector innovation, not the heavy boot of government telling the innovators what they should or should not do. The innovators are actually making things cleaner. We are producing a lot, and we are exporting a lot.

One thing I applaud President Trump for doing is challenging Chancellor Merkel and Germany to lessen their dependence on a foreign source of energy. In this case, not the Arab states, Saudi Arabia, or others, but lessen their dependence on Russia. A lot of Europe, Eastern Europe and Western Europe, get their energy from Russia, Gazprom and Rosneft, which support Vladimir Putin.

By lessening Europe’s dependence on Russia for their energy, Russia is no longer an influencer. It can’t turn the spigot on and off to influence political policy in Europe.

Let Europe find ways to meet its energy needs. It can do that looking west to the United States through our export of LNG, liquefied natural gas put on ships, sent to Europe, and off-loaded to provide the natural gas and energy security our allies overseas to lessen their dependence on Russia.

Exports of U.S. LNG are set to rise 72 percent this year, as compared to 2018. Russia is just a gas station masquerading as a country, but they are providing that natural gas to Europe. They use their leverage of influence, turning that spigot on and off to affect policy not only in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe. Those policies and those pipelines have to be built to provide that natural gas.

We need to provide that from this country. We have an abundance. We have an abundance of oil, too. We are now an exporter of oil.

If we look at what the U.S. energy sector has been able to do during this American energy renaissance, it will show that we are a leader in energy production and energy technology. We can help other countries around the globe to meet their energy needs with our technology as well.

Madam Speaker, we have a great group of House Energy Action Team members who want to talk about what is going on, maybe in their States, maybe things they know about in this Nation. I know Rick ALLAN wants to talk about nuclear power and what is going on in Georgia. I know BRUCE WESTERMAN wants to talk about what is going on in Arkansas. We have so many other great colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) to talk about what is going on in his part of the world.
Let’s look at transportation fuel. Some are in favor of doing away with all fossil fuels in transportation. What would that do to our environment?

If we look at global emissions across the world, the United States is responsible for 15 percent of carbon emissions throughout the world. If we look at that a little bit closer and break it down on transportation fuels, transportation fuels account for 27 percent of carbon emissions in the United States. Twenty-seven percent of 15 percent is only about 4 percent.

If we did away with all gasoline, all diesel fuels, got rid of all combustion engines, if we did away with jet fuel, with ships, if we took fossil fuels out of every form of transportation in the United States, it would wreak havoc on our economy. It would wreak havoc on our way of life. But it would reduce global carbon emissions only by around 4 percent.

There is a better, smarter way to do that. Let’s take the abundant energy that we have. Let’s apply our wonderful research facilities, the great minds and innovators that we have in America. We can figure out how to use all of our energy sources in a low-cost, clean way. We can all continue to experience a brighter future ahead.

I thank my colleague for hosting this time tonight where we can, hopefully, get some of the facts and common sense about energy out on the table.

Just remember, as low-cost and as clean as possible, that is a winning formula for American energy.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN). He was out in North Dakota with me. One thing we saw with natural gas and oil being produced out there, and the understanding of a need for infrastructure in this country, gas utilities the United States added over 730,000 miles of pipeline to serve almost 230 million more customers.

At the same time, methane emissions have fallen 70 percent, 75 percent, and CO₂ emissions from U.S. power systems are at their lowest level since 1985. Pipelines are the safest way to transport natural gas, but some parts of the country refuse to accept this reality.

For example, New England has moratoriums on natural gas extraction, and the inability to construct a pipeline caused an increase in electricity prices. These policies are just asinine and need to change.

Madam Speaker. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), a freshman Member of Congress and a leader on the House Energy Action Team. We will hear about what is going on in his great State of Oklahoma.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague as just yielding me a few minutes here to talk about the energy dominance in our country, and tonight we are celebrating American excellence and innovation in a field absolutely essential to the future of our country: energy.

There is a lot to be debated and argued on, but the crux of the matter is that energy independence—better yet, energy dominance—is the only pathway to a stable, fruitful, successful American economy.

We use energy every day. We power our homes, our offices, our cars, our phones, and our devices. All of this uses energy in a different way. Since energy is such a pervasive need in our society, it should be a top priority in Congress.

Completely cutting our energy sources like clean coal, which we have relied on for centuries, is simply not the answer. Making drastic, astronomical changes to our economy and way of life are simply not feasible, let alone rational.

My district is home to the oil and gas sector. One in five jobs in Oklahoma are supported by the oil and natural gas industry. Every new direct oil and gas job supports more than two additional jobs indirectly. The average Oklahoma oil and natural gas worker makes more than $94,000 per year.

Not only is Oklahoma’s energy sector a major job creator and economic stimulator, but it is also a nationwide leader in oil production and innovation in the industry.

In 2017, Oklahoma was the Nation’s sixth largest crude oil producing State. As of last year, we had five operational petroleum refineries with a combined daily processing capacity of over half a million barrels per day, accounting for almost 3 percent of the U.S. total. More than a dozen of the country’s 100 largest gas fields are located in Oklahoma.

These are things to be celebrated, not criticized. If you were to listen to some of our colleagues across the aisle, you would think oil and gas are the enemy. That is not the case at all. Oil and gas are the foundation to build on.

Renewable energy like wind and solar are great, and I agree that we need to continue investing in them and researching how to improve them, but they are not a replacement for oil and gas. The future of energy in our country is dependent on an all-of-the-above approach. All of these energy sources can and should work together to make America successful and energy dominant on the world stage.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on HEAT this year to find out energy solutions that play to our country’s strengths as well as incorporate the innovation that new technologies provide.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I tell you, in Oklahoma, they know energy. I think one of the first wells ever drilled in the United States of America was over in Oklahoma. And another place they know a lot about energy is down on the Gulf Coast in my adopted State of Louisiana.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) knows energy, and they have got a lot going on in The Pelican State. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for hosting this event tonight.

Madam Speaker, this is really important because it impacts every single American. Energy is one of those pervasive issues that, if you drive a car, if you ride in a taxi, if you take public transit. If you have a house or you have an apartment, you have to pay the energy bills. It affects every single one of us.

Madam Speaker, we have options before us. We can choose to go down this path of ignoring the energy abundance that the United States has; we can pivot in this direction of blindly seeking these lofty goals or ambitions without any technological basis, without any basis in infrastructure or reality; or we can move in a direction where we can produce American energy and we can produce it safely and we can produce it affordably.

Madam Speaker, let’s go down the paths of what these options look like.

If you look back in 2011, Madam Speaker, one half of the nation’s trade deficit, one half of it was attributable to us importing energy from other countries—one half. That means that we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars, hundreds of thousands of jobs, we are empowering them in countries like Iran, in countries like Venezuela and other Middle Eastern and African nations in many cases, Madam Speaker, that don’t share our values. They are taking those dollars and coming back and directly challenging American interests around the globe.

This doesn’t make sense. You don’t arm those who wish harm upon you. But that is what our energy policy was back in 2011. And so, the half of this Nation’s trade deficit attributable to us importing energy.

Now, more recently, Madam Speaker, you have seen folks who have come in and said: Hey, we want to migrate to no fossil fuels whatsoever. Think about it. If you were running a business and if your greatest asset was this abundance of American natural gas, of oil, of coal, think about if that is what your asset was and if you had the objective of achieving environmental sensitivities or this objective of reducing our emissions and providing more clean energy solutions, would you just go and say: Look, we are just going to ignore all these resources?

No. You would develop technologies on carbon capture and storage, on utilization to where you could take that resource and you could actually market it and make products from it or you could sequester it. That way you can continue to have a robust economy and you can continue to have affordable energy; you can continue to have American jobs without harming our economy.

H2320  CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE  July 23, 2019
Now, Madam Speaker, when you look at the option that some have chosen where they have chosen we are going on an aggressive renewable strategy, let’s look at the State of California where you have double or triple the cost of electricity as you have in my home State of Louisiana—double or triple.

On top of that, Madam Speaker, look at what the State of California has done. They have increased—increased—imports of oil from countries like Saudi Arabia and others, increased their dependence upon foreign energy, exporting jobs, exporting untold dollars to these other economies. It is fascinating.

Let’s go over to the Northeast, where, recently, you have seen them object to transmission sitting, object to natural gas pipelines. Madam Speaker, what they have done there, in doing so, they had to burn heating oil to warm the homes in the winter, one of the main reasons means of emissions. They had to import gas from Russia—from Russia—putting who knows how many dollars in Vladimir Putin’s hands to challenge U.S. interests around the globe.

Madam Speaker, these strategies are flawed. By rejecting some of these policies of the past, by pursuing the U.S. energy dominance agenda, we have been able to reduce emissions in the United States more than the next 12 countries combined, while continuing to have a robust economy, some of the lowest unemployment rates we have seen in decades, and ensuring that the United States can export energy like we are doing with liquefied natural gas right now to 35 countries, rather than being dependent upon those other nations.

We have two choices, Madam Speaker. I urge American energy dominance. I want to thank, again, the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Natural gas is being produced in this country in a tremendous amount, so much so, that we can export it anywhere in the world. But those on the other side are refusing to accept the reality of the benefits of natural gas. In fact, Berkeley, California, is the first American city to ban natural gas from being in homes and businesses, being banned from being used in new homes and businesses to heat and cook in their homes, probably banning transportation fuels, as well.

Natural gas is affordable for so many Americans, and I can tell you what. When Americans go to the pump, they are conscientious about the price because the money they put in that tank could be the difference in discretionary income they could use for other things.

When you help keep energy prices down, not only transportation fuels, but energy prices through the electricity generation in this country—folks over in Georgia understand electric generation. In fact, they are building the Nation’s only nuclear power plant over in Augusta, Georgia.

I yield to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia, to talk a little bit about that.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for hosting this here tonight.

This is extremely important, and the House Energy Action Team and the Energy and Commerce Members who will continue to speak play an important role in making sure that we get this message out, because, Madam Speaker, I am here to join my colleagues in discussing America’s energy resurgence and to bring to light the many developments and advances that have been made in our Nation, and there are many. Lots of developments, lots of advances have been made in our Nation.

We are in the midst of an economic boom. We all know that. We know that our economy is booming. We know that we have seen record low unemployment rates and that we have seen growing incomes. Simply put, jobs are being created and people are going back to work. We look to the Nation’s energy needs and output, people will often forget about how energy costs impact both people and the economy.

I have always said that I subscribe to the all-of-the-above type of energy strategy, and I think it is extremely important for a number of different reasons, not the least of which is to make sure that we in America have energy independence, to make sure that we have affordable energy, that we never put ourselves in the position that I can remember us being in in the late seventies, where we were dependent and were literally held over the barrel, if you will, by other nations for our energy needs.

We are a net benefit from lower energy costs, meaning our monthly home energy bills are lower and the costs to do business are lower. Lower costs translate into the ability of companies to invest in their businesses and in their employees.

American energy independence has been crucial to the growth we have seen since the recession. There is also significant investment by companies across the United States to be good stewards of the environment and our communities.

Yes, it can be done. Yes, we can have energy independence. Yes, we can be good stewards of our communities.

We are seeing significant investments in new, cleaner technologies, taking old and inefficient plants offline, improving energy efficiency and actively managing emissions. As has been mentioned by other speakers, we have done a great job in America of decreasing our emissions and still keeping our economy growing. There is a lot to be said for that.

Carbon management has really caught on for a number of employers, and the technology that can make it more effective is very promising. For instance, there are companies actively looking to pull carbon from the air, to sequester it into the ground through direct air capture. This technology continues to develop and to mature.

There are also innovative capture systems being developed in my home district. We are seeing incredibly efficient turbines being built that produce much lower emission numbers than similar products or plants.

In addition, I have the honor of serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we have done quite a bit of work addressing the regulatory issues that would prevent these innovative and new technologies from coming to market. We are doing everything that we can to get the government out of the way.

I have always said that the greatest innovators, the greatest scientists are right here in the United States of America, and they are. That is why I look toward the future with great anticipation, because I think this is going to be a great opportunity for us as Americans.

I look at renewable energy. I look at everything that is going to be done in the way of energy production, and I see America leading the way, and it is important the Federal Government not be an obstacle, not be a barrier to that.

As we look to the future and the hurdles are put up, the costs increase. That is why we focus on innovation and technology, new ideas and making sure that the private sector has the ability to explore these opportunities.

As I mentioned earlier, there are countless examples of employers seeking new options to reduce their impact on their communities and looking to ways to be good stewards. In manufacturing, I have been looking at how to turn those challenges of reducing consumption into new opportunities.

While one side of industry is looking at the cost, the energy sector is also investing in researching ways to become more efficient and effective when it comes to reducing emissions and expanding their energy mix.

Madam Speaker, if you want to see a country that can innovate, if you want to see a country that can lead, you look to the United States of America. Again, that is why I am so excited about the future of our energy production.

Just up the river from my district, Plant Vogtle has the only two nuclear units under construction in the United States. For a nation that once developed and dominated the nuclear sector, we have lagged behind direct competitors.

As the largest carbon-free source of power in the world, it makes sense to move forward with developing next-generation technology that can lower costs. Nuclear energy is an area we can do and should continue to once again have a leading role in the world.

Whether it is nuclear, more efficient equipment, carbon capture, or some...
other form of energy, now is our chance to really drill down and focus on the innovation and technology development that is needed.

I join my colleagues here on the HEAT team as we continue to work towards policy solutions to these issues facing our energy systems.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, and he was one of the first members of the House Energy Action Team. He comes from the Energy and Commerce Committee, working with me alongside some others on the HEAT team.

I want to applaud Whip Scalise for allowing the House Energy Action Team to be reconstituted, give us a chance to talk, communicate directly with the American people about American energy renaissance, American energy issues.

I would like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Olson). Before I do, I will say that one of the biggest honors I have had in my life came this year when Governor Abbott made me an honorary Texan. So I am happy to stand alongside my fellow Texan, Pete Olson from Texas, to talk about what is going on in the great State there.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Olson).

Mr. Olson. Madam Speaker, I thank my dear friend from South Carolina for those kind words about being an honorary Texan. We Texans take no offense to the comments he gave to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Garretson). That being said, home away from home, with all the ties between South Carolina and Texas.

The Battle of the Alamo commander, William Barret Travis, who died for our freedom, came from South Carolina. Two football players who would take our Gridiron to the Super Bowl, Jadeveon Clowney and Deshaun Watson, are products of South Carolina.

I am happy to join my friend and the HEAT team tonight to talk about the American energy renaissance.

Texans like to call this the era of America crushing OPEC’s monopoly and finally tearing down Mr. Putin’s wall of energy control over former Soviet Union states, nations like Estonia.

My wife and I went there about 2 years ago on a Baltic cruise. We saw happy, happy people, like people in that picture.

As my friend knows, that is a merchant vessel called Independence. It has been loaded with liquefied natural gas from Sabine Pass, Louisiana, by a company known as Cheniere, our first LNG port plant in American history.

Two years ago, that ship pulled up in the capitol of Estonia. As you can see, thousands and thousands of people waved flags and said welcome to Estonia, American liquefied natural gas, because they know that is not just a product. That is their freedom from Mr. Putin’s autonomy and brutality.

They know we exported liquid American freedom to Estonia.

In contrast, our port in Houston is 52 miles long. If I got five people to walk out and see a tanker pull up, that would be huge. Our battleship, the USS Texas, is over 100 years old. She is about to be moved to be repaired, to be moored permanently, at Galveston Island. If I got 10 people, maybe 20, to watch our battleship be moved, that would be awesome.

Those people came out in droves because they know their control by Mr. Putin is over.

Let’s talk about a great new ally called India. Their Prime Minister, Mr. Modi, is coming to Houston September 22. I have met the man four times. They are a growing economy of 1.4 billion people. They have our values. They have a problem with their energy. They have none that they can use in, the equipment they have a lot of coal. But coal is dirty. They have no natural gas. They have no fossil, no oil.

They can’t have a pipeline deliver those products to their nation. Coming from the west, that pipeline has to go through Iran and Pakistan, enemies. To the north are the Himalaya mountains. If you could get a pipeline over 18,000-foot elevation, God bless you. That is the eighth wonder of the world.

To the east is a place in the world that is falling apart, Bangladesh.

Their only solution to have cleaner air and energy independence is American LNG coming via the sea. A ship, one showed last year loaded with LNG, again from Sabine Pass.

We signed a contract, private sector to private sector, in India to deliver 14.4 megatons of LNG to India for over 20 years. That means there is no way, the government can be involved here in America or India. It is private sector to private sector freedom.

Finally, Madam Speaker, to my friend, I have to brag about Texas. Liberal friends want to address climate change with carbon capture. We are okay with that, but it must be viable in our economy, and it must be viable in a free market.

A company back home called NRG has a power plant 10 miles from my house called the Parish Power Plant. Parish generates energy from eight sources, four natural gas and four coal generators.

Wanting to improve their business and make the air cleaner, make more money, and help out the world, on their own, they reached out to a Japanese company to build a carbon capture system that grabs over 92 percent of CO2 up one of the coal stacks. But that technology is very, very expensive, over $1 billion.

Our friends want energy to swallow that product and bury that money in the ground, that captured carbon in the ground. That means you will bury $1 billion of American people responded. We have the best economy in the world.

Since then, we have continued to invest in our own energy resources and what did they do? They grabbed that CO2, and they have a pipeline that goes 85 miles southeast to an old, depleted oil field. It is like fracking fluid. That CO2 puts more pressure, so oil comes out, and we sell it in the market. It is very profitable.

In short, LNG dominance by America makes my home State of Texas great; it makes America greater; and it makes the whole world the greatest it can be.

Drill, baby, drill. Frack, baby, frack. Export, baby, export.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Olson) for being here tonight.

We hear a lot about the Green New Deal. That proposal is based solely on solar, wind, and hydropower in an effort to drastically cut carbon emissions across the country. In my State of South Carolina, we have seven reactors that produce 95 percent of the State’s emission-free electricity, 53 percent of our total electricity costs.

I want to show a graph really quickly before I introduce the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Allen).

This graphic shows the magnitude of one nuclear reactor and compares the capacity factors of one reactor, rated at 1,54 megawatts, to wind turbines. To match one reactor, it takes 2,077 windmills.

Think about the amount of acreage that would take just to put the windmills up to meet the electricity generated from one nuclear reactor.

I mentioned earlier the State of Georgia is building the only nuclear reactor being built in this country right now, and that is down at Vogtle in Augusta, Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Allen), from Augusta, and I am sure he is going to talk about nuclear energy.

Mr. Allen. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina (Mr. Duncan) for chairing this Special Order tonight.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this House Energy Action Team. It is a special coalition of Members of Congress who are focused on energy policy. I was honored to be selected as the nuclear subteam leader. This will allow me to do my part to advance our nuclear energy priorities through Congress and allow America to remain a dominant player in the global nuclear industry.

The theme for this Special Order is the American energy renaissance.

I have to tell you, after President Trump took office, the war on energy and the war on business was over. It was like flipping on a light switch. America was open for business again, and the American people responded. We have the best economy in the world.
have successfully made the United States energy independent. Who would have thought that 10 years ago?

Georgia’s 12th Congressional District is on the front line of the American energy renaissance, with the first two new nuclear reactors being built in the United States in the past 30 years at Plant Vogtle.

Just in March, I had the opportunity to be with Secretary of Energy Rick Perry to see the placement of the top of the Unit 3 containment vessel, truly a historic moment.

There is Secretary Perry, and there is the setting of the top of that vessel.

Finishing construction on these two units means that Americans can still do big things. I look forward to Units 3 and 4 coming online soon.

Nuclear energy plays an important role in Georgia’s energy portfolio, as it accounts for more than a quarter of all power generated and is the cleanest air source that can produce large amounts of electricity around the clock.

Georgia 12 is also home to all of Georgia’s nuclear capabilities, with four nuclear reactors, two already online at Plant Vogtle and two at Plant Hatch, these facilities currently employ almost 2,000 people, year-round, high-skilled employees.

The construction of Units 3 and 4 at Plant Vogtle is the largest construction project in Georgia, with more than 8,000 workers on site.

When we talk about clean energy in this country, we don’t need out-of-touch, costly socialist policies like the Green New Deal that would devastate the best economy in the world. We are talking about unleashing private-sector innovation, like nuclear power.

According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, Georgia’s nuclear energy facilities alone avoid more than 21 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions each year, equivalent of more than 4.8 million passenger cars.

It is of the utmost importance that we ensure these nuclear plants continue to provide energy in a safe, reliable, and affordable manner.

Georgia has been selected 6 years in a row as the best State to locate your business. A big reason for that is our low energy costs.

Overall, I believe we must continue to pursue a proactive, responsible, and all-of-the above energy policy that will benefit hardworking Americans and lower the cost of energy in this Nation.

The House Energy Action Team will continue to be laser-focused on continuing America’s energy renaissance, and I am so glad to be a part of it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments, and I thank him for leading the group down to look at that nuclear reactor.

Madam Speaker, it was cold this winter up in Michigan. Had it not been for fossil fuel, a lot of folks would have had a hard time.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) to talk about his role on the Energy and Commerce Committee and here on the House Energy Action Team.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for yielding.

Often during that polar vortex, I thought of South Carolina and sometimes wished that I could enjoy the warm breezes.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the House Energy Action Team as well as a proud member of the Energy and Commerce Committee serving on the Energy Subcommittee, I rise today about an important subject we have been talking about here, and that is American energy security and independence.

Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I understand the importance of being a good steward of our environment. As an avid outdoorsman, I am a proud supporter of the energy district of the Great Lakes State, a district that has wind, solar, nuclear, hydro, and coal power, along with natural gas, we have it all there. But I want my children and my grandchildren to live in the beautiful world that I have experienced. In fact, Madam Speaker, I want them to experience even better.

We can do that in the use of our energy as well, but we are not going to get there through socialist policies like the Green New Deal that will cause energy prices to skyrocket and commit, really, a fraud on the American people.

Instead, we should focus on solutions that spur innovation and encourage investments in new technologies that support these goals while keeping a reliable, resilient grid. These investments are happening now, but the transition needs to happen in an orderly way that doesn’t hinder economic growth or the security of our country.

One step we can take right now is to update our energy policies for the 21st century, and what I am looking at is that it is totally different than it did 40 years ago. Energy resources are abundant instead of scarce. It is a more diverse market than ever before, and it will continue.

With that in mind, I introduced H.R. 1502, the PURPA Modernization Act. The bill simply increases competition and reforms outdated regulations from the 1970s, so that consumers are not burdened with unnecessary costs on their utility bills coming from stale, outdated green energy regulations.

We also can’t forget that an all-of-the above energy approach will continue to utilize safe, clean, and resilient nuclear-based power, like that produced at the Fermi plants in my district.

Getting new technologies, like advanced carbon capture, out of a lab and into the market is also crucial. This past winter, we saw the importance of baseloaded power. Temperatures in Michigan and other places in the north plummeted to lower than 40 degrees below zero.

I would point my colleagues to bipartisan legislation that I helped introduce last week with my friend and colleague from Texas, Representative Crenshaw, which would provide a jump-start to those innovative technologies at commercial scale. That is what America is about: unleashing American energy.

And bringing down prices for families we represent is certainly an important crucial discussion to have.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman tonight for leading this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, America watching tonight will see that we have got a lot of great leaders in Congress that understand energy, and they come from a lot of different States.

The State of Arkansas produces oil, produces coal, produces a lot of biofuels, and produces wind. They also produce a lot of ducks, I enjoy going to Arkansas and hunting.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) to talk about what is going on in his great State.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding. He is welcome in the beautiful rice country of Arkansas to hunt ducks this fall at any time.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I appreciate also his work on the Sportsmen’s Caucus, the largest bipartisan caucus we have here in the House, and all of the good work it does in wildlife conservation and conservation of our public lands, so I thank my friend for that.

It is true, I appreciate also his work in the House Energy Action Team and that of our whip, STEVE SCALISE of Louisiana. And that is because we all understand the importance of energy to our economy, the importance of energy to our families, and how that has to be balanced in the world of public policy.

Madam Speaker, in 2018, crude oil was the world’s number one export product. Last year, the U.S. accounted for 98 percent of global growth in oil production. Since the Congress lifted the 40-year ban on oil exports in 2015, U.S. production continues to set records, and just last month set a new all-time high of exporting 3.3 million barrels of crude per day.

Lifting the ban has filled pipelines and sparked a surge of investment across this land in new shipping infrastructure across the U.S.

Total crude imports have also dropped significantly as we rely now more on domestic production and that production produced by our friends in Canada. Likewise, exporting clean natural gas is a leading export of the United States.

South Korea is now the largest buyer of American clean natural gas, Madam
Speaker. That is cleaning up their skies, lowering their carbon emissions, and cutting their trade imbalance with the United States.

Exporting more gas, exporting more oil, and lifting the ban has allowed us to be a leader in the world. We are no longer second fiddle to the Gulf, to Saudi Arabia, or to Russia. This comes as the United States is leading the world also, Madam Speaker, in reducing global climate or carbon emissions. Between 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced emissions more than 18 percent.

On the contrary, the world’s largest carbon emitters, like China and India, continue to have no policy to reduce their emissions, despite having the lowest marginal cost to do that. In the EU and the United States, it is very expensive for us to lower carbon emissions per unit. But, when you are a major carbon polluter, such as India and China, the marginal cost to clean up their emissions is much cheaper.

Instead, China is building 300 new coal plants, and not a single country in the EU is on target to meet their carbon reduction goals. These countries must do more to be competitive with us on the efforts we are taking here in the U.S.

Like my friends from Georgia and South Carolina, I am a strong supporter of nuclear energy because it is the cleanest, most green form of base power generation. In Arkansas, we get about 19 percent of our electricity generated from nuclear.

And I support the idea of better and more effective ways to store nuclear waste, which we have talked about and tried to pass in this House. Any discussion of eliminating carbon emissions must include nuclear energy.

We also must invest in longer battery life technologies and lowering barriers towards solar cell innovation. The future of clean energy rests with harnessing the power of the Sun and being able to store that power cheaply and portably. No one, Madam Speaker, is doing more research on that than the United States. We are spending over $550 million a year on advanced energy research to make our country even more energy competitive.

So, I believe, like many of my colleagues, we need to pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will lead us to a cleaner, less carbon-dependent world without forcing American families and Arkansas families to pay for that electricity? Where does that electricity get generated? And, most importantly, will it be a 24-7, 365-day baseload power supply always on, available when they want to manufacture that next BMW in Greer, South Carolina, or that next Boeing aircraft in Charleston, or the next component that goes in one of those manufactured all over the country.

We take for granted in this Nation that we have a 24-7, 365-day baseload power supply always on, and it is transmitted over tremendous infrastructure, but that infrastructure needs to be improved. We need pipelines to transfer and transmit the natural gas that is being produced and the oil that is being produced, like Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. But also the wind power that is generated wherever wind is generated and solar power wherever solar power is generated, there has to be transmission lines to get power to the grid so that it can be used. So as we have the conversation in America about all of the above—and one thing the House Energy Action Team is about is all of the above; we like wind, solar, and hydro, it is all groovy—but we know what works, and that is nuclear power and that is hydro and fossil fuels, supplemented by the alternative fuels that are coming online.

We have got the GrayMatter innovators and entrepreneurs in this country to meet some of the things that Mr. Hill talked about: the battery capacity. And that is to store that power to be used when needed, when it is generated by wind and solar. It is intermittently to store that power, it’s generated when the Sun is shining and generated when the wind is blowing, and it is stored to be used at night or when the wind isn’t blowing. Natural gas always runs. These are components of this debate that we need to talk about.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Members of the House Energy Action Team coming to the floor and talking with America with so much passion about American energy to meet the needs of our constituents, but at an affordable price that helps our constituents meet their budgets.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity for this Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

DECORUM ON HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 50 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I rise to reflect on the recent acts of Speaker Pelosi and other Members of the majority last week on the House floor, it was a clear and egregious violation of the rules of the House that transferred gas and other Members.

House Members are expected to speak respectfully of their fellow Members of Congress and of the President of the United States, a precedent that goes back to the very first Congress about conduct on the floor. It is clear and egregious violation of the rules of the House.

Citing Jefferson’s Manual, the first American book on parliamentary procedure, “References to racial or other discrimination on the part of the President are not in order.”

This week, Speaker Pelosi clearly violated Chapter 29, Section 65.6 of Jefferson’s Manual. The House parliamentarian ruled her speech violated the rules forbidding personal attacks on the House floor against the President.

Citing Jefferson’s Manual, the first American book on parliamentary procedure, “References to racial or other discrimination on the part of the President are not in order.”

I call on the majority to put partisanship and pointless attacks aside and get back to the real work that will move our great country forward.

CRISIS IN SYRIA

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to, once again, speak out about the crisis in Syria.

The director general of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons recently reported that traces of a nerve agent or poison gas byproduct were discovered late last year at Syria’s Scientific Studies and Research Center.

Even though we were assured by the Obama administration that the Russians would destroy all the chemical weapons in Syria, this report is not surprising. For some, photos of dead bodies in the streets littered with children, victims of barrel bombing, or asphyxiated by sarin gas just weren’t enough.

Now with a United Nations report. The United Nations reports that, since May, fighting in Idlib Province has forced 300,000 Syrians to flee their
homes and thousands more continue to die from Assad’s butchering.

Madam Speaker, when will this House finally grow weary of 8 years of Assad’s treachery: more than 570,000 dead, 200,000 imprisoned, and nearly 12 million displaced?

The House must act.

Speaker PELOSI well knows, this House, under Republican leadership, passed the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act three times over the past three Congresses, only to have it bogged down in the Senate.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about H. Res. 246, a resolution stating Congress’ opposition to the ongoing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel in the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement, or BDS, targeting Israel.

H. Res. 246 passed this House today. Let me get one thing clear, though. BDS is anti-Semitic at its core, and it seeks to delegitimize and isolate our ally Israel.

I am a strong supporter and I cosponsored H. Res. 246, but this is not the piece of anti-BDS legislation that we should have considered on the floor of this House this week. We should not be letting the majority off the hook by passing a nonbinding House resolution.

H. Res. 246 does not take tangible action to combat the BDS movement, nor does it have any teeth in it.

Instead, we should be considering and passing H.R. 336, the Strengthening America’s Security in the Middle East Act, which is the House version of S. 1. This legislation, Madam Speaker, passed the Senate in February by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 77-23.

H.R. 336 includes the Combating BDS Act, which allows a State or local government to divest its assets from entities using BDS against Israel. This bill includes other important provisions for ties using BDS against Israel. This bill passed the Senate in February by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 77–23.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Ambassador-at-Large for Religious Freedom Sam Brownback for hosting the 2019 Ministerial to Advance Religious Freedom.

This second ministerial on religious freedom makes the protection of religious freedom around the world a priority for this administration. This global conclave demonstrates that the United States proudly stands for religious liberty and tolerance so that everyone from all nations can worship freely and without discrimination.

I agree with President Ronald Reagan when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly in 1986 by saying: “Respect for human rights is not social work; it is not merely an act of compassion. It is the first obligation of government and the source of its legitimacy...”

It is through this obligation of service to our fellow man that we can make our societies better for our children and all future generations yet to be born.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Taekwondo Association and the roughly 20,000 people who gathered in Little Rock for the 2019 Worlds ATA Martial Arts competition just last week.

ATA is celebrating its golden anniversary this year with 50 years of international training. This organization was founded in 1969 and relocated to Little Rock in 1977, citing similarities between the State’s landscape and that of South Korea.

My friend, Mrs. Sun Cha Lee, is the chairman of the board for ATA Martial Arts and is committed to changing lives through martial arts and her philanthropy.

As a fellow member of the Rotary Club of Little Rock, Mrs. Lee embodies the motto of “service above self” and continues to lead their scholarship foundation that has provided over $1 million to deserving students.

Mrs. Lee and ATA’s cultural addition to Little Rock’s story has made indelible impact on Arkansas citizens and communities.

I would like to extend gratitude and congratulations to Mrs. Lee on reaching this memorable milestone. I wish her and all of ATA much continued success for generations to come.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Eagle Bank and Trust Company on its 100th anniversary. Eagle Bank has been serving customers since 1919 and has grown into 13 full-service bank locations.

Eagle Bank was the vision of Harry Hastings, Jr., who applied for a bank charter for the First State Bank of Sherwood in 1919, eventually becoming Eagle Bank and Trust Company in 1988. In 2012, the bank merged with Heber Springs State Bank, which received its original bank charter in 1919 and was originally known as Arkansas National Bank of Heber Springs. The bank survived the Great Depression and the 2008 recession, never closing its doors on its customers.

Today, Cathy Hastings Owen, daughter of Harry Hastings, operates Eagle Bank and Trust Company. In 2018, she became the 128th chairman of the Arkansas Bankers Association and is the first woman to lead that important organization.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the Hastings family and Eagle Bank and Trust Company, and I wish the company much continued success for generations to come.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize three Faulkner County, Arkansas, Scouting units that helped us in preparation for the historic flooding that occurred in Arkansas just in the past few weeks.

Pack 444, Troop 444, and Troop 644, all of the First United Methodist Church in Vilonia, volunteered to help our communities in need. This group who filled sandbags included children in elementary school and up to high school-aged teens.

Arkansans began filling sandbags on Monday, and more than 65,000 sandbags have been filled by volunteers from across our State. Sandbagging helps divert water from peoples’ homes and
was an effective way to prevent and reduce the flood damage from these historic floods.

I thank the Scouting units of First United Methodist Church and all of those who volunteered their time to help those affected by this historic flooding.

CONGRATULATING FORD OVERTON

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I want to rise and congratulate and thank my very good friend and Overton, for his selfless service to the State of Arkansas.

Ford served on the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission for 7 years, including serving as chairman in his final year. His term just expired on July 1.

As a graduate of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, his love for the outdoors has always been evident, especially his interest in fishing and preservation of habitat.

While on the commission, Ford worked with wildlife biologists and lawmakers to ensure that future generations of Arkansans will be able to continue to enjoy the healthy wildlife populations with which we are so abundantly blessed. He successfully inspired many young Arkansans to enjoy the great hunting and fishing opportunities all across our State.

Ford’s service to the State of Arkansas and to wildlife conservation will not be forgotten, and I join all Arkansans in congratulating Ford on his infectious passion and leadership throughout the State.

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC ACTS OF TROY BRASWELL, SR.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic acts of Mr. Troy Braswell, Sr., a World War II veteran, for his remarkable service to our country.

Troy grew up in Louisiana, and after graduating from high school, he joined the Navy to serve his country. He was only 17 years old, and his role was that of a powderman.

During his service, Troy served on the USS Mississippi, survived a kamikaze attack, and, afterwards, contracting tuberculosis. He was told by a doctor that he had but 6 months to live.

He overcame and survived these challenges, and after his military service, Troy located to Arkansas in 1945. In 1952, he graduated from the University of Central Arkansas, then called Arkansas State Teachers College. Troy turned 60 years older this year and currently resides in Hot Springs Village.

Troy’s sacrifice for Arkansas and for America will not be forgotten, and I join all Arkansans in thanking him for his bravery and dedication to our State and our country.

RECOGNIZING VICTORY MISSION BIBLE TRAINING CENTER

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Victory Mission Bible Training Center’s grand opening and ribbon cutting earlier this month in Center Ridge, Arkansas.

Victory Mission Bible Training Center is an 8- to 10-month residential discipleship training program catering to those who struggle with problems such as alcoholism and addiction. It is strictly donation-based and available to people of all ages who need this important assistance.

I want to congratulate the resident director, Ms. Jennifer Jones, herself a graduate of the program. She was homeless and struggled with alcohol and drug addiction before entering this important program.

Since 1960, over 24,000 people have been treated by Mission Teens centers, and 89 percent of their graduates report that they are doing well. Several have gone into the ministry or now help at one of the 20 centers across the United States.

Alcoholism and addiction are powerful diseases, and I am grateful to the Center Ridge community for the opening of the Victory Mission Bible Training Center and their worthwhile investment in the health of our citizens and their community.

Honor Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Dr. Edith Irby Jones, a civil rights leader and the first African American graduate at the University of Arkansas for Medical Science. Dr. Irby Jones recently passed away at the age of 91.

Dr. Jones became a distinguished physician on the national stage and accomplished many firsts for African Americans and women. She was the first African American woman to intern in the State of Arkansas, the first female president of the National Medical Association.

As a child, Dr. Jones experienced the deaths of her father and sister and suffered from rheumatic fever that left her temporarily unable to walk or attend school. Despite her hardships, she went on to become the first African American female resident at Baylor University Hospital in Houston.

When Dr. Jones wasn’t practicing medicine, she was in schools and churches, advocating for racial equality. She later became an advocate for women’s health and was awarded an award for volunteerism and community service by the American College of Physicians.

She also has been inducted into both the University of Arkansas College of Medicine Hall of Fame and the inaugural group of women inducted into the Arkansas Women’s Hall of Fame.

I honor Dr. Jones for her determination, dedication, and contributions to civil rights and enriching the lives of countless Arkansans and Americans. She was a true friend to many across our State. I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to her friends, family, and loved ones.

CONGRATULATING CAMP ROCKEFELLER

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Arkansas’ Camp Rockefeller for being once again, as a nationally accredited camp by the Boy Scouts of America National Camp Accreditation Program.

BSA’s National Camp Accreditation Program recognizes camps that provide a fun, high-quality, and safe program consistent with the Boy Scouts of America brand and what the public expects from scouting.

Camp Rockefeller successfully completed a review of over 200 standards related to the safety and quality of the program, including campgrounds, properties, and the well-being of every camper, leader, and visitor. Over the years, Camp Rockefeller has shown continuous improvement in all areas.

Camp Rockefeller is located within Gus Blass Scout Reservation. Each year, thousands of scouts from across the country enjoy this beautiful part of Arkansas and are given the opportunity to participate in hiking, fishing, climbing, camping, and other outdoor activities.

As a fellow scout, I am proud of these high standards that are being set at Camp Rockefeller. On behalf of all Arkansans, congratulations, and we look forward to following your continued success in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING CONWAY FOR RECYCLING AWARD

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Conway Department of Sanitation in the city of Conway, Arkansas, on being named the 2019 Recycling Education Program of the Year by the Arkansas Recycling Coalition. This award honors an agency or association that has made a significant contribution to the advancement of waste reduction, recycling, and sustainability across our State in the past year.
Conway was selected for this award as a result of its outstanding public education and community outreach effort. This involved talking with more than 2,700 community members of all ages from schools, daycares, churches, homeowner associations, universities, and more.

Recycling is a component of making the environment a cleaner place, conserving materials, saving energy, and reducing the size of our landfills.

I extend my congratulations to the Conway Department of Sanitation and the entire city of Conway for its worthwhile commitment to our environment and our natural resources.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Fairfield Bay, Arkansas, on being named the Best of the Best Top 100 Planned Communities in America by ideal-LIVING Magazine. The Best of the Best honors those areas and communities that deserve special recognition for their outstanding qualities, facilities, and programs.

Fairfield Bay began as a planned community 40 years ago and has grown into an ideal family recreation destination. It was chosen from hundreds of nominations from North America and Central America.

A huge congratulations to the community, to the residents of Fairfield Bay, and to Mayor Wellenberger on achieving this recognition. I look forward to following the Fairfield Bay community as it continues to grow in the years to come.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize two central Arkansas journalists who received the Golden 50 Service Awards from the Arkansas Press Association for a half-century in journalism.

Larry Miller, from Morrilton, Arkansas, is the editor of the Conway County Petit Jean Country Headlight newspaper.

Frank Fellone of Little Rock was also recognized and is a former Arkansas Democrat-Gazette deputy editor and now an independent journalist.

I also congratulate David Bailey, managing editor of the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, on receiving the Arkansas Press Association Freedom of Information Award.

I congratulate these men who exemplify the spirit and dedication behind the mission of these awards and our First Amendment, and I wish them continued success in the years to come.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
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. 3504, the Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the Congressional Record.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
<th>FY 2028</th>
<th>FY 2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
House Rule XXVI (H. Doc. No. 116–49); to the Committee on Ethics and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequent to the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. McKEE): H.R. 1307. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL): H.R. 3878. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify the process for registrants to exercise due diligence upon discovering a suspicious order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. STEWART, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SIMPSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GLYNN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LAMalfa): H.R. 3879. A bill to modify the procedures for issuing special recreation permits for certain public land units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. DELGADO (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania): H.R. 3880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction for health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FRAHIEL (for herself, Mrs. WATSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. WEBER of Texas): H.R. 3881. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TITUS, Ms. CLARKER of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCCULLIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEAN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PINKER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. MATSU): H.R. 3882. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide pay equity for and for other personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah): H.R. 3883. A bill to establish the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the
H.R. 3902. A bill to provide standards for physical condition and management of housing receiving assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DeLauro:

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. GIROUARD, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DEMINGs, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. THOMPson of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. NATsON, and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to authorize grants to eligible agencies to carry out career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to State coalitions that build or expand career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping during high tides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PÉREZ, Mr. ESCOBAR, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3895. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. PEREZ):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that only citizens or nationals of the United States may operate trains within the United States that originate in Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRakis:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly housing stipend under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals who pursue programs of education solely through distance learning on more than a half-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FINKENAUER (for himself and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to consider benefits to navigation to be gained by converting a waterway to double locks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUSon (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3900. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to address motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to award competitive grants for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, and providing educational or career pathway programs for workers and displaced workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3893. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to State coalitions that build or expand career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping during high tides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PÉREZ, Mr. ESCOBAR, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3895. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. PEREZ):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that only citizens or nationals of the United States may operate trains within the United States that originate in Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRakis:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly housing stipend under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals who pursue programs of education solely through distance learning on more than a half-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FINKENAUER (for himself and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to consider benefits to navigation to be gained by converting a waterway to double locks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUSon (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3900. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to address motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to award competitive grants for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, and providing educational or career pathway programs for workers and displaced workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3893. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to State coalitions that build or expand career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping during high tides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PÉREZ, Mr. ESCOBAR, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3895. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. PEREZ):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that only citizens or nationals of the United States may operate trains within the United States that originate in Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRakis:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly housing stipend under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals who pursue programs of education solely through distance learning on more than a half-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FINKENAUER (for himself and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to consider benefits to navigation to be gained by converting a waterway to double locks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUSon (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3900. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to address motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to award competitive grants for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, and providing educational or career pathway programs for workers and displaced workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3893. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to State coalitions that build or expand career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping during high tides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PÉREZ, Mr. ESCOBAR, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3895. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. PEREZ):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that only citizens or nationals of the United States may operate trains within the United States that originate in Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRakis:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly housing stipend under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals who pursue programs of education solely through distance learning on more than a half-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FINKENAUER (for himself and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to consider benefits to navigation to be gained by converting a waterway to double locks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUSon (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3900. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to address motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):  H.R. 3911. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act to expand and improve access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program for the purposes: to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):  H.R. 3912. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase awareness, expand preventative services, and improve care for individuals with end stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:  H.R. 3913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants for education programs on the history of the treatment of Italian Americans during World War II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN:  H.R. 3914. A bill to apologize for the treatment of Italian Americans during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BAIRD, MISS GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. BACON, and Mr. WOODALL):  H.R. 3915. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to reauthorize the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LJUJÁN (for himself, Mr. YANG, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):  H.R. 3916. A bill to provide for a study on the protection of Native American seeds and traditions; for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DE LAURO (for herself, Mr. MEeks, Ms. HALLAND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FASCHEL, Ms. WILD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BONNIE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TLAIB, Mr. SHAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ENSMINGER of New Hampshire, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DE FAZIO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SPRINGER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DeGREGGOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MITCHUERSEY-Powell, Mr. CINNHEROS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLI, Ms. LAWRENCE, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ESHEL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LJUJÁN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. CHIST, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. Sires, Mrs. LE of Nevada, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BRATTON, Mr. GREENALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCLAUGHLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. WESTON, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. FLORES):  H.R. 3917. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable treatment of the national women's and men's national teams; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HALLAND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WILCER, Mrs. KINNAN, Ms. CASTOR of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEeks, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DE FAZIO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):  H.R. 3918. A bill to protect the health and safety of children in immigration detention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):  H.R. 3919. A bill to require research in coastal sustainability, to ensure that the Federal Government continues to implement and advance coastal resiliency efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. NADLER (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):  H.R. 3920. A bill to prohibit agreements between employers that directly restrict the current or future employment of any employee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY:  H.R. 3921. A bill to require an institution of higher education to report, with the Secretary of Education whenever such institution receives a gift from or enters into a contract with a foreign source, the value of which is $100,000 or more, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:  H.R. 3922. A bill to establish American opportunity accounts, to modify estate and gift tax rates, to reform the taxation of capital income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ:  H.R. 3923. A bill to require Federal agencies to address issues of sex discrimination; to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, 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. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. REED):  H.R. 3924. A bill to provide for the treatment of a pharmacy counter refusal as a coverage determination under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):  H.R. 3925. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit States from imposing utilization control policies or medication-assisted treatment under Medicaid from imposing utilization control policies or procedures with respect to such treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:  H.R. 3926. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the service obligation verification process for TEACH Grant recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RASKIN:  H.Res. 507. A resolution affirming the validity of subpoenas duly issued and investigations undertaken by any standing or permanent select committee of the House of Representatives pursuant to authorities delegated by the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. HOLINGSWORTH, Mr. FENICE, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. BROOKS of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. BUCHSHORN):  H.Res. 508. A resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of the return of the Indiana Rangers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):  H.Res. 510. A resolution affirming United States support to the countries of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova in their effort to retain political sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. PEETERS, and Mr. VARGAS):  H.Res. 511. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Department of the Navy should take a leading role in the mitigation of cross-border spills, discharges, and debris in the Tijuana River that impact national security interests of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):  H.Res. 512. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):  H.Res. 513. A resolution recognizing the vital importance of democracy in the United States and encouraging State and local governments to aide citizens in reflecting on the contributions of democracy to a more free and stable world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. POSTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. Sires, and Mr. SABLAN):  H.Res. 514. A resolution committing to elevate the voices, leadership, and needs of communities that face systemic barriers in the effort to end sexual violence and support all survivors of sexual violence and gender-
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based violence, including immigrant sur-
vivors, survivors who are incarcerated, sur-
vivors with disabilities, survivors of color, 
American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, sur-
vivors of sexual abuse, and lesbian, gay, bisex- 
ual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors; to the Committee on the 
Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 
Energy and Commerce, for a period to be 
subsequently determined by the Speaker, in 
each case for consideration of such provi-
sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the 
committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials 
were presented and referred as follows:

112. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relat-
ive to House Joint Resolution 15, urging 
Congress to pass the Daylight Act, to the 
Committee on Energy and Commerce.

113. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to Senate 
Concurrent Resolution 1, urging Congress to extend 
Medicaid coverage beyond 15 days for serv-
ces provided in certain settings to adults with 
devices or mental illness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

114. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to House 
Concurrent Resolution 9, declaring support for the 
negotiated settlement agreement of federal reserved 
claims between State Representatives of the Navajo Nation, the 
United States, and the State of Utah; to the Committee on 
Natural Resources.

115. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent 
Resolution 9, declaring support for the 
negotiated settlement agreement of federal reserved 
claims between State Representatives of the Navajo Nation, the 
United States, and the State of Utah; to the Committee on 
Natural Resources.

116. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to House 
Concurrent Resolution 21, reaffirming the equal polit-
ical, civil, and religious rights and privileges granted by the Utah Constitution for both 
men and women; to the Committee on 
the Judiciary.

117. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurre-
nt Resolution 9, requesting the Congress of the United States 
call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of 
the United States; to the Committee on 
the Judiciary.

118. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurr-
rent Resolution 7, urging the President of the 
United States and Congress to remove 
barriers that prohibit the medical cannabis 
industry from accessing banking 
services; jointly to the Committees on 
Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

119. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to House Resolu-
tion 3, urging a humane response to the hu-
manitarian crises at the U.S.-Mexico border; 
jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and 
Homeland Security.

120. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurre-
nent Resolution 14, encouraging Utah’s state and 
congressional delegations to continue sup-
porting legislation and practices that en-
force electrical grid security against nat-
ural, accidental, or intentional occurrences, 
including disruption from electromagnetic 
pulses, that could potentially interrupt reli-
able electricity services; jointly to the 
Committees on Transportation and 
Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY 
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the 
Rules of the House of Representa-
tives, the following statements are sub-
mitted regarding the specific powers 
granted to Congress in the Constitu-
tion to enact the accompanying bill or 
joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: 
H.R. 3876. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of 
the United States.

By Mr. YARMUTH: 
H.R. 3877. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, 
Section 8, Clause 2; Article 1, Section 
8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 
9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: 
H.R. 3878. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article 1, Section 8; Section 6—Powers of Congress. 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 Ms. HAALAND: 
H.R. 3879. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 
3

By Mr. DELGADO: 
H.R. 3890. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the 
Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. FRANKEL: 
H.R. 3891. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPIERER: 
H.R. 3892. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power 
granted to Congress under Article 1 Section 
8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: 
H.R. 3893. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States 
Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER: 
H.R. 3894. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, and 18 
of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. GABBARD: 
H.R. 3895. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, 
Section 8.

By Mr. MCADAMS: 
H.R. 3896. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYBURN: 
H.R. 3897. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 
To regulate Commerce with foreign Na-
tions, and among the several States, and 
with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROUDA: 
H.R. 3898. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8 of the United States 
Constitution.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: 
H.R. 3899. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 
To regulate Commerce with foreign Na-
tions, and among the several States, and 
with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HARDER of California: 
H.R. 3900. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8 of the United States 
Constitution.

By Mr. HARDER of California: 
H.R. 3901. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I, Section 8 of the United States 
Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI: 
H.R. 3902. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
Article I Section 8, Clause 18 
“To make all Laws which shall be neces-
sary and proper for carrying into Execu-
tion 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. VARGAS: 
H.R. 3903. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
(1) To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Im-
posts and Excises, to pay the Debts and pro-
vide for the common Defence and general 
Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, 
Imposts and Excises shall be uniform 
throughout the United States, as enumer-
ated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the 
U.S. Constitution;

(2) To regulate commerce with foreign na-
tions, and among the several States, and with 
the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 
1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To make all laws necessary and proper 
for executing powers vested by the Constitu-
tion in the Government of the United States, as enumer-
ated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the 
United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI: 
H.R. 3904. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
(1) To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Im-
posts and Excises, to pay the Debts and pro-
provide for the common Defence and general 
Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, 
Imposts and Excises shall be uniform 
throughout the United States, as enumer-
ated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the 
U.S. Constitution;

(2) To regulate commerce with foreign na-
tions, and among the several States, and with 
the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 
1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To make all laws necessary and proper 
for executing powers vested by the Constitu-
tion in the Government of the United States, as enumer-
ated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the 
United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI: 
H.R. 3905. 
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lative resolution pursuant to the fol-
lowing: 
The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, 
Section 8.
By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 8897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. HOST:
H.R. 3898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:
H.R. 3899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KINZINGER:
H.R. 3908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:
H.R. 3909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 3910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 3911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JUDY CHU of California:
H.R. 3901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art. 1, Sec. 8: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 3902.

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 Ms. POXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 3904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 3905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. JAYAPAL:
H.R. 3906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 3907.

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. LUJÁN:
H.R. 3912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 3913.

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. LOPFGREN:
H.R. 3914.

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, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 3915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. LUCAS:
H.R. 3916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 3907.

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, of in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 3912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 3913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. LEW of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

By Mr. BOST:
H.R. 3900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 3901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 3910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 3911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 93: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 94: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 136: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 196: Mr. McGovern.

H.R. 295: Mr. Norquist.

H.R. 377: Mr. Desaulnier.

H.R. 336: Ms. Cheney and Mr. Fleischmann.

H.R. 388: Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio.

H.R. 455: Mr. Cunningham.

H.R. 500: Mr. Price of North Carolina.

H.R. 586: Mr. Gosar.

H.R. 587: Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Shimkus, Mrs. Demings, and Mr. Price of North Carolina.

H.R. 593: Mr. Desaulnier.

H.R. 598: Mr. Rice of South Carolina.

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. MATSUI:
H.R. 3917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 3918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 3919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NADLER:
H.R. 3920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 3921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. PRESSELEY:
H.R. 3922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 3923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 3924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 3925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:
H.R. 3926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 94: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 136: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 93: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 96: Ms. Lee of California and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 196: Mr. McGovern.

H.R. 295: Mr. Norquist.

H.R. 377: Mr. Desaulnier.

H.R. 336: Ms. Cheney and Mr. Fleischmann.

H.R. 388: Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio.

H.R. 455: Mr. Cunningham.

H.R. 500: Mr. Price of North Carolina.

H.R. 586: Mr. Gosar.

H.R. 587: Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Shimkus, Mrs. Demings, and Mr. Price of North Carolina.

H.R. 593: Mr. Desaulnier.

H.R. 598: Mr. Rice of South Carolina.
H.R. 3816: Mr. Brooks of Alabama.
H.R. 3819: Ms. Norton, Ms. Wild, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Hastings, and Mr. Suozzi.
H.R. 3820: Ms. Hill of California.
H.R. 3829: Mr. Womack, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Waltz, and Mr. Baird.
H.R. 3837: Mr. Young.
H.R. 3838: Ms. Meng.
H.R. 3839: Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 3853: Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 3862: Mr. Rush, Mr. Takano, and Ms. Norton.
H.R. 3866: Mr. Crist.
H.R. 3873: Mr. Crow.
H.R. 3874: Mr. Ted Lieu of California.
H.J. Res. 35: Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Schneiter.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. Jeffries.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. Bera.
H.Con. Res. 20: Mr. Kim and Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania.
H.Res. 23: Mrs. Murphy, Mr. Guest, and Mr. Schrader.
H.Res. 33: Mr. Evans.
H.Res. 177: Mr. Bushon.
H.Res. 189: Ms. Haaland, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Porter, Mr. Khanna, and Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico.
H.Res. 233: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.Res. 246: Mr. Richmond and Mrs. Radewagen.
H.Res. 300: Mr. Gallego.
H.Res. 329: Mr. Schneider, Ms. Frankel, Mrs. Torres of California, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Casten of Illinois, and Ms. Wasserman Schultz.
H.Res. 358: Mrs. Walorski and Mr. Taylor.
H.Res. 374: Mr. Collins of Georgia.
H.Res. 379: Mr. Correa and Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.Res. 438: Mr. Waltz.
H.Res. 452: Mr. Cinneros.
H.Res. 493: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Banks, Mr. Norman, Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Wright, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Reschenthaler, Mr. Babin, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, and Mr. McHenry.
H.Res. 496: Ms. Pressley, Mr. Blumenauer, and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.Res. 562: Mr. Carson of Indiana and Mr. Grijalva.
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.

Lord of the harvest, we continue to seek You, for we desire to please You. You, O God, are our light and salvation, so we refuse to be afraid. As our lawmakers seek to walk with integrity, provide them with a harvest of truth, justice, and righteousness. May they cultivate such ethical consistency that their words will be undergirded by right actions.

Lord, keep them aware of Your continued presence as they find in You fullness of joy. Show them the path to life, as You guide them to Your desired destination.

We pray in Your merciful 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.

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

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

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the United States of America has the mightiest military in the world to protect our freedoms and to guarantee peace around the world. That is why it is so important to keep check on the Pentagon’s financial ledgers. Tax-payers expect their money to be spent wisely, and it is our job in Congress to make sure that money is spent wisely.

I am glad Secretary Esper has said he will work with whistleblowers to stop wasteful spending and to prevent more spare parts rip-offs. These are things that have been of interest to me over the last several decades with the defense budget. I met with Secretary Esper, and I believe he has his heart in the right place to help us accomplish these goals.

He has also indicated he will prioritize getting a clean audit of our military services and an opinion that can be certified because the 2010 law that all the audits ought to be certified was not met by 2017, and they are still not done. How can you follow the money if it can’t be audited?

Our men and women in uniform deserve no less than to make sure every dollar in the Defense Department is spent wisely.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the administration informed congressional leaders that Secretary Mnuchin, White House Chief of Staff Mulvaney, and Acting OMB Director Vought reached a deal with Speaker Pelosi to prevent a government-fund-
Government is coming up with urgent deadlines with respect to the debt limit and bringing the appropriations process.

The full faith and credit of the United States cannot be in question. The question is whether Washington to throw a big wrench in this red-hot economy that is creating historic levels of job opportunities and growing their take-home pay, so faced with our Democratic colleagues’ refusal to allow a vote to advance Dr. Mark Esper’s nomination yesterday afternoon came in at 85 to 6. That is precisely the kind of overwhelming bipartisan vote that is called for in this circumstance.

The nominee is beyond qualified. His record of public service is beyond impressive. His commitment to serving our servicemembers is beyond obvious. The need for a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Defense is beyond urgent. I urge every one of my colleagues to vote to confirm our next Secretary of Defense later today.

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, that isn’t the only important task we will tackle on a bipartisan basis today. In just a few hours, the Senate will attend to an important subject we have never failed to address; that is, the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund.

I know my colleagues don’t need any extended lecture from me about the solemn commitments this program represents: commitments to the firefighters, police officers, and all the first responders who rushed selflessly toward the World Trade Center just moments after the attacks began, to the first responders and workers who helped police officers for duty days or even weeks later, putting their health at serious risk to help others; commitments to those who responded to the Pentagon and in Shanksville, PA, as well, and in the cases where injury or illness has already claimed the lives of these heroes; commitments to the surviving families.

Congress can never repay these men, women, and families for their sacrifices, but we can do a small part to make our heroes whole. That is why the Senate has never failed to attend to the fund before. We are not about to do so now.

I had the honor of meeting with a group of first responders and advocates several weeks back. They gave me the badge of Luis Alvarez, a New York Police Department bomb squad detective who was terminally ill and has since tragically passed away.

It was my honor to receive it. It was my honor that Senator McCain’s ironclad commitment to getting this done was never in doubt. I told the first responders I wanted the Senate to address this prior to the August recess, and today we will do so. It will be my honor later today to vote to fund and ensure this fund is secure. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONG KONG

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, in recent weeks, I have spoken about our Nation’s renewed competition with other great powers, like Russia and China. Despite decades of efforts to welcome these nations into the global community, we have not achieved a fair international system, we are constantly reminded that these nations have their own design on the future. In their visions, foundational principles of sovereignty, freedom, human rights, and a rules-based international order tend to take a backseat to power politics and the pursuit of hegemony.

The Chinese Communist Party, for example, is working to extend its control and influence everywhere from the South China Sea to Taiwan, to Burma, to Hong Kong, as we have seen recently. The tools and tactics may differ but the goal is the same: Beijing wants to bend its neighbors to its will. Earlier this month, after historic protests, Hong Kong’s Government hit pause on legislation that would have further eroded its autonomy and invited more meddling from the mainland, but victory for freedom and autonomy is not yet assured. The bill in question has been suspended, but it hasn’t been totally withdrawn. Hong Kong’s people, emboldened by this rare victory over Beijing’s creeping influence, have continued to exercise their freedom of assembly to reclaim the rights, privileges, and autonomy slowly sliced away in recent years by the PRC. Protests continue and with them countervailing pressures from authorities beholden to Beijing. Increasingly bold pro-independence and mainland vigilantes are drawing blood in an effort to intimidate Hongkongers back into submission.

Hong Kong’s autonomous government, political freedoms, and stable rule of law has been a crucial precondition of its tremendous growth and prosperity. U.S. firms have invested tens of billions in Hong Kong’s economy because they trust the autonomous region’s political climate, independent judicial system, and degree of independence from Beijing.

By contrast, international firms are currently pulling back from China due to concerns about corruption, autocracy, intellectual property rights violations, and state-sponsored corporate espionage.

At a time when China faces slowing growth, Beijing should seek to emulate Hong Kong, not engulf Hong Kong and remake it in the image of the Chinese Communist Party.

The PRC has long been working hard under the surface to increase its influence and power. In Hong Kong, like in so many other areas, China has used this approach that experts have called “soft power”—building its intentions and biding their time, slowly slicing away resistance, building leverage, and encroaching, one step at a time.

In the case of Hong Kong, Beijing and its agents have overreached, but they are recalculating—postponing action on this legislation while biding time to resume the encroachment.

This is not just a matter of the people of Hong Kong. The PRC’s treatment of Hong Kong—just like its treatment of Uighurs or Tibetans—and the PRC’s treatment of fair international system, we are constantly reminded that these nations have their own design on the future. In their visions, foundational principles of sovereignty, freedom, human rights, and a rules-based international order tend to take a backseat to power politics and the pursuit of hegemony.

The Chinese Communist Party, for example, is working to extend its control and influence everywhere from the South China Sea to Taiwan, to Burma, to Hong Kong, as we have seen recently. The tools and tactics may differ but the goal is the same: Beijing wants to bend its neighbors to its will.

Earlier this month, after historic protests, Hong Kong’s Government hit pause on legislation that would have further eroded its autonomy and invited more meddling from the mainland, but victory for freedom and autonomy is not yet assured. The bill in question has been suspended, but it hasn’t been totally withdrawn. Hong Kong’s people, emboldened by this rare victory over Beijing’s creeping influence, have continued to exercise their freedom of assembly to reclaim the rights, privileges, and autonomy slowly sliced away in recent years by the PRC. Protests continue and with them countervailing pressures from authorities beholden to Beijing. Increasingly bold pro-independence and mainland vigilantes are drawing blood in an effort to intimidate Hongkongers back into submission.

Hong Kong’s autonomous government, political freedoms, and stable rule of law has been a crucial precondition of its tremendous growth and prosperity. U.S. firms have invested tens of billions in Hong Kong’s economy because they trust the autonomous region’s political climate, independent judicial system, and degree of independence from Beijing.

By contrast, international firms are currently pulling back from China due to concerns about corruption, autocracy, intellectual property rights violations, and state-sponsored corporate espionage.

At a time when China faces slowing growth, Beijing should seek to emulate Hong Kong, not engulf Hong Kong and remake it in the image of the Chinese Communist Party.

The PRC has long been working hard under the surface to increase its influence and power. In Hong Kong, like in so many other areas, China has used this approach that experts have called “soft power”—building its intentions and biding their time, slowly slicing away resistance, building leverage, and encroaching, one step at a time.

In the case of Hong Kong, Beijing and its agents have overreached, but they are recalculating—postponing action on this legislation while biding time to resume the encroachment.

This is not just a matter of the people of Hong Kong. The PRC’s treatment of Hong Kong—just like its treatment of Uighurs or Tibetans—and the PRC’s claims as citizens—is an indicator of how Chinese rulers will behave abroad. All nations who trade with the PRC should be watching the drama unfolding on the streets of Hong Kong.

The world is watching and wondering: If a government cannot respect the basic rights of people it claims as its own citizens, why on Earth would it be trusted to respect the rights and interests of its neighbors, its trading partners, or the companies that invest in its economy?

As we all know, the people of Hong Kong have been carrying the banner for decades. I am proud to say that here in the United States, we have been marching alongside them the entire way. Back in 1992, I was proud to author the U.S.-Hong Kong Policy Act and helped codify America’s stance on the special status of Hong Kong.

So on the 70th anniversary of the PRC and the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, I am grateful the administration and Congress, on a bipartisan basis, are reexamining America’s relationship with
the PRC. I am grateful for the bipartisan work my colleagues have done on this important issue, and I am confident Congress will continue to hold hearings and stay vigilant on the subject of autonomy and democracy in Hong Kong, as well as China’s overall strategy and its implications for the United States, our allies, and the entire world.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last Friday, I went with a group of Senate Democrats to visit several detention centers at our southern border, including the Border Patrol facility in McAllen and processing centers at Donna and Ursula, TX. The hearing accounted for conditions endured by the migrant families are true. We saw overcrowding. We heard migrants tell us they are unable to brush their teeth, shower, call their families, or access feminine hygiene products. We saw children in soiled clothing, caged and expressionless. It is heartbreaking—the thousand-smile stares on the faces of toddlers where smiles and laughter should have been. It breaks your heart and makes your blood boil all at once. It is nothing else. I am always looking for the positive. We saw a much better model employed by a nonprofit Catholic Charities center, run by Sister Norma Pimentel. There, families had access to medicine, food, and showers as their asylum cases were being processed in an orderly fashion. These people were being treated humanely, and they were following the law.

Sister Norma told us that the government could replicate this model. She explained that if ICE reinstated the Family Case Management Program, we could see as high as 99 percent compliance with immigration court orders without the need for expanded detention and overcrowding. What a difference that could make.

Sister Norma confided in us that we can treat these migrants with respect and decency without sacrificing border security or law and order. The two are not mutually exclusive. That is such an important point. You can have both humane treatment and rule of law. Anyone who says we must choose between treating these people humanely and enforcing our laws is offering a false choice. We can do both, and we can follow the model of Catholic Charities all along the border.

That is why Democrats have been pushing to restart and infuse more dollars into alternatives to detention despite Republican objections. The President’s approach, coupled with a Democratic bill to address the treatment of children—a bill that Senators Merkley, Feinstein, Durbin, and I have sponsored, as well as many others—over 30 other Democrats, I believe—have moved conditions at the detention centers and ensure that families comply with our immigration laws.

I would say one more thing about these kids and the parents. They are not criminals. I asked Mark Morgan, who is certainly known as a hard-liner on immigration: What percentage of these kids and parents are criminals? It is a very small percentage. At one point, it was said that 96 percent—and at another point 96 percent—are not criminals. The name people our grandparents or our great- grandparents or our great-great-grandparents were, who sought safety and a decent life in America. Their children and their grandchildren—on my father’s side of the grand- children, and on my mother’s side I am one of the great-grandchildren—have done good things for America throughout the country. That is what America is all about. These people are not fleeing from the law. They are not fleeing to traffic drugs. They are fleeing because the gangs down there have told the parents: We will rape your daughter, we will murder your son, and we will burn your house if you don’t do what we want. They are fleeing for the safety, the beauty, and the opportunity of America, which generations since the 1600s have done and have made this country great.

We need to return to a rational discussion about the rules on the ground, and that includes a discussion about the root causes of immigration. Again, when the President says Americans should know that all of these people arriving at our borders are criminals trying to game the law, he should know who they are. As I said, Mark Morgan, his own CBP Commissioner, admitted as much to our congressional delegation on Friday when we questioned him. The vast majority of families are fleeing unimaginable violence and desperation. So let’s get at the root causes of this, instead of just tweeting and going on TV and ranting, which people have done.

First, allow migrants to apply for asylum inside their own countries. Second, hire more immigration judges to reduce the backlog in cases at the border. Third, provide security assistance to these Central American countries to help them crack down on the vicious gangs and drug cartels that cause so many to flee. This is a rational thing to do. I think most Americans, regardless of their ideology, regardless of their party, regardless of their political position, would support this. But the Trump administration has now pledged to end the security assistance to Central American countries. That is counter-productive. It is boneheaded because it is going to cause more people to flee. Unfortunately, it is been typical of the President’s approach. This morning, the President tweeted and bragged about how he has cut off funding to Guatemala 9 months ago. It is counterproductive. That’s not the answer—not policies at our borders, plain and simple.

In my experience, I have not seen the President be serious about dealing with immigration. He has had the last—he inflames his base without telling them the truth, making them think they are all criminals—I see this on FOX News all the time as well—denying immigrants, who are what America is all about, inflaming racial tensions, and stoking fear.

So we in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, should take the lead and develop a way forward, a real way that will solve the problems at the border in a way that complies with humanity, the American way, and the rule of law.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Madam President, on a different subject, yesterday, four congressional leaders in the Trump administration reached a bipartisan agreement that will strengthen our national security and clear the way for important investments in America—investments in healthcare, education, childcare, veterans, cancer research, and more.

First and foremost, I am pleased to report that in this deal, Democrats have finally found a way to end the threat of sequestration permanently. The arbitrary and draconian limits of the sequester have hampered our ability to invest in working Americans for too long. There are large forces pushing the middle class around—globalization and automation—and the only answer, because most of our international companies haven’t really made the effort at least until now, is government providing ladders—ways out, ways in, and ways up—so that average middle-class people can maintain that great American dream, which means, simply put, if you work hard, you will be doing better 10 years from now than you are doing today, and you will be doing better than you. We need those kinds of programs—education, infrastructure, healthcare, and childcare—to make this happen; otherwise, these big economic forces are going to continue to push the young, the poor, and people around. The wealthy—they will do fine, even though this Republican Party and this administration seem to make them their first choice. Look at that tax cut.

So this is a good thing. It means that the shadow of sequestration, the inability of the government to provide ladders so that middle-class people can
deal with the big forces pushing them around, will no longer hover over our work on the Federal budget.

Not only did we permanently end that devastating sequester, which, by the way, the military hated, as well as people who work in the defense facto-

s covered by the sequester. It slashed the defense. It was done. General Mattis was fanatic, almost, in a good way about this. I miss him. But we Democrats did this in an extra-

ordinary fashion.

The agreement includes a significant increase in funding for critical domestic priorities, including an increase in the defense budget authority that even exceeds the increase in defense by $10 billion over the next 2 years. For those counting, yesterday’s deal means that Democrats have secured over $100 billion in funding increases for domestic programs since President Trump took office. At the same time, it en-

sures that our military is prepared to keep Americans safe around the world. This body has come together to help our soldiers and their families.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, fin-

ally, there is something we can vote on today at long, long last—the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund for those brave heroes who rushed to the Towers on 9/11. The light at the end of the tun-

nel of what has been a very long and sometimes very dark time is now only a few hours away. We have waited too long to settle this matter. Too many people have put up bipartisan roadblocks along the road. Now we are here, about to exit the tunnel and guarantee once and for all that the heroes who rushed to the Tow-

ers 18 years ago will no longer have to worry about compensation for their families when they are gone. These widows and widows, many of them sick, some of them gravely so, will not have to return to Congress anymore to fight for the compensation they always should have been given. They will be able to go home, tend to their illnesses, tend to their family members, and their friends. That is what they always wanted to do—just take care of them-

selves, their families, and their friends who got sick from the poisonous stuff that was in the air right after 9/11, when, bravely, these men and women rushed to the Towers. That is what we want. We have waited too long.

Now, we are going to have a few amendments votes first, and I warn my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: If you vote for these amendments, you will, at best, delay the bill but, at worst, kill it. Neither is a good choice, neither is a palatable choice, and nei-

ther is an acceptable choice. Let’s de-

feat these amendments. I believe they will be defeated. Then, let’s pass the bill overwhelmingly.

This body has come together to help veterans time and again. These people are just like veterans, and 9/11 seemed like a war. I was there. I was there the next day, standing on the wall of the Pentagon. It happened. In a time of war, these brave people selflessly risked their lives and rushed to the Towers to de-

fend our freedom, just like our soldiers do and just like our armed services do. So we should sign this bill into law.

Now, I will have more to say on the matter before and after the vote, about what this means, and thanking the many people, particularly the first re-

sponders—names like Zadroga, Pfeifer, and Alvarez—who made this happen. It’s hard for me to express how much I am looking forward to passing this bill here today.

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.

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NEVER FORGET THE HEROES: JAMES ZADROGA, RAY PFEIFER, AND LUIS ALVAREZ PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF THE SEP-

TEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPEN-

SATION FUND ACT

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

sume consideration of H.R. 1327, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1327) to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, later this morning we will be voting on the nomination of Mark Esper to be Sec-

retary of Defense. Dr. Esper is an outstanding choice. I don’t need to tell anyone how essential the position of Secretary of Defense is to our national security. The Secretary of Defense is key to ensuring that our Nation is pre-

pared to meet and defeat any threat. Dr. Esper has the experience, the knowledge, and the character for the job. He has an illustrious resume: West Point grad, Gulf war veteran, Bronze Star recipient, Rifle Company command-

er, a total of 10 years on Active Duty, and an additional 11 in the Na-

tional Guard and Army Reserve.

In addition to his practical military and leadership experience, he has ex-

tensive experience on the policy side of things as well. He has a master’s de-

gree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and a doc-

torate in public policy from George Washington University here in the Na-

tion’s Capital. He worked as a senior professional staff member on the Sen-

ate Foreign Relations Committee and the Governmental Affairs Committee, and a senior director for the House Armed Services Committee, and as national security adviser to former Senate Ma-

majority Leader Bill Frist. He also served
Speaker PELOSI prioritizes money for defense during the George W. Bush administration, and during the Trump administration, of course, he has served as Secretary of the Army.

As Army Secretary, he has driven budgetary support for Army modernization, supported defense cooperation with our allies, and supervised the most significant reorganization of the Army in 45 years. His character and his expertise have won him respect from both sides of the aisle.

The Democratic junior Senator from Virginia recently described Dr. Esper as “a person of sound character and moral courage” and encouraged his colleagues to support Dr. Esper’s nomination.

Reacting to Dr. Esper’s appointment as Acting Defense Secretary, the Democratic chairman of the House Armed Services Committee noted that the Department of Defense would benefit from Dr. Esper’s leadership.

Dr. Esper was confirmed as Secretary of the Army by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, and his nomination as Defense Secretary was reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee with nearly unanimous support. I look forward to seeing a similarly strong bipartisan vote for his confirmation later today.

In November 2018, the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission released a report warning that our readiness had eroded to the point where we might struggle to win a war against a major power like China or Russia. The Commission noted that we would be especially vulnerable if we were called on to fight a war on two fronts.

Rebuilding our military and equipping it to meet 21st century threats has to be a priority. I was encouraged yesterday by the fact that the budget deal arrived at by the administration and Speaker Pelosi prioritizes money for our military. While it is not a perfect piece of legislation, it will ensure that we are able to keep rebuilding our military and deliver on-time funding for our men and women in uniform.

During his confirmation hearing, Dr. Esper revealed his clear understanding of what needs to be done on the national security front: modernize and rebuild our military; ensure that we are prepared for a new era of great-power competition; and maintain the ability to confront terrorist organizations and rogue nations; cultivate our relationship with our allies; and support our men and women in uniform, who sacrifice so much to keep our Nation safe and free.

I am confident that Dr. Esper will be an outstanding Secretary of Defense, and I look forward to supporting his nomination later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Nomination of Stephen M. Dickson

Ms. CANTWELL: Madam President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the nomination of Stephen Dickson to be the next Administrator of the FAA.

I have said that it is very important that in this day and age, when it comes to aviation, safety must always be our top priority. We considered Mr. Dickson’s nomination, took the ongoing case of a whistleblower retaliation, and given all of that, it is clear to me that he is not the right person for the safety culture we need today at the FAA.

It is disturbing to me that Mr. Dickson advanced out of committee on just a party-line vote. We have never had a partisan vote on an FAA nominee in the past, and I believe we should have found consensus on the nominee for the FAA given all the concerns the public has about flying safety.

The reason why I oppose Mr. Dickson is from what I understood, after the hearing, from First Officer Karlene Petitt, who has a Ph.D. in aviation safety and is an experienced pilot over 40 years and happens to be one of my constituents. At a hearing, we basically understood that no one was holding Mr. Dickson accountable for actions that he took against her at Delta Airlines.

Back in 2010, she was a pilot on an A330 flight. She had seen a crash of an A330 plane—tragically, an Air France plane in the Atlantic Ocean. She had also heard comments from those in the Delta executive team that if you have a concern about safety, say something. So she thought she was doing just that.

As part of what she thought was important information following these A330 incidents, she said she had concerns about pilot training when it came to potential automation and failures of making sure that they were giving enough rest time to pilots. She observed that there were issues she thought were putting both her and passengers at risk.

So what did she do? Did she do what all employees, we hope, would do. She informed her superiors and suggested possible solutions. She was persistent and wanted to make sure that these recommendations were met with by the leadership of the organization—Mr. Dickson and his second-in-command, Jim Graham. Some of the concerns she raised about inadequate pilot training and not enough pilot rest were things that you would have thought would have been key concerns, say something.

I informed the Senator that Mr. Dickson’s team had made recommendations and then moved forward after it was brought up. That is right. The only reason we knew about this incident is because of his requirement to disclose it to the committee. It is standard operating procedure in the U.S. Senate to ask nominees this question: Have you or any business or nonprofit that you have been associated with been involved as a party to an administrative agency, criminal, or civil litigation?

Why do we want to know that? We want to know of any kind of derogatory information about a nominee whom we are about to entrust with the public confidence through the U.S. Senate. We want to know whether there have been any issues and whether there that trust has been misplaced.

It is very unfortunate that this situation arose, but it is more unfortunate that Mr. Dickson was not evenhanded about it when his nomination came before the Senate. We considered Mr. Dickson’s nomination at committee level, and we never had a partisan vote. We have never had a partisan vote. We have never had a party-line vote. We have never had a partisan vote on an FAA nominee in the past, and I believe we should have found consensus on the nominee for the FAA given all the concerns the public has about flying safety.

The reason why I oppose Mr. Dickson is from what I understood, after the hearing, from First Officer Karlene Petitt, who has a Ph.D. in aviation safety and is an experienced pilot over 40 years and happens to be one of my constituents. At a hearing, we basically understood that no one was holding Mr. Dickson accountable for actions that he took against her at Delta Airlines.

Back in 2010, she was a pilot on an A330 flight. She had seen a crash of an A330 plane—tragically, an Air France plane in the Atlantic Ocean. She had also heard comments from those in the Delta executive team that if you have a concern about safety, say something. So she thought she was doing just that.

As part of what she thought was important information following these A330 incidents, she said she had concerns about pilot training when it came to potential automation and failures of making sure that they were giving enough rest time to pilots. She observed that there were issues she thought were putting both her and passengers at risk.

So what did she do? Did she do what all employees, we hope, would do. She informed her superiors and suggested possible solutions. She was persistent and wanted to make sure that these recommendations were met with by the leadership of the organization—Mr. Dickson and his second-in-command, Jim Graham. Some of the concerns she raised about inadequate pilot training and not enough pilot rest were things that you would have thought would have been key concerns, say something.

I informed the Senator that Mr. Dickson’s team had made recommendations and then moved forward after it was brought up. That is right. The only reason we knew about this incident is because of his requirement to disclose it to the committee. It is standard operating procedure in the U.S. Senate to ask nominees this question: Have you or any business or nonprofit that you have been associated with been involved as a party to an administrative agency, criminal, or civil litigation?

Why do we want to know that? We want to know of any kind of derogatory information about a nominee whom we are about to entrust with the public confidence through the U.S. Senate. We want to know whether there have been any issues and whether there that trust has been misplaced.

Instead of Officer Petitt getting the firing, she was told to go back to work. It is very unfortunate that this situation arose, but it is more unfortunate that Mr. Dickson was not evenhanded about it when his nomination came before the Senate.

I am confident that Dr. Esper will be an outstanding Secretary of Defense, and I look forward to supporting his nomination later today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Nomination of Stephen M. Dickson
Mr. Dickson was more involved than just one meeting.

We all want our officials to show a commitment to safety, establishing rules and a culture that protects the flying public. That is one reason Captain Sullenberger's and Mr. Dickson's refereed to this nominee. He knows that when it comes to creating a culture of safety, it has to start at the top, and we have to listen to people like the pilots who are showing concerns today about the Boeing 787. We should listen to them and the inspector general on what types of processes should be put in place to resolve the challenges we face as we integrate more automation.

Automation can help us make things safer, but automation without the pilot training, without the integration, without a culture that rewards people for bringing up issues, instead of almost red-coding them as a response, is not what we should be doing.

A 2016 report by the Department of Transportation inspector general highlights the essential role of FAA oversight to reduce the hazards with regard to increased reliance on flight deck automation. The inspector general estimates that automation is used 90 percent of the time in flight. Yet, according to the inspector general's report, the FAA did not have a process to ensure that airline pilots are properly trained to use and monitor automation systems while maintaining proficiency in manual flight operations.

The report recommended that the FAA provide guidance in defining standards that airlines can use to train and evaluate pilots in the use of automation. It also recommended that standards be established to determine whether pilots were receiving sufficient training to develop and maintain manual flying skills.

These are the very matters First Officer Pettit had focused on when making her observations and suggestions regarding safety. They are as critical today as they were for the A330.

We are living in an era of increasing automation, and we have work to do. I guarantee that we are going to continue to play a role in this in the Commerce Committee, making sure the inspector general's criticisms of the FAA with regard to these issues are addressed. We need someone on the front line who takes safety seriously and listens to the pilots. I know these issues are weighing on the American public—the Boeing 787. That's what we need to talk about.

But Mr. Dickson has doubled down. He basically said that he had no regrets about trying to end a 40-year career of a whistleblower. I find this very challenging. I want to know what the FAA Administrator makes will determine how safe every airline passenger and crew will be.

I know that it is hard for people in busy jobs to slow down and listen to whistleblowers, but I guarantee they have helped us many times to solve many problems.

I ask my colleagues to turn down this nomination today and to help us create an environment where whistleblowers will be welcomed to yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

ENCRYPTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to rebut the deeply flawed proposal by the Attorney General this morning. This morning, he raised a tired, debunked plan to blow a hole in one of the most important security features protecting the digital lives of the American people. Mr. Barr—one again speaking from the far right—is trying to undermine strong encryption and require government back doors into the personal devices of the American people.

"Encryption" is a technical term that gets thrown around by people in government who don't want you to use it. The idea, however, is simple: It is using math to encode your information so that the only people who can read it are the ones you want to read it.

As is often true, encryption is used every time a credit card is swiped or an online bank account is accessed. It helps protect our kids from predators who would spy on them through their cell phone cameras or surreptitiously track their movements. It keeps our health records, our personal communications, and our other sensitive data secure from hackers. Strong encryption helps protect national security secrets from hackers working for the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, and other hostile governments.

I have spent a full decade fighting off horrible plans to undermine strong encryption. My usual argument goes something like this: You can't build a back door only for the good guys, for government officials who are trying to protect people. Once you weaken encryption with a back door, you make it far easier for criminals and hackers and predators to get into your digital life. We know the reasons.

Today, I want to raise some even more pressing concerns that are new. Many times in the past, I have warned that unnecessary government surveillance holds the potential to be abused, but I have never done what I am doing today. Today, I fear—rather, I expect—that if we give the Attorney General and the President the unprecedented power to break encryption across the board and burrow into the most intimate details of Americans' lives, they would abuse it. I don't say that lightly. Yet, when I look at the record, the public statements, and the behavior of William Barr and Donald Trump, it is clear to me that you can't make the case for giving them this kind of power. There is too much evidence that they will abuse it. Their record shows they do not feel constrained by the law. They have not been bound by legal or moral precepts, and they have, in their own words, no ethical compunction—these are his words—about using government power against his political enemies.

Never before have I been so certain that an administration in power would knowingly abuse the massive power of government surveillance. It is for that reason that building government back doors into the encrypted communications of the American people is now uniquely dangerous and must be opposed at all costs.

These are serious charges that I have made, and I am going to walk through my reasoning. First, I would like to discuss the case for giving them this history when it comes to government surveillance and government power.

When this body voted on Mr. Barr's nomination earlier this year, I laid out in great detail his history when it comes to Executive power. Anyone hoping for a full airing of Mr. Barr's lifelong devotion to unbounded Executive power can dial up those remarks of mine on C-SPAN, but I just want to highlight one item again this morning. Mr. Barr testified in 2003, and he laid out his ideological position that the President is not restrained when it comes to surveilling people here in the United States—not by laws passed by Congress, not by the Fourth Amendment, no constraints.

In that 2003 testimony, Mr. Barr said that the PATRIOT Act didn't go far enough in terms of government surveillance. Even worse, Mr. Barr said that the act did not give the President the power to initiate programs that lightly. Yet, when I look at the record, the public statements, and the behavior of William Barr and Donald Trump, it is clear to me that you can't make the case for giving them this kind of power. There is too much evidence that they will abuse it. Their record shows they do not feel constrained by the law. They have not been bound by legal or moral precepts, and they have, in their own words, no ethical compunction—these are his words—about using government power against his political enemies.

Never before have I been so certain that an administration in power would knowingly abuse the massive power of government surveillance. It is for that reason that building government back doors into the encrypted communications of the American people is now uniquely dangerous and must be opposed at all costs.

These are serious charges that I have made, and I am going to walk through my reasoning. First, I would like to discuss the case for giving them this history when it comes to government surveillance and government power.

When this body voted on Mr. Barr's nomination earlier this year, I laid out in great detail his history when it comes to Executive power. Anyone hoping for a full airing of Mr. Barr's lifelong devotion to unbounded Executive power can dial up those remarks of mine on C-SPAN, but I just want to highlight one item again this morning. Mr. Barr testified in 2003, and he laid out his ideological position that the President is not restrained when it comes to surveilling people here in the United States—not by laws passed by Congress, not by the Fourth Amendment, no constraints.

In that 2003 testimony, Mr. Barr said that the PATRIOT Act didn't go far enough in terms of government surveillance. Even worse, Mr. Barr said that the act did not give the President the power to initiate programs that lightly. Yet, when I look at the record, the public statements, and the behavior of William Barr and Donald Trump, it is clear to me that you can't make the case for giving them this kind of power. There is too much evidence that they will abuse it. Their record shows they do not feel constrained by the law. They have not been bound by legal or moral precepts, and they have, in their own words, no ethical compunction—these are his words—about using government power against his political enemies.

Never before have I been so certain that an administration in power would knowingly abuse the massive power of government surveillance. It is for that reason that building government back doors into the encrypted communications of the American people is now uniquely dangerous and must be opposed at all costs.

These are serious charges that I have made, and I am going to walk through my reasoning. First, I would like to discuss the case for giving them this history when it comes to government surveillance and government power.
It is far more than just words, however, that lead me to this conclusion. It is now public record that William Barr, when he was Attorney General in the 1990s, approved a massive, illegal surveillance program.

The inspector general at the Department of Justice revealed this March that William Barr gave the OK to a bulk phone records dragnet at the Drug Enforcement Agency that ran for more than 20 years. The inspector general found, never even looked to see whether that Drug Enforcement Administration bulk surveillance program was legal. The inspector general called it “troubling” because of the disconnect between what the law says and how it was secretely being interpreted and used. The Drug Enforcement Agency program that William Barr approved relied on subpoena power that requires that the records being collected be “relevant or material” to an investigation. But Mr. Barr didn’t consider whether those phone records that were collected in bulk were consistent with the law; he just went ahead and rubberstamped it.

The inspector general tends to be polite about outright calling government programs illegal, but even the inspector general pointed out that there are multiple court cases that “clearly suggested potential challenges to the legality of the DEA’s use of this statutory subpoena power in this expansive, non-targeted manner.”

Finally, the inspector general found that the records collected from the program were used outside the Drug Enforcement Agency for investigations that had nothing to do with drugs—a practice the inspector general said “raised significant legal questions.”

The inspector general goes on to note that Congress was kept almost entirely in the dark. At a time when the American people are hungry for transparency and openness and accountability, the inspector general says Congress was kept in the dark by Mr. Barr about a decades-long, illegal bulk collection program, with the exception of a single secret Intelligence Community hearing in 2007. Even then, it was obvious the program was illegal. That is why my colleague Senator Feingold and I wrote to the head of National Intelligence pointing out that the subpoena power the DEA was using was never intended for bulk collection. This was secret law, and it was wrong and dangerous.

That is why I wanted to make sure people knew Mr. Barr’s history, because this secret, illegal bulk collection program was approved by the current Attorney General. So you have an Attorney General who not only has said he is not constrained by the law, but he has a history of breaking the law. You also have a President who almost daily approves and uses continuous secret, illegal surveillance on his powers. That attitude applies to surveillance too. In 2016, in response to Russian hacking of his opponents, Donald Trump said: “I wish I had that power.”

So Donald Trump—a President who Attorney General Barr thinks can do no wrong—is the one who is driving this. This President who Attorney General Barr thinks is above the law. This is the President whom the Attorney General will, in effect, cover for at virtually every turn, as he did when he repeatedly lied about the center of this colossal, international dragnet.

Let me close by talking about why this matters to William Barr’s efforts now to break into Americans’ encrypted communications. The argument that the government needs to weaken encryption has always been based on the promise that the government will never use the back door without a court-ordered warrant.

Yet Mr. Barr, in his own words and actions, has demonstrated repeatedly, as recently as this week, that the laws don’t matter, that the courts don’t matter, and that even the Constitution doesn’t matter. The only thing that matters is what he and the President feel like doing.

So I would ask my colleagues who are here, what Senators in their right minds would give these men the authority to break into the phone of every single American? Imagine what kind of information they could gather on their political opponents. Imagine if a Member of Congress were secretly gay and were desperate to hide the fact. Despite campaigning on family values, imagine if a Member of Congress had cheated on his wife. Would a man like the individual I have described here use that information against them? Would Donald Trump use it to secure their loyalty in the face of his own wrongdoing?

I understand that the world is a frightening place, and anybody who serves on the Select Committee on Intelligence would share that view. Some government agencies will always advocate for greater powers to surveil Americans and intrude into their digital lives. It is important to remember, as I touched on in the beginning, that the banning of encryption in America will not stop the bad guys from using encryption, and it will not ban basic math algorithms elsewhere in the world. It will only leave Americans less secure against foreign hackers, and—I regret having to say this—it will leave Americans less secure against intrusions by an administration that has shown it is willing to support lawless measures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MAIDEN SPEECH

MRS. SINEMA. Mr. President, I am honored to rise to deliver my maiden speech as the newest U.S. Senator from the great State of Arizona. I was sworn in to this distinguished body just over 6 months ago. I am incredibly honored and humbled to join only a dozen others who have had the honor of representing the great State 48 in the U.S. Senate, and I am filled with gratitude to the people of the State who have entrusted me with this duty. In continuing the work of leaders who have held the Senate seat, from Senators Barry Goldwater to Ted Stevens, to, most recently, Senators Jon Kyl and Jeff Flake, I have pledged to uphold Arizona’s proud tradition of putting country above party.

Most new Senators deliver their maiden speeches sooner being sworn in. I have waited so I could use these 6 months to demonstrate to Arizonans, in actions more than words, exactly how I intend to serve our State in the Senate. I promised Arizona that I would do things differently than have others in Washington.

Americans see a lot of chaos in this city. There is intense pressure from all sides to spend time and energy on every scandal, every insult, every partisan fight, and it is very easy to get distracted. It is the simplest thing in the world to line up on either side of a partisan battle. What is harder, though, is to ignore the chaos and get out of our comfort zones to build coalitions and get things done. I promised Arizona I would do the hard work, and that approach has produced results.

In these first 6 months, two bills I have sponsored to improve protections for veterans have passed the Senate and the House, and they now await the President’s signature to put them into law. These new measures expand American Legion membership to veterans across the country, protect veterans from scam artists, and help veterans achieve the dream of homeownership. Few efforts better illustrate my approach to service or are more worthy of our attention than that of the Somers family.

As a Congresswoman, I shared the story of SGT Daniel Somers on the floor of the U.S. House, and I will now share that story for the first time on the floor of the Senate.

Sergeant Somers was an Arizona Army veteran who served two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit, and ran more than 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a humvee. Part of his role required him to program and download technical specs. His work was deemed classified. Like many veterans, Sergeant Somers was haunted by the war when he returned home. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and other symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder—all made worse by a traumatic brain injury. Sergeant Somers needed help.

He and his family did what all families who face similar challenges are urged to do—they asked for help. Yet, when the VA, the answer came. It demonstrated exactly what happens when America’s veterans are left behind. The VA enrolled Sergeant Somers in group
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therapy sessions—sessions he could not attend for fear of his disclosing classified information. Despite repeated requests for individualized counseling or some other reasonable accommodation to allow Sergeant Somers to receive appropriate care for his PTSD, the VA delayed in providing him with suitable support and care.

Like many veterans, Sergeant Somers’ isolation got worse when he transitioned to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to cope due to his disability. He struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending for more than 1 year without there having been any resolution, and he didn’t get the help he needed in time.

On June 10 of 2013, Sergeant Somers wrote a letter to his family. He wrote:

I am not getting better. I am not going to get better. And I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on.

He went on to write:

I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace. Too damaged to be at war. Abandoned by those who would take the easy route and a liability to those who should have saved me. I wish you knew what the world is like. Not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it. This is what brought me to my actual final mission.

On that day, we lost Sgt Daniel Somers to suicide.

And here’s why we must return home from having served our Nation must always have somewhere to turn for support. I am committed to ensuring that no veteran feels trapped like Sergeant Somers did and that all of our veterans have access to appropriate mental health care.

Sergeant Somers’ story will sound too familiar to too many military families. Perhaps less common is the astonishing bravery that had been demonstrated by Sergeant Somers’ parents, Howard and Jean, after their son’s death.

Howard and Jean are in the Senate’s Gallery today, and I am so honored to have them here as I share their son’s story.

Howard and Jean were devastated by the loss of their son, and nobody would have blamed them if they had turned inward to deal with their grief, but they didn’t. Howard and Jean faced the world and bravely shared Sgt Daniel Somers’ story, and they have created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Sergeant Somers’ story brings to light America’s deadliest war—the 20 veterans we lose to suicide in this country every day.

While I served in the U.S. House, I worked closely with Howard and Jean to develop and pass into law the Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act, which is legislation that ensures veterans who serve in a classified capacity receive behavioral health services in appropriate care settings.

Now it is time to take the next innovative step in providing the support our servicemembers and veterans have earned, for servicemembers’ loved ones are not always aware of the resources that are available to them—resources that can prove to be critical when those servicemembers encounter challenges during Active Duty or after their separations from the military.

The Somers’ family and I have worked over the past several months with the Department of Defense on new legislation to create a network of support for our military members. In May, I introduced the legislation Sidecar to the Daniel Somers Network of Support Act, which was cosponsored by my friend and colleague on the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, Republican Senator Thom Tillis. Our legislation requires each new servicemember be asked for the names of loved ones whom he or she considers to be part of his or her network of support. In return, the Department of Defense and the Red Cross will provide information about benefits and services that are available to military members.

By engaging loved ones and families from the beginning, the Department of Defense can better prepare and equip our military families and friends to better understand military life, to notice who serves in need, and to help ensure that servicemembers get the right kind of assistance or care. We must do everything possible to empower family and friends, who are the first line of defense in our preventing suicide among our veterans and servicemembers.

This commonsense solution could be a game-changer for the men and women who have risked their lives to protect our freedoms, for their isolation leads to tragedy. We have worked with Congressman Scott Peters, of California, who has introduced companion legislation in the U.S. House. In working as a team across party lines, we successfully included our network of support legislation in the National Defense bill that was passed by both the Senate and the House over the past few weeks.

I am proud of this accomplishment, but we have so much more to do. When servicemembers transition from active service to veteran status, they face old and confusing regulations that can be difficult to navigate even for those who are able to care for themselves. We must ensure that veterans who receive care from the VA also have a network of support in place to help them thrive and prosper when they return to civilian life. I have spoken directly with VA Secretary Robert Wilkie, who expressed his support for extending the network of support to veterans, and I look forward to working closely with him to get it done.

As we continue this work, I urge my colleagues to join me in expanding this critical program. We can help ensure together that all veterans have networks to turn to so they never have to face their challenges alone.

The story of Sergeant Somers and his parents, the failure of the VA bureaucracy to provide the support this Arizona veteran needed, and the resulting tragedy is not a story that dominated the national headlines. It is not a political scandal, and it is not a partisan food fight to which Members of Congress are pressured. It is not what reporters in the Capitol’s hallways ask me about, and it is not what people tweet to me on a daily or on even an hourly basis. You will never see a push notification on your iPhone that says, “Demonstrate every day what can get done when leaders put aside their differences and work toward common goals. Our bipartisan legislation got this far thanks in part to support from Senator Isakson and Tester, as well as from the leaders of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman James Inhofe and Ranking Member Jack Reed. However, in this effort and in so many others, it is exactly what John McCain would do. We must honor the memory of the former Armed Services chairman and my personal hero, John McCain.

So many of my colleagues in this body came to know and love Senator John McCain for his military heroism and what he accomplished for his years of service in the Senate. Back home in Arizona, Senator John McCain is also a hero for what he represented in public service.

What Senator McCain said in his last speech in this very Chamber shapes my service to Arizona every day. He said:

In the face of very great difficulties, despite the fact that we have some disagreements, some philosophical disagreements, I believe we can agree on a lot of things, and that is a good thing. It is most important to remember that in the United States of America we have a major goal, and that is to preserve and promote the American way of life.

But make no mistake, my service here is the most important job I have had in my life. And I am so grateful to the people of Arizona for the privilege—for the honor—of serving here and the opportunities it gives me to play a small role in the history of the country I love.

He went on to say:

If you feel prevented from doing the work you believe is right, I teach you a lesson: my life isn’t what I believe is right. I oppose what I believe is right. I am not trying to do the right thing. I am not trying to get things done. I am trying to get things done. I am trying to get things done. I am not trying to do the right thing. I am trying to get things done. I am trying to get things done. I am trying to get things done.

Senator McCain talked of what is possible when the Senate works the way it was meant to work. He stood for everything we stand for as Arizonans: fighting for what you believe in, standing up for what is right even if you stand alone, and serving a cause greater than one’s self.
He taught us to always assume the best in others, to seek compromise instead of sowing division, and to always put country ahead of party.

One of Senator McCain’s last acts in the Senate was to shepherd last year’s annual defense bill—the same annual bill which, this year, includes our Daniel Somers Network of Support Act. I hope we are making Senator McCain proud with such important work.

With Senator McCain’s example lighting the way, and with the trust of the people of Arizona shaping my service, I recommit to ignoring political games and focusing on upholding Arizona values to get things done for the State and for the country I love.

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.

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

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue that transcends politics and strikes at the very core of who we are as Americans.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have made it my priority to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to look past partisanship, and to work toward passing commonsense legislation so we can help working families in Nevada and across our country.

In the House, I was proud to be named one of the most bipartisan Members of Congress, and that is a title I plan to keep in the Senate. So I hope my colleagues recognize the seriousness of why I rise today.

It is without partisan motivation when I say that we have a crisis on our hands. Make no mistake about it, there is a humanitarian crisis at our southern border and we are failing to address it. This administration is failing to address it. This Congress is failing to address it.

With violence and political unrest increasing in the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, we are experiencing a surge in the number of migrants who have come to our southern border seeking refuge from violence and persecution.

More than 60 percent of migrants are families and unaccompanied children fleeing for their lives and seeking a safe place. Children and their families are coming to our country for the same reasons so many of our ancestors did—because they have no other choice. They are coming to the United States, a nation of immigrants, a nation built on a foundation of core values, and we do not turn away those fleeing persecution and certain death.

It is those same values that tell us that when children—including infants and toddlers—are at our doorstep, we do not put them in cages, tear them from their mother’s arms, let them go without showers, food, or medical attention, or let them sleep on cold floors.

The reality is, Customs and Border Patrol officers are not trained to care for children, much less those who have experienced trauma. They are not prepared nor qualified to provide the much needed care to the families and children who are coming here. What is also true is that there are members of our Border Patrol and law enforcement who are trying to do the right thing. Those men and women signed up to protect our country from terrorism, narcotics, and foreign threats. They are not trained to take care of traumatized children. The fact remains, the state of things in these immigration facilities is untenable and indefensible.

I have had the chance to see this crisis firsthand, so allow me to speak a little bit on what I have witnessed and how we got here.

Children and families have been placed into overcrowded and unsanitary facilities, left without suitable living conditions, and without access to the basic of necessities for days or even weeks.

Last year, while serving as a member of the House of Representatives, I traveled to the U.S.-Mexico border with one of my colleagues to tour the Tornillo unaccompanied minor facility and the Paso del Norte Processing Center in Texas. What we witnessed there was heartbreaking.

We saw a tent city holding unaccompanied migrant children and children separated from their parents. They have no access to legal counsel, no way to regularly talk to their families. They are without any idea of what might happen next. Throughout their camp, there was a sense of anxiety, hopelessness, and despair. I have carried the images of what I saw during that tour with me to this day.

In committee testimony and in followup briefings, in conversations with the administration and its agencies, we were told conditions would improve, that plans were in place to provide the care that is so desperately needed, and that families would be reunited. We now know that was wrong.

We have read news reports detailing the abysmal state of these facilities—children still in cages, still going to sleep hungry, still going weeks without bathing or having access to clean clothes, young children being tasked by officers to care for toddlers, and, in some cases, allegations of sexual abuse by officers.

To find out firsthand whether conditions are improving, just last week I joined my Senate colleagues in touring detention facilities in the McAllen, TX, area. I am sad to say these new news reports are accurate. These horrific conditions have not changed, families are still being separated, children are still in cages, not knowing if they will ever see their parents again, and this administration continues to ignore basic human rights. Children should never be held in these conditions under any circumstances, for any amount of time, period.

We saw children stuffed into crowded spaces. The people detained in these facilities lack access to basic necessities like toothpaste and access to sanitary supplies. There are few, if any, pediatricians, no child welfare professionals, no hope, just thousands of children and families living in the care of law enforcement officers. This is not who we are.

The dehumanization of migrants, including many tender-age children in our detention centers today, is unacceptable. The psychological trauma they have experienced, and that they are continuing to experience, will likely leave children with deep scars that will haunt them for the rest of their lives.

Let me be clear: We are failing our law enforcement, we are failing our families, and we are failing children.

We can agree that immigrants with criminal records or those who have falsified their reasons for coming should not be allowed to stay, but during my visit to McAllen last week, the acting head of Border Patrol told all of us that the vast majority of migrant families are not criminals.

I refuse to stand by while this takes place on American soil. So I decided to take action by placing holds on two individuals nominated by this administration to serve in administrative and policy roles of DHS until conditions in these facilities drastically improve, until DHS meets the standards it is obligated—obligated—to uphold.

This is the United States of America. All children deserve to be treated humanely and with dignity, and those of any age who come to our country claiming asylum have a legal right to present their case.

We must ensure that we achieve, at the very least, minimum humanitarian standards at CBP facilities. That means all CBP facilities where children are processed or detained need to have onsite medical professionals with pediatric training and child welfare professionals. That means going through a process for announced and unannounced site visits by NGOs so we can ensure proper oversight and accountability, as well as direct services for children. Even something as simple as a sign that communicates to migrant families explaining where they are and what to expect—something that simple could reduce anxiety and hopelessness that these individuals and children are feeling.

There is so much good in the American people, and that shines in the outpouring of support NGOs that are ready and willing to step in and respond. They do so many other humanitarian efforts. Yet our government is
turning away these offers of help. Conditions at these facilities have not improved, and until they do, I will not remove my holds on this administration’s nominees.

Once we have taken the necessary steps to ensure migrant children are being held in safe and sanitary conditions, we must then take up the critical and long- overdue task of reforming our long-term immigration policy. We owe it to migrant children and families to replace an immediate solution. We owe it to our law enforcement to prevent this difficult situation from continuing.

We must come together. We must take action now because, at the end of the day, these are human lives, and they depend on us.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quasi session be dispensed with.

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

VOTE ON STEPHEN M. DICKSON

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, in a few moments, at 12 noon, the Senate will vote on a cloture motion for the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. I rise in strong support of that motion. I think it will pass today, I will be supporting the nomination and it comes to a full vote on the floor of the Senate sometime later.

As chair of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, let me report that we recently voted to report Mr. Dickson’s nomination favorably to the Senate. I hope the Senate will soon confirm this highly qualified nominee. Steve Dickson was chosen for this important position based on his strong qualifications, which include almost 40 years of combined service in the U.S. Air Force and the commercial air transportation sector.

Mr. Dickson is a 1979 distinguished graduate of the Air Force Academy and graduated magna cum laude from Georgia State University College of Law in 1999, where he earned his J.D. He served in the U.S. Air Force as an F–15 fighter pilot, including assignments as a flight commander, instructor pilot, and flight examiner. From 1981 until October of 2018, he was employed by Delta Air Lines as a pilot and management executive. He retired after rising through the ranks to become Delta’s senior vice president of flight operations.

On May 15, the committee held a hearing to consider Mr. Dickson’s nomination, and he clearly demonstrated the experience and leadership abilities necessary to lead the FAA. I don’t know if there was a single member of the committee who failed to be impressed.

After Mr. Dickson’s hearing, new information came to the committee’s attention, which we gave due diligence to looking into. The information involved employees reporting possible safety violations at Mr. Dickson’s former employer while he was serving as senior vice president. These matters merited further examination. The committee conducted a review of these allegations, including multiple follow- up conversations and meetings with Mr. Dickson. We have studied hundreds of pages of legal documents.

Here is what we know for a fact about these allegations. We know for a fact—and it is uncontroversial—that Mr. Dickson was not a named party in any of these matters. We also know for a fact that he was not personally alleged to have retaliated against any of his fellow employees who raised the safety concerns.

Mr. Dickson’s responses to post-hearing questions for the record demonstrate that he has commitments to safety and to the protection of employees who raised concerns and that that is paramount, in his view. In fact, Mr. Dickson unequivocally stated in his written responses that he was never named as a party to any judicial, administrative, or regulatory proceedings and was never accused of retaliation in any sort during his tenure at his former employer.

I think the FAA, we all agree, should be the gold standard in aviation safety. I think Steve Dickson is the correct person to be at the helm of the FAA at this crucial time for the agency. The majority of the committee believes that Mr. Dickson is an excellent nominee for this position and will bring the commitment, experience, and expertise necessary to lead the FAA and fulfill its mission. I am going to be urging my colleagues to vote yes on the cloture motion and then to swiftly confirm Mr. Dickson’s nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks before we move to the vote to confirm our next Secretary of Defense.

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

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are in a great position that we are not very many months away from the withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan. This is something we are enthusiastically supported by Republicans, by Democrats, and he is obviously the right person. He has the trust of our President, he has the trust of our military, and he has the trust of Congress and the country to keep our Nation safe.

Dr. Mark Esper is the right man for the job. He is a great choice to lead the Pentagon, and I am proud to support him. And I am not the only one. In fact, I would like to take a moment to show the strong bipartisan support we have for Dr. Esper from the defense experts, former officials, and my own colleagues.

Senator Kaine from Virginia said this at Dr. Esper’s confirmation hearing:

He is a person of sound character and moral courage. He’s been proactive and transparent . . . trademarks of exceptional leadership.

Secretary Mattis—you remember him—when Dr. Esper was being sworn in as the Secretary of the Army, then-Secretary of Defense Mattis said:

The bottom line is the virtuous and vile alike have written history, but let’s remember here today that we’re the good guys . . . and this is the man who can take us forward.

Mark Jacobson, a senior adviser to Ash Carter, said:

He is someone who can work across the aisle. This is somebody who can work with Congress. And that’s really what defines him. A soldier, a scholar.

The Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell, said:

Anybody impartial would have to come away impressed by Dr. Esper’s mastery, intelligence, and thoroughness.

My colleagues in the Armed Services Committee also widely support Dr. Esper’s nomination, advancing his nomination with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Across the Capitol, both the chairman and ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee support Dr. Esper. They all support him. Chairman Adam Smith said that Dr. Esper is “capable of executing the National Defense Strategy in a way that is insulated from outside influence and political considerations,” and that if the Department would benefit from his leadership.” That is my counterpart over in the House.

Ranking Member Mac Thornberry said he has “done an outstanding job as Secretary of the Army.” I agree with Congressman Thornberry.

Under Dr. Esper’s leadership, we saw Army modernization leap forward by leaps and bounds. He managed the largest Army organization in 45 years, prioritizing research, development, and innovation. He showed accountability to the taxpayers by being responsible with his budget, making tough decisions, tough choices, streamlining legacy programs, and directing defense dollars to critical future needs. It is impressive, but being a good Army Secretary isn’t enough on its own. Secretary Mattis reminded us that civilian leaders in our military must be more than their past accomplishments. Mark Esper is more because he truly respects and honors his commitment to the men and women in uniform. I have seen this firsthand.

Back in April, I asked Dr. Esper to join me on a visit to Fort Sill in my State of Oklahoma. What impressed me was how well he communicated with the troops in the field. He is one of the troops out there, and you could see the love that he had for them. In Fort Sill, he even joined them—and I was there—for a combat fitness test workout. He participated with the troops. He ate the MREs out in the field. Any one who has been in the Army can tell
you that you don’t often find people who choose to do that, but Mark Esper did.

Dr. Esper deeply cares about the troops, whether it is making sure that they have the weapons, equipment, and training they need to succeed in their missions or simply that they have quality housing when they are on base.

We moved quickly to consider Dr. Esper’s nomination here on the floor, but that isn’t because we didn’t fulfill our duty of advice and consent. We did. Dr. Esper testified for over 3 hours. Between his hearing and his followup questions for the record, he answered approximately 600 questions. It is clear that Dr. Esper has what it takes to lead the Department of Defense and that most of my colleagues think so as well.

He has served the Nation with honor and integrity, and I am certain that he is going to continue to do so when he is confirmed.

I strongly request a strong vote to confirm Dr. Mark Esper to be our next Secretary of Defense.

With that, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

VOTE ON ESPER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stephen M. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the nomination is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will immediately notify the Senate’s action.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.


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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander    Fischer
Barrasso    Gardner
Braun    Grassley
Boozman    Hawley
Burr    Hoeven
Capito    Inhofe
Cassidy    Johnson
Collins    Kennedy
Cornyn    Lankford
Cotton    Lee
Cramer    McConnell
Crapo    McSally
Crandall    Murray
Cvena    Neil
Daines    Moran
Durbin    Murkowski
Duckworth    Nelson
Enzi    owl
Fischer    Murray
Gardner    Paul
Graham    Perdue
Hawley    Reed
Heinrich    Risch
Hirono    Roberts
Isakson    Sanders
Jones    Young
Kaine    Young
Klobuchar    Wyden
Merkley    Wyden
Murray    Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Isakson    Sanders
Vernon    Wyden
Whitehouse    Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Maine.

RECESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).
NEVER FORGET THE HEROES: JAMES ZADROGA, RAY PFEIFER, AND LUIS ALVAREZ PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF THE SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, this afternoon the Senate will vote on permanent reauthorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund. I am proud to lead this legislation on behalf of Senator GILLIBRAND, and I want to thank all of the incredible first responders for their efforts to make this day happen and, day in and day out, to get this legislation to where it is today.

This critical legislation would fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund and ensure that all those exposed to toxins and impacted by 9/11-related illnesses are thoroughly compensated now and as conditions are diagnosed in the future.

Solving this problem is urgent as more and more people become sick—people like Luis Alvarez, who came to Washington, DC, just a few months ago, postponing chemotherapy treatment to advocate for his fellow heroes. Luis is not here to watch from the Gallery today. He is watching from above. As we celebrate this vote today, we celebrate the lives of people like Luis Alvarez.

The Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act is named in honor of these three first responders who lost their lives to 9/11-related illnesses. Today, the Senate has an opportunity to honor these three and so many others we have lost who never stopped fighting for 9/11 first responders and the country they loved by voting yes on this critical legislation.

I have shared with many of my colleagues that the privilege of going to New York City before September 11, 2001, but I will never forget my first visit after September 11, 2001. It was just a few weeks after the attack had happened. I will never forget the smell. I will never forget the smoke coming out of the debris piles. I will never forget the silent firetrucks—their lights on but no sirens—as they delivered even more heroes to the recovery efforts at Ground Zero. I will never forget the force dedication of the men and women who came when they were called, watching the firetrucks with their flags heading to continue the work that by then had become so emblematic in people’s minds across this country.

The work they did in those days, those weeks, and those months wasn’t just for those in Manhattan who suffered an incredible loss. The work they carried forward for our country became symbols of our security, symbols of our freedoms, symbols of this country’s willingness, determination, effort, and tenacity to fight back.

Law enforcement officers and firefighters from across the Nation, including the West Metro Fire Rescue in Colorado, home of Colorado Task Force 1, have been tireless advocates for this effort. Every State has people who served in one capacity or another during the rescue and recovery operations of September 11th.

West Metro Fire District chief Steve Aseltine was one of 64 Coloradans with Colorado Task Force 1 who participated, as he said, searching through the rubble.” No one should be at risk of standing up and worrying, when this country needs them the most, whether the American Government has their back.

If passed today, without amendments, the legislation will head straight to the President’s desk for his signature. So I urge my colleagues today not to forget, to pass a clean bill, and to join me in opposing both amendments, and to stand with all of our first responders throughout this tragic day for this bill’s final passage and ultimate enactment.

I urge this Chamber to support those who have given so much to this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, today I will offer an amendment to pay for the spending in this bill. This is not something unusual. I did this in and day out. It has been part of the reason I ran for office—that we shouldn’t add more debt to our country without trying to pay for it by maybe reducing spending from wasteful spending.

In the last week or so, we have seen a manufactured crisis. Rarely has there been a manufactured crisis so intense—a fake furor instigated by partisans more concerned with scoring points than telling the truth. But, for some of us, the truth is still important.

The mob and demagogues in this body accuse me of holding up this bill for political points. They obviously don’t know much about politics, because there certainly hasn’t been any political gain by my holding this bill for debate and amendment. But I think it is important we do this, rather than rush through and everybody says: No questions asked, please. It sounds a little more like an authoritarian atmosphere than democracy to actually have debate, discussion, and amendments. That is all we have asked for.

In fact, last week when we were granted the amendments, we said to the other side: Let’s have the vote last week. And all of those who were in such a furor, all those who were so hysterical that the world was ending said: Oh, we cannot vote on it—it was not convenient last week—because some in our Democratic Members had already gone home for the weekend. So when the mob was told last week they could have the vote, they said no. It is a manufactured crisis. As of today, the fund in question has $2 billion in it, and no one is being denied medical care.

So let’s have an honest debate. Let’s have an honest debate about whether it matters to this country whether we are $2 billion in debt, and whether or not, we have new spending programs—no matter how charitable, no matter how needed—whether or not we are going to pay for them by reducing spending in wasteful programs.

It is perhaps a historical anomaly that this bill appropriates unlimited funds for a virtually unlimited time period.

What would you think if someone came to you, they had a good cause, and they said: You know, my neighbors’ house has burnt down, and I want to help them, and I want to give them unlimited money for an unlimited period of time?

That wouldn’t be wise. No one would do that. So why do we, in our hysteria, throw out all common sense and say that we are going to approach this as if we don’t have a problem?

We have this enormous problem in our country. We are borrowing over $1 million a minute. My amendment to offer today is to fund this bill of $10 billion in the first 10 years. Realize that this bill as written is not a 10-year bill. It is a 72-year bill. It goes to the year 2092. To my knowledge, we have never, ever had a bill that was unlimited in the dollar amount and unlimited in the time period. Mine would be to pay for the first 10 years of this. The pay would come by reducing mandatory spending by 0.6 percent. That’s 61/100th of 1 percent of other mandatory spending.

At the same time, we would exempt Medicare, Social Security, and Veterans Affairs from cuts. We would exempt the vast bulk of mandatory spending, but we would still say: If this is a wise expenditure of money, if we need more money for this fund, we would simply take it from something that is less pressing.

No matter how good a cause may be, it makes no sense to borrow from China to pay for our immediate concerns. Spending someone else’s money is not charity. Spending borrowed money is just not wise or sound governance.

Being a legislator should be about making choices, about deciding priorities, and not just cutting out wasteful spending.

No matter how much a government would be able to cut out all common sense and say: Why don’t we cut out some of this waste? Why don’t we...
quit spending money teaching foreigners how to apply to get more of our money?

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask whether it is wise to spend $300,000 studying whether Japanese quail are more sexual or libidinous or what-have-you? That is your money. So when somebody is being asked for a good cause, ask why we couldn't eliminate money we are spending on awful things that should never have been wasted in the Federal Government—borrow from China.

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask why we continue to spend $50 billion a year building bridges and roads and hotels and gas stations in Afghanistan? Perhaps that money could be better spent here at home.

The debate today is not over the spending of the money. It is over, when we do spend money—even for a good cause—whether or not we should cut corresponding funding money that we are wasting around the world, much of it not helping American citizens and much of it going to foreign countries and foreign people.

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask why we had a study last year that spent $2 million seeking to know the question: If someone in front of you in the cafeteria line sneezes on the food, are you more or less likely to pick up the food and eat it?

Seriously, this is where your tax dollars are going. If we have a better cause, and we want to fund this fund we are talking about today, couldn't we say we will not spend $2 million next year studying whether, if someone sneezes on your food, you are more or less likely to take the food?

Shouldn't we be forced as a Congress to make decisions, instead of just saying: Well, it is a good cause. So, therefore, we should not use our brain. We should put on blinders. We shouldn't think about it, and we should just say: Well, it is a good cause so let's just borrow the money from China.

Do you think that helps us as a country? Isn't part of legislation trying to prioritize spending, not just adding to the debt?

The leftwing mob maintains that Republicans have lost the moral high ground and can't talk about debt anymore because we supported a tax cut. Poppycock. This is misinformation. This is fake news. This is plainly people just not paying any attention to what goes on around here.

During the tax cut, which I supported, I offered cuts to mandatory spending which pay for the tax cut. The media seems to have forgotten this. But I forced a vote on the floor to say: Yes, we may be cutting taxes and, if it affects the deficit, we should pay for it.

Interestingly, though, the leftwing mob doesn't want to admit that when we actually cut tax rates, we actually got more money. The revenue coming in last year was actually greater than the previous year. The tax cut didn't add to the deficit. The deficit went up because we continue to spend money and we actually added more spending. The curve of spending increases actually rose faster than the revenue coming in.

When the tax cut happened, I offered an amendment to cut spending to pay for it. This is a fact. The leftwing mob and all of their buddies in the media can do and say whatever they want. It is a free country, but it is an absolute crock ofshit. Republicans who voted for this tax cut also were not concerned with spending. I, for one, was, and I offered an amendment to cut spending.

The tax cut also was passed under a law we have had on the books for some time. It is called the pay-go law. This is a law that should be working even on a bill like this current bill. But we exempt ourselves from it all the time. The current bill actually exempts the pay-go rule. If you increase spending by $10 billion, you have to decrease it by $10 billion somewhere else.

It has been on the books for a long time, but like everything else Congress does, they try to bring in rules to say: Do you think that helps us as a country?

This bill will pass overwhelmingly. At that time, I also brought up an amendment that said: Hey, you guys shouldn't waive the pay-go rule. If the tax cut causes the debt to go up, we should cut spending across board. Let's think about it. Here. There are those of us who have been consistent from day one that the debt does matter. There is no particular animus toward this bill. In the last year, I have done this probably a half dozen times. In the last 2 years, I have probably done it two dozen times. That means every spending bill.

A month ago, it was spending for the border. I support money to be spent on the border, but I don't support doing it if it adds to the deficit. The amendment I have today is identical to the amendment I had a month ago, saying: Border spending, even if you want to do it, we should cut money from somewhere else where it is not as much needed and where it is being wasted.

I did it 3 months ago for the hurricane disaster relief. Every bit of new spending—it doesn't matter whether it is middle-class tax cuts or $50 billion a year building bridges and roads in Afghanistan. The leftwing mob and their buddies in the media seem to have forgotten this.

But I forced a vote on the floor to say: We borrow over $1 million—close to $2 million every minute. This is a problem for our country. We are eroding the foundation of this country with so much debt—$22 trillion.

The tax cut was passed under the pay-go rules. I voted not to suspend the pay-go rules. I voted to actually have spending cuts to offset any increase in the deficit from the tax cut.

The establishment of both parties moved to waive this pay-go requirement. I forced a vote, and only eight Senators voted, which shows you where the real problem is. Why does the deficit go up so much? There is not one Democrat in my view who is even slightly concerned about the deficit. Not one Democrat in Congress will lift a finger to refrain from government spending. Therefore, everything—you name it, they are for it.

The problem is, Republicans aren't so good on this either. There are only a handful of Republicans who actually care about the debt, and many of them will vote consistently to raise the debt limit and vote to add new debt.

Today's vote, though, was a prelude of next week's vote. This is the preliminary. This is the introduction to our problem in our country, over $10 trillion. Next week, it is the entirety of the whole budget. Next week, both parties—and watch this closely. People say: Oh, Republicans can't get along with Democrats. Guess what. They get along just swell when it comes to spending money and adding to the debt.

This bill will pass overwhelmingly today without any concern for the debt or paying for it. Next week will be even worse. We have something called the debt ceiling. Every time we spend more money that comes in, in taxes, it approaches a debt ceiling, and the debt ceiling says you can't borrow any more money. So conservatives say: Well, we should reform our ways and quit giving away money to Afghanistan and Mexico and all those different countries. We should have reform involved with raising the debt ceiling.

What is going to come about next week is no debt ceiling for 2 years, until after the next Presidential election. It is a terrible idea. It is fiscal insanity. They also will vote to forever get rid of the debt ceiling. In 2011, amongst the tea party movement, when more people became concerned about the deficit spending, we actually came in and had a reform. For the first time, we didn't cut spending; we slowed down the rate of growth of spending. In doing so, the deficit was narrowing. For a couple of years, we were doing better. Then what happened
was basically both parties once again came together. The Republicans said: We want to be in every war overseas we can possibly get involved in, and we want to have more money spent on the military.

The Democrats said: We need more money for welfare. Guess what. They are not at odds. You scratch my back; I will scratch yours.

The Republicans and Democrats agree on one thing: Spending money is the most important thing they can do. The deficit doesn’t matter.

So when we come back, when we address this issue next week, what we are going to find is they are going to explode the debt ceiling. There will be no limits on the debt ceiling for 2 years, and they are getting rid of all pretense of having any spending caps.

A majority of Republicans, unfortunately, will even vote to get rid of the budget caps and to eliminate the debt ceiling for 2 years. This is sad.

Today, though, the Senate has a chance to vote for this $10 billion bill with very modest reductions in mandatory spending—reductions that actually exempt Medicare, Social Security, and Veterans Affairs.

Americans, particularly conservatives, need to sit up and watch closely how their Senators vote, for today’s vote is about whether your representatives really cares at all about the disaster that is our $22 trillion debt.

AMENDMENT NO. 929

Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 929 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Paul] proposes an amendment numbered 929.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a sequestration of certain direct spending)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms "direct spending" and "sequestration" have the meanings given such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 908(c)); and

(2) the term "nonexempt direct spending" means all direct spending except—

(A) direct spending for benefits payable under any function or program of the Federal Government for amelioration of old age, retirement, disability, unemployment, or health care;

(B) direct spending for the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(C) direct spending for the Medicaid program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.);

(D) direct spending for net interest (all of which is direct spending for a program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services);

(E) direct spending for certain benefits for certain World War II veterans (38 U.S.C. 1801–1807 and 1809); and

(F) direct spending for the child nutrition programs defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1701(b)).

(b) SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020, as soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, and on the dates the Office of Management and Budget issues its sequestration preview reports for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904(c)), the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, that reduces all nonexempt direct spending by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce the total amount of nonexempt direct spending for such fiscal year by $2,036,000,000.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—When implementing the sequestration direct spending under paragraph (1), the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 935) and the special rules specified in section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906); and

(B) shall not follow the exemptions specified in section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905).

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am speaking on the bill as well as the amendments. In a short time, the Senate will vote and pass a permanent reauthorization of the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund.

In my short time on the floor, I can’t do justice to the years upon years of work by the first responders, by labor leaders, by advocates, and that led to this moment. Suffice it to say, this is not a day of joy for them or for this bill’s authors; rather, it is a day of relief.

For 18 years, those first responders, some of whom are in the Gallery, have watched their brothers and sisters get sick because they rushed bravely to the Towers at Ground Zero. At first, they were told by the government the air was safe.

It was not safe. We began hearing of cancers that people never got when they were 38 or 40 or 42 occurring all of a sudden in firefighters, in police officers, and they only had one thing in common: They had all rushed to the Towers.

They had to persuade people this was real because they saw their brothers and sisters dying. Then, they endured folks telling them they were crazy for thinking they had sicknesses they suffered that had anything to do with 9/11. The liberals said: They were not crazy, and the people who told them they were, shame on them, including government agencies and others. Then, once it was confirmed beyond a shadow of a doubt that these cancers and respiratory illnesses were linked to the toxic dust and ash around the pile, it became an exhausting struggle to get Congress to provide the care they needed but they couldn’t afford.

There were numerous false dawns and delays, temporary reauthorizations. We were forced to persuade Congress to provide the care they needed but they couldn’t afford. The liberals said: We need more money spent on the military.

We want to be in every war overseas we can possibly get involved in, and we want to have more money spent on the military. The deficit doesn’t matter.

The Republicans and Democrats agree on one thing: Spending money is the most important thing they can do. The deficit doesn’t matter.

So when we come back, when we address this issue next week, what we are going to find is they are going to explode the debt ceiling. There will be no limits on the debt ceiling for 2 years, and they are getting rid of all pretense of having any spending caps.

A majority of Republicans, unfortunately, will even vote to get rid of the budget caps and to eliminate the debt ceiling for 2 years. This is sad.

Today, though, the Senate has a chance to vote for this $10 billion bill with very modest reductions in mandatory spending—reductions that actually exempt Medicare, Social Security, and Veterans Affairs.

Americans, particularly conservatives, need to sit up and watch closely how their Senators vote, for today’s vote is about whether your representatives really cares at all about the disaster that is our $22 trillion debt.
Detective Christopher Cranston. A father of 5, he was only 48 years old, but he will be buried on Thursday because of the months of work he did on the pile at Ground Zero at Fresh Kills Landfill. He spent his 20th anniversary just by chemotherapy.

"The eyes of the Nation are looking at this Chamber today to see if we will finally stand by our 9/11 heroes for the rest of their lives. In a few minutes, heroes such as James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Lou Alvarez will have their names among the history books forever, which is where they belong.

Their families are in the Gallery today—here again, walking the halls of this Chamber and this Congress to be heard, here again to ask one more time that this body do what is right—stand by them in their gravest time of need. Their families are here today to watch whether this Chamber will do what is right. They are standing here with so many others in the 9/11 community and I hope so hard that I demand that Congress do the right thing.

Let’s honor their service today. Let’s actually honor their commitment to coming here time and time again, not for themselves but for their brothers and sisters who are dying all across this country. Seven are dying a week. Let’s honor the ultimate sacrifice they paid for responding to the call of duty when the Nation needed them most. Responders came from Arizona, Wisconsin, South Dakota, California, New Jersey, through the snow and sleet.

Last week, we lost Richard Driscoll, the 200th FDNY firefighter to succumb to a 9/11 illness. More police officers have died since 9/11 than on 9/11. More than 19,000 people have been certified with a 9/11-related cancer, with more being diagnosed every day. More will get sick. More will die. Some of them will not be diagnosed for years. That includes responders, and it includes the residents, teachers, and students who stayed downtown because the government told them the air was safe. They told them it was safe to breathe, even though it was not.

This bill will not change any of that, but we can finally let the people in the Gallery, who are sitting here watching us today and witnessing this, go home knowing that the government will truly never forget. We owe them that promise. Today, we have the opportunity to let them get back to their lives, to be with their families, and to exhale. They vastly deserve that.

I thank Senator GARDNER for his leadership on this bill. I thank Senator McCONNEL for staying true to his commitment. As I said earlier, I thank Senator SCHUMER for being a tremendous advocate, leader, and partner who, never, ever, gave up. And I thank every single person who has spent their time and energy coming here again and again over these many years to advocate for this bill and for their brothers and sisters.

I ask every Senator to have empathy—just that bit of care for someone else—to vote yes on this bill and stand by our first responders. I also urge every colleague of mine to reject the amendments that are being put forward.

First is the amendment from my colleague from Utah. Unfortunately, this amendment would accomplish only one thing. It would make sure these first responders have to go through this entire process again in just a few years. It would force sick and dying police officers, firefighters, and other 9/11 first responders to waste even more of their precious time away from their families, away from their loved ones, away from their cancer treatments, away from their last moments in their homes and communities, traveling back and forth to Washington and lobbying Congress to pass the bill for the fourth time. Do not fall into this trap.

Our 9/11 heroes deserve this program as it is written in the bill, without these amendments, which will only force them to have to come back here again and again. Stand up for our heroes. End the games. Let’s reject this amendment, pass the bill, and let our heroes go home and live in peace, where they can breathe and finally exhale. I yield the floor to my colleague from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to deliver my remarks and delay the onset of the votes until after my remarks have been completed.

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

Mr. LEE. Madam President, for many years, the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund has compensated the brave men and women who responded to the horrific events of 9/11. It has been a lifeline for a long time.

Of the $7.4 billion authorized for the fund since 2011, however, $25.4 billion has already been paid out. Since February of this year, money has gotten tight and claimants’ benefits have had to be reduced. I believe it is only right for Congress to authorize and replenish the fund so that we can make those beneficiaries whole.

But the bill before us today has a peculiar feature, one that I believe requires our attention. The bill authorizes the program for 72 years and does not specify a dollar amount. If you look to page 2 of the bill, lines 8 through 10, it makes clear that this program is funded through 2029 and funded to the tune of “such sums as may be necessary.” In other words, without any finite authorization, it offers no way to ensure that the money actually gets to its intended beneficiaries and is not lost in government bureaucracy or misused in some other way. That is, in fact, how we make sure that government programs get to where they need to go, by specifying not only the purpose of the fund but also identifying how much it is that we are spending.

In 2011, the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund has always had finite authorizations, and it has always had an absolutely excellent, outstanding record of distributing waste, fraud, and abuse. The 9/11 survivors and responders deserve no less going forward.

That is why I am offering a simple amendment to this bill, one that would authorize $10.2 billion in additional funding for the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund over the next 10 years. To be clear, that is the full amount that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated is necessary for covering all claims through 2029.

My amendment wouldn’t end there. It would go further to authorize an additional $10 billion to be paid out in subsequent decades. It will not block or delay this bill’s consideration, let alone its passage, nor does it have as its intended effect any kind of downgrading of the benefits we would be paying. But it would make sure that the money gets to the victims and the first responders who need it the most—to the intended beneficiaries—rather than remaining vulnerable to the kinds of waste, fraud, and abuse that come about whenever we authorize something until 2029 with “such sums” language. This isn’t the way we normally do things.

My distinguished colleague and friend from New York has made the comment that if this amendment were to pass, it would somehow make the victims of 9/11 come back again and again and go through this process over and over again. I don’t see that. Those facts are not borne out by the record, which, again, indicates that the Congressional Budget Office itself has acknowledged that the amount of money I would be setting aside would be sufficient to fund this program.

This is how we make government programs work: With finite authorizations for a period of time and for an amount of money that we believe is sufficient. This would do that. For that reason, I am proposing this amendment.

I, therefore, call up my amendment No. 928 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Lee] proposes an amendment numbered 928.

The amendment is as follows: (Purpose: To limit the amount available for additional claims through the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund)

Strike paragraph (1) of section 2(a) and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "$4,600,000,000" and all that follows through "and over again."; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking "$10,000,000,000" and all that follows through "for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2029, and for the period of fiscal years 2030 through 2092, to remain available until expended.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 928

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on
agreeing to the underlying amendment No. 928.

Mr. LEE. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Leg.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA'S—32</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrasso</td>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Inhoffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Landgraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Risch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischler</td>
<td>Romney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassley</td>
<td>Rounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS—66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexander</th>
<th>Gardner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozeman</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capito</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connyn</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Masto</td>
<td>Markay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>McConnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craney</td>
<td>Mckay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Merkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring</td>
<td>Perdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Peters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NAYS—77

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 32 and the nays are 66.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is not agreed to. The amendment (No. 928) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 929

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This was the previous order, the question occurs on amendment No. 929 offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President. I would ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Paul amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The new bill is a signal from our Nation, from this body, from Congress, that we are representing people in all 50 States and that the Senate will live up to the words it has said over and over again, ‘never forget’—that we will never forget our 9/11 heroes and that we will never stop helping them when they are in need.

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. We will pass this bill for them, once and for all, so they can get back home where they belong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title by page for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

(Disturbance in the Visitors’ Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The expression is approval of the Gallery. Expresses was not permitted in the Gallery.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS—97</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrasso</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozer</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capito</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connyn</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Masto</td>
<td>Markay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>McConnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craney</td>
<td>Mckay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Merkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Markwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring</td>
<td>Perdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS—2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 2.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to. The amendment (No. 929) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, after this vote, the people in the Galleries above us, these brave men and women who have suffered unbelievably, will not have to come here again. This should never have been a fight. It should never have taken this long to pass this bill and make it permanent. It should never have been a question.

But now, finally, we have the chance to get this job done for our 9/11 heroes once and for all—our firefighters, our police officers, our EMTs, our construction workers, our survivors, our families who stayed in their homes at Ground Zero because EPA told them the air was safe.

This bill is a signal from our Nation, from this body, from Congress, that we
Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I congratulate all of those responsible for this long overdue legislation. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who made this happen but first and foremost all of the advocates all over the country but primarily in and around the Northeast. There were hundreds upon hundreds of individuals who rushed to that scene from my State of Connecticut, many of them dealing with potentially terminal diseases as a result of that action. I am glad we have stepped up in a bipartisan way and once again done the right thing.

I am on the floor to continue the conversation about healthcare. I wish I had as good news as comes with the passage of this legislation, which is going to extend the guarantee of healthcare to the millions of heroes in and around New York. At the very same time, we are dealing with a potential calamity for millions of other Americans who also have serious conditions, who are dealing with diagnoses like cancer.

Today, if you have a preexisting condition, you know you are going to be able to get insured for that preexisting condition. If you are the parent of a child who has a serious illness, you don’t have to worry about being denied care for your son or daughter because of that diagnosis. That is because we have the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act has been on the books now for going on a decade. It says: If you are sick, you are, no insurance company can deny you care. That has made a world of difference for millions upon millions of Americans who have preexisting conditions.

The potential calamity comes in a court case filed by Republican Attorneys General, supported by the President and by Republicans in this Congress, that would try to use the court system to do what the Congress would not—overturn the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. Congress wouldn’t do that. We debated it. We voted down measures to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because Americans all across this country rose up and said: We want you to fix what continues to be broken with the healthcare system, not tear down my coverage, not remove me from the rolls of those who are insured.

All across the country, over 20 million people have insurance just because of the Affordable Care Act—either because of tax credits we give people to afford private insurance or the 12 million people who got Medicaid because of the Affordable Care Act, never mind all the folks who buy private insurance on their own, who can finally afford it because we don’t discriminate against you if you are poor. People didn’t want that taken away from them, so they rose up all across the country, and Congress listened. By the skin of our teeth, we voted to rejection to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Because opponents of the Affordable Care Act—in particular, this President and Republicans who don’t like it—think the Affordable Care Act’s branch, they are now going to the courts to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Right now weaving its way through the court system is a case called Texas v. United States. I won’t go into the complicated legal argument, the goal of it, if it is successful, is to wipe out the entirety of the Affordable Care Act overnight. It has been successful at the district court level. It was just argued before the appellate court level, and by the account of witnesses who were there, the arguments didn’t go too well for those of us who think the Affordable Care Act should stick around.

There is just a simple question right now for my colleagues: Do you support Texas v. United States? Do you support the lawsuit that would wipe out the entirety of the Affordable Care Act overnight and replace it with nothing? I put Republicans on here because I actually know what the answer is from watching Senate Republicans. Every single Democrat in the Senate opposes this lawsuit. It is not because every single Democrat thinks you shouldn’t change anything about the healthcare system; it is because we don’t think it is a very good idea to kick 20 million people off of insurance, jack up rates for people with preexisting conditions, and have nothing to replace it—nothing. That is what will happen if Texas v. United States is successful. Petitioners have to prove the whole act to be thrown out and nothing to replace it. That would be a humanitarian catastrophe in this country, if 20 million people all of a sudden woke up and found they didn’t have insurance coverage any longer; if insurers were once again able to charge that family of a child with a cancer diagnosis two times, three times, four times as much.

The question for Republicans is: Do you support this lawsuit? I think we have to ask ourselves: I think we need to get some answers. Some of my colleagues are on record saying they hope it fails. More are on record saying they hope it succeeds. But I don’t think this body can just box its eyes and ears to the reality of what would happen if this lawsuit succeeds.

We are not riding to the rescue this Congress. Let me just be honest with you. Given how fraught the debate is here about everything but in particular about healthcare, there is no way that the Congress and this dysfunctional White House can reassemble all of the protections in the Affordable Care Act if the courts wipe them out. That is just not realistic. We don’t debate anything on this floor any longer. We don’t have the muscle to pass minor pieces of legislation like this body used to do 20 years ago, never mind a reordering and reconstruction of one-sixth of the American economy, which is what the healthcare system represents.

Republicans need to start making a decision. Do you support this lawsuit or do you not? If you do support it, you can’t just say “Well, you know, if everything goes through the roof for people with preexisting conditions, we will figure it out” without having a specific plan for how you are going to do that. It is not good enough to just say “I hope that lawsuit succeeds. I hope everybody loses their insurance. And then, the day after, we will come back and we will see if we can try to find people healthcare.” That is irresponsible. That is not satisfactory. It isn’t enough for people out there who are dying every day to fear that their insurance is about to vanish.

The problem is, the last time Republicans started thinking about what they would want to replace the Affordable Care Act with, it was a joke. It was a joke. The Better Care Reconciliation Act, which was Senate Republicans’ replacement for the Affordable Care Act—CBO found that it would increase the number of people without insurance by 22 million. It found that by 2026, an estimated 49 million people would be without insurance, almost doubling the number who lack insurance today. That is not better care; that is much, much worse care. So forgive me if I don’t have confidence that my Republican friends who run the Senate today are going to have a plan to deal with a successful Texas v. United States court case that keeps insurance for people in my State, the 111,000 people in Connecticut who get insurance through the private market with ACA subsidies and the 268,000 people in Connecticut who are covered in my State under the Medicaid expansion.

It is time for everybody in this body, whether Republican or Democrat, to step up and say: A, do I support the lawsuit to get rid of all of the protections in the Affordable Care Act, with nothing to replace it, and B, do I have a plan for what to do if the lawsuit that I support is successful?

Chris, from Westbrook, CT, is asking that question of everybody in this Chamber. Here is what he said:

I am a 30 year old patient living with muscular dystrophy type 2B. Preexisting conditions can happen to anyone. Disease does not discriminate. . . . No amount of pre-planning or prudence can stop you from preventing a genetic disease, for example. You can be healthy one day and have a health crisis the next. Everyone knows someone with a preexisting condition. It is a lifesaver—having insurance when you have a preexisting condition is your ticket to afford lifesaving medicines and treatments.

Chris is watching carefully to see what the answer to this question is.
Jeff in Enfield, CT, told me that in 2012, at the age of 7, his daughter was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. He said: “By the time we noticed the symptoms and took her to the doctor, she most likely had only a couple weeks left to live. She is healthy today thanks to a daily regimen of insulin. But insulin in the U.S. costs five to ten times what it costs everywhere else. . . . Without insurance, the expense of keeping our daughter alive would ruin us. The prospect of my daughter being un-insurable is terrifying. . . . Without the ACA’s insurance protections, the problem would be epidemic.”

The problem of people not being able to afford insulin all across this country.

Jeff continued: “How can anyone be expected to live under that kind of strain, especially a young person just starting out in life?”

I am asking this question of my colleagues on behalf of my constituents, but millions of Americans who are sick or have a child who is sick are sick and tired of Congress playing politics with healthcare. You may not love everything in the Affordable Care Act, but I do not think it is a just or humane thing to try to score a political point on healthcare. You may not love every-thing in the Affordable Care Act, but I do not think it is a just or humane thing to try to score a political point on healthcare.

Asking the courts to overturn the entirety of the act with no plan to replace it is an abdication of the promise that has been made. I don’t begrudge people trying to repeal a law they don’t like if they think they can do something better, but Congress didn’t repeal the Affordable Care Act because people didn’t want us to do it.

This is an irresponsible and thoughtless mechanism to try to score a political victory, but it ends up playing with lots of people’s lives.

I urge the Senate to reject the Affordable Care Act and replace it with something better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today America lays to rest the great Justice John Paul Stevens. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, it is my privilege, along with my Illinois colleague Senator DUCKWORTH, to introduce and have adopted a bipartisan resolution honoring this remarkable and noble man, a native of the city of Chicago.

During his Supreme Court confirmation hearings in 1975, then-Judge John Paul Stevens faced a line of questioning about his health, which, in retrospect, is amusing. They were asking questions about his health 44 years ago. Justice Stevens had undergone a single bypass heart surgery 2 years earlier, and the members of the Judiciary Committee wanted to make sure he could handle the rigors of serving on the U.S. Supreme Court. History has shown us that Justice John Paul Stevens had not only a strong heart but a good heart when it came to serving on the U.S. Supreme Court. Sadly, that mighty heart finally did stop beating last week. Justice Stevens was 99 years old. He died peacefully with his daughters Elizabeth and Susan by his side.

My State of Illinois is proud to claim John Paul Stevens as a native son. He was a member of a prominent Chicago family, and he grew up in the luxury of his family’s home, then known as the Stevens Hotel and now known as the Hilton Hotel at Navy Ave. He never used the privilege of his family’s wealth to shirk his responsibilities as a citizen of America.

In World War II he was a lieutenant commander in the Navy. He was awarded the Bronze Star for his service on the code-breaking team, whose work led to the downing of the plane of the man who had planned the attack on Pearl Harbor. After the war, he became an accomplished attorney and a champion of good government. It was John Paul Stevens’ integrity, as much as his brilliant legal mind, that convinced President Gerald Ford to nominate him, then a Federal judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court in 1975. President Ford called then-Judge Stevens “the finest legal mind I could find.” The Senate obviously agreed. The vote on the Senate floor for John Paul Stevens’ confirmation was 98-0.

He was the second oldest and third longest serving Justice in the history of our Nation, but it is the quality of his service, and not its length, that most distinguishes John Paul Stevens’ career on the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Stevens approached disputes fairly, squarely, and succinctly. He took great pains to understand all sides of a case and give all sides a fair hearing. He rejected the easy path of ideology, and he was willing to change his position when that was warranted.

He authored the majority opinions in some of the most famous and important Supreme Court decisions in his time. One example was in 2004. Justice Stevens wrote the majority opinion in which the Court, by a vote of 6 to 3, rejected the Bush administration’s view that prisoners at Guantanamo Bay could be held beyond the reach of the law with no access to the Federal courts. The case was Rasul v. Bush.

In 1984, in the landmark Chevron case, Justice Stevens wrote an opinion for a unanimous Supreme Court about the deference owed to Agency interpretations of Federal statutes, crafting a legal framework that has been cited in more than 11,000 subsequent judicial opinions.

He was also often brilliant in dissent. In his lengthy dissent in Citizens United v. FEC in 2010, Justice Stevens rejected the radical and, I personally believe, dangerous notion that corporations have essentially the same First Amendment rights as individuals and should be allowed to spend, potentially, unlimited amounts of money on campaigns.

President Eisenhower famously said that he made only two mistakes as President, “and they’re both sitting on the Supreme Court.”

President Ford felt just the opposite about his choice in Justice Stevens. In 2005, the year before his death, President Ford wrote of Justice Stevens: “I am prepared to allow history’s judgment on my term in office (if necessary, exclusively) on my nomination 30 years ago of John Paul Stevens to the U.S. Supreme Court.” I can think of no higher praise.

Justice Stevens stepped down from the Supreme Court 9 years ago. Anyone who had hoped that he might slip quietly into retirement was certainly disappointed. He continued in his retirement to speak and write forcefully and eloquently on major issues facing America.

In 2014, he testified before the Senate Rules Committee on the dangers that dark money in politics posed to American democracy.

I quote from his book. Justice Stevens once told an interviewer that the person who most motivated him to write was a professor from whom he took a poetry class at the University of Chicago. The professor’s name was Norman Maclean. In his own retirement, Norman Maclean wrote a semi-auto-biographical novel entitled, “A River Runs Through It and Other Stories.” It was later made into a movie starring Robert Redford.

Looking at the life’s work of John Paul Stevens, it is clear that a river ran through his life too. The currents in that river included a reverence for American democracy and the Constitution, compassion and respect for individuals, and a painstaking commitment to decide each case on its merits rather than relying on easy answers suggested by political ideology.

Justice John Paul Stevens was a great man and a courageous man, whose strong heart was matched by a brilliant mind, ceaseless curiosity, and a fierce commitment to justice. He fought the good fight. He served our Nation with honor, and he safeguarded our democracy. May he rest in peace and honor.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 282, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.
The bill clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 282) honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am further asked to announce that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to consider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

**BORDER SECURITY**

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I made my second trip to the southern border just this last Friday with, I believe, 14 of my Senate Democratic colleagues and the largest congressional delegation I have ever been a part of for this type of assignment. We went to McAllen, TX.

Approximately 40 percent of those who present themselves at our border come to McAllen, TX. There is a port of entry there where many people, of course, are detained when they present themselves at nearby border positions.

Just a few months before, I had been to El Paso, TX, and, in El Paso, about 20 percent of those who come to our southern border present themselves as well. It was an eye opener and an emotional experience to see the hundreds of people who are being held in detention at our border in McAllen.

There were two contrasting images. One of them was the image of a Catholic nun, Sister Norma Pimentel, who has, for most of her adult life, dedicated herself to those who come to our border seeking refuge and security. Catholic Charities in McAllen, TX, has an extraordinary center filled with volunteers from all over the United States. I met some people from the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois and from all across the Nation who had given up their daily lives to come down and volunteer and do the basics—cook food, clean up, pass out toiletries, and offer a helping hand to many people who have just gone through the worst struggle in their lives.

Sister Norma is an extraordinary person, and she has really touched the hearts of so many people in her caring and loving way. It is a reminder time and again of the goodness of so many Americans who want to tell the world that we are in fact a nation driven by values of importance.

It was my good fortune to have breakfast with her and then spend another part of my day with her and my Senate colleagues. That hour—that hour—I will never forget—is when I saw these people, many of whom had struggled for weeks, a month, days and days to get to the border of the United States. They had gone through life experiences that we wouldn’t wish on anyone. They were victims of assault, rape, and crimes that were committed against them, but they were leaving determined to come to the U.S. border. Many of them, particularly from the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, about what they had been through and the threats to their families in these countries, which are largely lawless now, as these drug gangs and others threaten their lives. We were there in desperation that many of them made this journey, cashing in everything they owned on Earth to try to make it to the border of the United States.

There is today’s story, but it really is the story of this country that goes back for many years. It was 108 years ago that my grandmother decided to make her journey to the United States with three small children. She brought two daughters and her son from the Russian Empire. She was an immigrant. She was never an immigrant. She came to the United States. Her 2-year-old daughter, which she carried in her arms, was my mother, and I am a proud son of that Lithuanian immigrant.

What did they come to the United States? Simply because they heard there was a better chance for a better future if they made it here.

That is the story of this country. We are being tested now at this time in this generation as to whether that story is still alive. Now, we understand there are some basics here. I hope we can all agree on them. Perhaps some will not, but I believe they are important.

The first is that we need border security. In an age of terrorism with the worst drug epidemic in the history of our Nation, it is right for us to know who is coming into this country and what they are bringing into our country.

Secondly, we want to make certain that anyone who is known to be a danger in this country is never admitted to this country, and that those who are here undocumented and who commit a serious crime have forfeited their right to stay, as far as I am concerned—no questions asked beyond that.

The third thing is that we have to have an orderly immigration system. We cannot absorb every person in the world that wants to be in the United States at this moment. It just is not in our best interest. It really isn’t in theirs either. We need an orderly immigration process. The question we have to ask ourselves is this: If we agree on those three things, can we then agree that we have a broken immigration system that needs to be repaired? Can we agree that people who do present themselves at the border will be treated in a humane fashion?

I told the story of Sister Norma, but if you look at the immigration policy of the Trump administration, you find a much different message to the world. We remember when this President initiated his Presidency by establishing a Muslim travel ban, creating chaos at airports across the country, and continued to separate thousands of American families. We remember the policy of this administration when the President announced the repeal of DACA. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, is a program that grew out of the DREAM Act, a bill that I introduced about 18 years ago. It was a bill that said—or an Executive decision, actually, under President Obama: that if you were a child, if you entered this country as a child, and your parents made the decision to come, and you were just along for the ride, but you lived in this country, got an education in this country, didn’t create serious crimes in this country, you deserve a chance.

You got up every morning and went to school and pledged allegiance to that flag and believed it was your own, and, then, probably when you were about 10 or 12, someone in the family told you something that you had heard before: You were not legally in America.

What should we do with these young people? Well, when I introduced this bill 18 years ago, my plan was to give them a chance to regularize their way to legal status, finish their education, make certain that they have no serious criminal record, be willing to serve this country in the Armed Forces—and so many of them are—be willing to go to school and pledge to serve in teaching, engineering, nursing, or medicine, and then we gave you a chance for a green card and a path to legalization and citizenship in America.

In 18 years, I have never been able to make this the law of the land, but I prevailed on President Obama to create a program based on this premise, and he created the DACA Program. Now, over 800,000 young people in America stepped up, paid a $600 filing fee, went through a criminal background check, and they were given permission to stay in this country without fear of deportation and with permission to work in this country as well.

Who are they? There are so many different people. I have introduced them on the floor today—I mean other days, I should say—with color photographs and telling their stories. The ones I think of immediately, the stars of the class, as far as I am concerned, are the 30,000 DACA students who are currently enrolled in the Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine in Chicago, which made the competition for the school of medicine open to DACA recipients, and they competed openly and won 32 slots.

In order to pay for their education, because they don’t qualify for Federal assistance to go to school, my State of Illinois loans them money, and for each year that they are loaned money, they promise to serve a year, once they are licensed physicians, in an area of medical need in my State. What a wonderful program that takes into account their skills and talent and our need in
the State for medical care in rural communities in Smalltown, America, and in the inner city of Chicago and other big cities in my State.

Well, the President of the United States decided to end the program that made it eligible to apply to medical school, and in making that decision, the President jeopardized the completion of their medical degrees because, you see, no matter how hard they worked, that medical degree leads to a residency where they learn how to practice medicine hands on, and a residency is a job, and to be legally entitled to work in this country, you need to have DACA protection, which President Trump took away.

So many of them found the prospect that their medical education would end because of the President’s decision. Fortunately for them, the case was brought to Federal court to try to stop President Trump from eliminating DACA, and it provided us with a program to determine with its protections until the court case is resolved. That could happen, and it could happen soon.

It tells you what happens when a President makes a decision that affects so many people that the damage that it can do, not just to them and their families but to our Nation.

The President also terminated the Temporary Protected Status Program for multiple countries that protected some 1 million people that had come to the United States over the years because of adverse natural disasters or political conditions in their country.

Then the President, last year, initiated a program called “Zero Tolerance” that resulted in the disastrous separation of thousands of families at the border. A court found “an immediate risk to the health and safety.” The inspector general is right. That condition that I saw was a risk to health and safety.

Then, the President, through a series of his infamous tweets, threatened mass arrests and deportations of millions of immigrants who have committed no crime and posed no threat to the safety and security of their communities. What the President has done is create more fear in the immigrant communities around Illinois and around this Nation.

Then, the President put in place a new rule that blocks asylum claims at the border for nationals of any country except Mexico, including families and children fleeing persecution. The UNHCR, the United Nations refugee agency, said that the rule that the President promulgated will endanger vulnerable people in need of international protection from violence or persecution.

Now the President is continuing on his path of destruction. He is considering reducing the number of refugees that the United States will admit in the year 2020 to zero.

You have to go back in history to the World War II, when the President of the United States, a member of my own political party, made a conscious decision to tell those Jewish people coming from Europe that they would not be allowed admittance into the United States to escape the Nazi Holocaust. The story of the SS St. Louis is one that people should read and consider. The 900 passengers on that ship who were rejected by the administration as refugees and sent back to Europe. A fourth of them died in the Holocaust.

Because of our feeling of shame after World War II, the United States, under Presidents of both political parties, said that we would try to set a standard for the world when it came to accepting refugees, and we did. An average of 20,000 refugees a year were admitted into the United States. Think back to the Cubans who came to this country to escape communism under Castro. They have become such a vibrant part of America today, and in fact three of the Senators today are of Cuban descent. They were part of that refugee movement—maybe not their generation but in their family.

Then, of course, we accepted Jewish people from the Soviet Union, who were being persecuted. Soviet Jews found a welcoming America. The Vietnamese who risked their lives to fight on our side in that horrible war were welcomed into the United States rather than see them face persecution in their own countries.

The story goes on and on and for years and years. For decades the United States established a standard of caring when it came to refugees. Now the President has said he will end it. For the last 2 years, the Trump administration has set the lowest refugee ceilings in history in the midst of the worst refugee crisis in history. Now the administration may slam the door at least for a year or until someone prevails in the President.

Today, as almost every day, the administration has announced a new rule that allows immigration officers to arrest and deport undocumented immigrants anywhere in the United States without consulting an attorney or counselor or defending themselves in a hearing before an immigration judge. It is summary judgment on the street to deport people and tear families apart.

America is better than this. We can certainly keep America safe and respect our heritage as a nation of immigrants. We can have a secure border and abide by our international obligations to protect refugees fleeing persecution as we have done on a bipartisan basis for decades.

When I went and toured the McAllen Border Patrol station, Donna, and Ursula, we met with many of the leaders there and saw firsthand what is happening. We are starting to build facilities that will be more humane, at least by design, and hope that is exactly what happens.

I would like to say a word about the men and women who work for Customs and Border Protection. I am not going to make any excuses for those who have abused people in the past or those who have said horrible things online about them—no excuses at all. But the
people I met as part of our government service at the border were overwhel-
mingly good and caring people who are con-
fronted with a situation at the bor-
der that they never envisioned with
circumstances beyond their control. So
I want to say a word for those who are
doing their duty under these ex-
tremely difficult circumstances and thank
them for their service.

The reality is that President Trump's poli-
cies, as harsh and cruel as they have
been, have been ineffective at our south-
ern border and has made our situation
less secure than when he took office.

The President's obsession with the bor-
dal wall led to the longest government
shutdown in history, even paralyzing our
immigration courts for that 35-day
period.

More refugees have been driven to the
corner because the President has shut
the legal avenues for migration and
blocked all assistance to sta-
bilize the Northern Triangle countries.

Unfortunately, we still have
that country in Guatemala, El Salvador,
and Honduras an opportunity for those
who wished to come forward and apply
for asylum status in the United States
without leaving their own country if
they wished to do so.
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There is also a gaping leadership vac-
cuum at the Department of Homeland
Security. In the 2½ years the President
has been in office, there have been four
different leaders in the Office of the
Secretary of the Department of Home-
land Security, and in every major sub-
category position, whether it is inte-
rior enforcement or border enforce-
ment, there have been at least as many
people in an acting capacity and not in
a permanent capacity.

I will say that we have tried our best
to work with this administration when
they have asked for help and volun-
teered it when they didn't. Last Feb-
uary, when we passed the omnibus
bill, we included over $400 million for
humanitarian assistance at the border,
and when the President came back and
asked for an emergency supplemental
of $4.6 billion for additional funding,
Democrats joined Republicans to pass
that legislation.

Last year, before the border crisis
began, Senate Democrats supported a
bipartisan agreement, including robust
border security funding and dozens of
provisions to strengthen border secu-

ity. But the President threatened to
deny funding to get what he wanted.

We stand ready to work on this side
of the aisle for smart, effective, hu-
mane border security policy. We need
to have a bipartisan approach. Repub-
lican colleagues need to step up and
find a constructive way to deal with
the challenges we face on the border
today. We can keep America safe. We
can continue to probably call ourselves
a nation of immigrants. What we are
seeing now is a situation which begs for
a bipartisan, compromise solution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. CAS-
SIDEY. The senior assistant legislative clerk
proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I come to the
floor just the day before Robert
Mueller is set to come before the House
Intelligence and Judiciary Committees
to focus attention on some of the key
findings of the special counsel’s report
on Russia’s interference in our 2016
elections.

I have spoken on the floor many
times about the depth and breadth of
the Russian interference in the 2016
election. The special counsel’s report
goes to great lengths to detail this,
in his terms, “sweeping and systemic in-
terference.” What continues to be wor-
risome is that these information war-
fare attacks and cyber influence opera-
tions are ongoing with more plans for
our elections next year.

This threat to our national security
and the integrity of our democracy has
yet to be sufficiently recognized or
counted by this administration. Indeed,
in the months since the report was re-
leased, the Trump administration and
congressional Republicans have repeat-
edly claimed that the report vindicates
the President on all charges of collu-
sion between the Trump campaign and
Russia and on obstruction of justice
rather than taking steps to ensure that
we will never be targeted in this way
again.

The special counsel’s testimony is
vital so he can detail what he uncovered
and shed additional light on the
events of the investigation. In par-
cular, what Congress and the Ameri-
can people need to hear from Director
Mueller relates to three broad cat-
categories of questions. For instance,
whether the special counsel found
that the Trump campaign and
Russia and on obstruction of justice
rather than taking steps to ensure that
we will never be targeted in this way
again.
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and the extent to which Russia influenced the 2016 election. These hearings are not the end. This is not case closed. The intelligence community has assessed that the threat from Russia will continue to evolve and grow even more sophisticated. For our elections to remain free, open, and transparent, we must take seriously the threat posed by Russia and other potential foreign adversaries. We must hold hearings in the Senate with testimony from the special counsel’s office and key witnesses from the report. We must consider legislation on election security, foreign influence operations, disinformation, Federal election laws, money laundering, and many other issues.

When it comes to protecting our democracy, we cannot be complacent. Now is the time for action to make sure we are ready ahead of the elections in 2020 and beyond. Each and every one of us in this Chamber swore an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. In order to do that, we can’t just take tweets about no collusion and no obstruction at face value. This isn’t a witch hunt. It should be an effort to circle the partisan wagons around the President and absolve him of any wrongdoing. It has to be a serious examination of what happened and how to defend our Nation against future attacks.

Mr. President, in anticipation of the upcoming testimony of the special counsel before the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees, I want to highlight key findings in his report that go to the heart of Russian interference into our elections in 2016 and the ongoing threat still facing our national security and the integrity of our democracy.

Indeed many of the President’s own national security officials have warned of heightened Russian information warfare attacks and other foreign influence operations in next year’s election—which could make its 2016 interference in our elections, catalogued in the Mueller report, look like child’s play. Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Wray recently stated that the 2018 midterm elections were seen by Russia as “a dress rehearsal for the big show in 2020.” Wray added that the FBI anticipates that threat being “more challenging.” Director of National Intelligence Daniel Coats warned the Senate Intelligence Committee in January 2019 that, in the 2020 election cycle, “Moscow may employ additional influence toolkits—such as spreading disinformation, conducting hack-and-leak operations, or manipulating data—in a more targeted fashion to influence U.S. policy, actions, and elections.”

Despite this ongoing and increasingly sophisticated threat, we are still not fully prepared to defend against the inevitable Russian attacks on our democracy. The Russian interference in the 2016 election was akin to a military operation against our nation. To date, we do not have a complete understanding of what happened in 2016. More importantly, we do not have a comprehensive strategy, nor have we reorganized our government or prepared the American people for the next inevitable Russian interference will not happen again. The release of the Mueller report cannot mark the end of the strategy to investigate and prevent Russian interference. The special counsel’s testimony will add to the urgency for this administration and Congress to change course and act immediately to protect our democracy and strengthen public faith in the American election process.

Since the release of the special counsel’s report, the President, the Attorney General, and some Republican congressional leaders have said that the case of Russian interference in the 2016 election is closed, that our work is done, and that we can move on. The President, he made clear that he is the special counsel’s report cleared him of any connections to Russia and any wrongdoing in contradiction of the voluminous evidence laid out in the report. But those declarations of innocence and attempts to dismiss this report, Mr. President, the Administration, the President and his associates have a duty to review the findings of the special counsel on behalf of the American people and not simply accept the administration’s spin and mischaracterizations of Robert Mueller’s findings.

Despite the President’s declarations of “hoax” and “witch hunt,” the special counsel’s office did bring indictments for “conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud the United States” under 18 U.S. Code § 371, against Putin cronies Yevgeny Prigozhin, who was in charge of the Kremlin-linked troll operation known as the Internet Research Agency, and against his related holdings and multiple employees. The indictment also contains conspiracy indictments of 12 officers from Russian Military Intelligence, also known as the GRU.

While the available evidence did not meet the legal standard to charge the President or his associates with a crime for a coordinating role in that conspiracy, the special counsel takes care to note that does not mean that evidence of coordination does not exist. This is not, as the President has attempted to do, an attempt to characterize this report as a “Hoax.”

As the special counsel plainly points out, in regards to coordination with Russia, while “this report embodies factual and legal determinations that the office believes to be accurate and complete to the greatest extent possible, given these identified gaps, the office cannot rule out the possibility that the unavailable information would shed additional light on (or cast in a new light) the events described in this report.”

What is more, President Trump and his supporters purposefully leave out important context from the report where the special counsel explains that he lacked the authority to indict a sitting President because of an Office of Legal Counsel, OLC, opinion finding that “the indictment or criminal prosecution of a sitting President would impermissibly undermine the capacity of the executive branch to perform its important constitutional function” in violation of “the constitutional separation of powers.”

Another critical consideration for the special counsel was that a Federal criminal investigation of a sitting President could preempt the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution to address Presidential misconduct. In addition, Mueller notes that “a President does not have immunity after he leaves office” and that “we conducted a thorough factual investigation in order to preserve the evidence when memories were fresh and documentary materials were available.” Put together, while the special counsel concluded that he could not prosecute the President, he made clear that he is creating a record of evidence and deferring to Congress and future prosecutors should they pursue an obstruction case.

Which is all the more reason why we must hear from the special counsel on his findings and his decision-making process. In particular, what Congress and the American people need to hear from Special Counsel Mueller relates to three broad categories of questions. First, what was the nature and extent of the Russian interference campaign launched against the United States in the 2016 election? Second, what evidence did the investigation find of Trump campaign associates or the President coordinating with the Russian campaign, and why did Mueller decide the available evidence was not sufficient to prove “beyond a reasonable doubt” that they had criminally conspired with the Russian efforts? And finally, what relate to acts of obstruction by Trump campaign associates and the President himself.

On the first set of issues, one of the main responsibilities charged to the special counsel by the Department of Justice was to conduct a “full and thorough investigation of the Russian government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election.” As the report concludes, “the Special Counsel’s investigation, established a Russian intervention in the 2016 election primarily through two operations.”

First, Mueller provides detailed evidence that Kremlin-linked operators sought to help the Kremlin’s preferred candidate, whose election would serve Russia’s interests. The report describes how a Kremlin-linked troll operation, called the Internet Research Agency, “carried out a social media campaign that favored presidential candidate Donald J. Trump and disparaged presidential candidate Hillary Clinton.” It also found that “[a]s early as 2014, the [Kremlin-linked Internet Research Agency] instructed its employees to
target U.S. persons who could be used to advance its operational goals.”

Second, Mueller describes in detail the Russian spying operation to steal “dirt” on the opposition candidate and then use that stolen information against her. The report states equivocally, “[a] Russian military intelligence’s spying operation conducted computer intrusion operations against entities, employees and volunteers working on the Clinton Campaign and then released the stolen documents.

The Mueller report makes clear that the Russian election interference was a coordinated campaign targeting our democracy along multiple lines of effort. While these conclusions affirm the assessments of our intelligence community, the President appears unwilling or unable to take them seriously.

At the G20 Summit in Osaka in June 2019, President Trump treated Russian election interference as a joke, signaling to Putin that he would not hold Russia accountable. And in a recent interview, the President failed to grasp what was wrong with taking “dirt” on his political opponent from a foreign source and indicated that, if it happened again in the 2020 campaign, he would do it again.

The special counsel’s report presents significant evidence that President Trump and his associates embraced, encouraged, and applauded Russian help. The report definitively concludes that Russia saw its interests as aligned with, and served by, a Trump Presidency that would lift sanctions and otherwise hinder the ability of the special counsel to obtain relevant communications pertinent to the investigation. In each of these cases, the Mueller report found that “those lies materially impaired the investigation of Russian election interference.”

Furthermore, the special counsel’s report found that the President and his aides materially impaired the investigation. For instance, the President did not give an in-person interview to the special counsel and would only answer written questions that did not address issues relating to Presidential obstruction. In his written responses, the President replied that he could not recall or did not remember more than 30 times, covering the vast majority of the special counsel’s questions. In addition, the Trump campaign associates and others from his inner circle, including General Michael Flynn, George Papadopoulos, and Roger Stone, and his attorney Michael Cohen, lied about their dealings with Kremlin or Kremlin-linked actors. Michael Cohen, for example, admitted to the special counsel that among the reasons he lied to Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project was to try and limit the ongoing Russia investigation. In each of these cases, the Mueller report found “those lies materially impaired the investigation of Russian election interference.”

Similarly, the special counsel found that Trump campaign associates frustrated the investigation by withholding information or otherwise impeding the ability of the special counsel to obtain relevant communications pertinent to the investigation. One example was Trump campaign associates’ communications with Konstantin Kilimnik, a Ukrainian national whom the FBI assesses as having ties to Russian intelligence and who worked for Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort’s political consulting business for many years. During 2016, Manafort directed his campaign deputy Rick Gates to provide internal polling data to Kilimnik. Manafort expected Kilimnik to share that information with others in Ukraine and Putin crony Oleg Deripaska, who had funded pro-Kremlin influence operations in the past. The Mueller report details that Gates used an encrypted app to send the polling data and then deleted it daily. As a result of deleted and encrypted communications and because of Manafort’s false statements, the special counsel was not able to determine what happened with this data and whether it was part of a coordinated effort between Russia and the Trump campaign to interfere in our elections.

What makes the Mueller’s testimony even more urgent are the Trump administration’s efforts to attack the credibility of the report and to prevent Congress from further investigating Russian influence operations that did not address issues relating to Presidential obstruction. The White House has adopted a strategy of trying to block key witnesses named in the Mueller report from testifying before...
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It is not only the White House that has been trying to muddy the waters around the Mueller report. Attorney General William Barr has deliberately mischaracterized and increased partisan skepticism of the report. Before releasing the report to the public, Barr published a misleading summary of its findings, which the special counsel disputed. Barr also held a press conference where he claimed that the White House fully cooperated with the special counsel’s investigation, that the special counsel found “no collusion,” and that there was not sufficient evidence to establish obstruction of justice. These statements are favorable to the President, but none of them are consistent with the special counsel’s findings.

As I have laid out, despite the ongoing and increasingly sophisticated threat we face and despite the 2020 election being less than a year and a half away, we are still not prepared to defend against the inevitable Russian attack on our democracy. As Mueller said during his press conference on May 29, 2019, “I will close by reiterating the central allegation of our indictment—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election. That allegation deserves the attention of every American.” I could not agree more. We cannot forget that Russia interfered in our election in 2016 with hybrid warfare tactics similar to what the Chinese did in 2018. And our intelligence community assessed that it is poised to conduct additional operations against our elections in 2020 with increasing sophistication. We cannot ignore these attacks or wish them away.

The impediments erected by the President and the people around him meant that despite the best efforts of the Mueller team, there remains unfinished business in getting to the bottom of what happened in 2016 and after, which is why it is critically important we hear from the special counsel.

While it is an important step that the special counsel is testifying to the House in front of two committees, I am making this statement about the questions that should be asked of Mueller because, as of this moment, there are no scheduled hearings or plan for him to appear in the Senate. We should be holding hearings in the Senate with testimony from the special counsel and others, including the ones I have raised. We should be passing legislation, including on election security, to ensure that we are appropriately reorganized across government and society ahead of the elections in 2020 and beyond. Indeed, the administration needs to take election security seriously. That means being proactive. It also means finding ways to reassure the American people about the legitimacy of our elections.

For example, we could require the Secretary of Homeland Security, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and the FBI Director, to rapidly assess and inform the public whether interference or influence is detected against our election process, procedures, and infrastructure.

As former Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul wrote in the Washington Post after the special counsel’s report was released: “the Mueller report is a good start, but it is only a start.” There is too much at stake for our national security and the integrity of democracy to stop now.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity and the privilege, as we all did earlier today, to vote for Secretary Mark Esper as the next Secretary of Defense. I have known Dr. Esper for more than a decade as a servant and a patriot of the first order. I think the overwhelming vote today indicates the confidence we have in him, and it indicates the importance we understand that job holds for all of us. We have entrusted him to begin his dedicated service to the country as an 18-year-old at West Point, served in the Army, then went on to serve in administrations and as a public-spirited citizen through his entire life.

Mr. President, I rise to state my support for the nomination of Dr. Mark Esper, who was confirmed earlier today to be the 27th Secretary of Defense. Dr. Esper has served this Nation in a variety of roles most of his life. He is a true Eagle.” He retired from the U.S. Army in 2007, after spending 10 years on Active Duty and 11 years in the National Guard and Army Reserve.

After the Army, Dr. Esper worked in the private sector, but he also worked in several offices on Capitol Hill, including the offices of Senator and Secretary Hagel and Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. He also was a professional staff member on the Senate Foreign Relations and Senate Government Relations committees and the House Armed Services Committee. Until his nomination to be Secretary of Defense, Dr. Esper was serving as the 23rd Secretary of the Army. His wealth of experience in defense policy and in senior leadership positions in both the public and private sector should serve him well as Secretary of Defense.

It has been nearly 7 months since the Department has had a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Defense. At no other time in history has the office of the Secretary remained vacant for so long. In addition, we must bear in mind the national security challenges facing our country. Currently, the Department is focused on competition with near-peer adversaries like China and Russia. Furthermore, the Department must continue to recruit and retain high-caliber individuals, while restoring readiness, and pursuing new high-end capabilities for the force.

Despite these daunting challenges, the number of senior-level civilian vacancies throughout the Department is staggering. The constant turnover of senior civilian leadership, coupled with the duration of these vacancies, has been troubling. I believe it has had a significant impact on the Defense Department, which is adrift in a way I have not seen in my time on Capitol Hill. It is my hope that Dr. Esper will work to fill these civilian leadership positions because it is necessary to manage the difficult challenges facing the Department, as well as the extensive Pentagon bureaucracy.

In addition, Dr. Esper will help oversee national security policy for a President whose temperament and management skills are challenging. It is extremely important for our Nation that he be surrounded by leaders who can provide thoughtful advice and counsel. Diversity of opinion is important when crafting policy and making decisions that impact the well-being of our men and women in uniform. It is my fervent hope that Dr. Esper will be willing and able to provide the President with his best policy advice even if the President disagrees with the counsel or it runs contrary to his policy goals.

But most importantly, while the Secretary of Defense serves at the pleasure of the President, we should never forget that they also oversee the finest fighting force in the world, men and women who have volunteered to serve a cause greater than themselves. Our servicemembers and their families should always be at the forefront when considering defense policy or military action.

On a final note, I would also like to thank Dr. Esper’s family, his wife Leah and their children, Luke, John, and Kate. They, too, will be serving our country, and we appreciate their support.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, when it comes to air safety, the United States of America should be the gold standard for the world. In fact, better than the gold standard, it ought to be the Standard.

We remember Sully Sullenberger, who was the pilot at the controls when the “Miracle on the Hudson” flight in 2009 landed safely. He prescribed the qualities that we should regard most highly as we choose a new Administrator of the FAA. He also gave us the leadership we need and should respect when considering the nomination of Stephen Dickson. We should reject it, and he articulated exactly why.

Chesley “Sully” Sullenberger said about Stephen Dickson that “his actions and words raise grave concerns about his ability to act with the integrity and the independence the next FAA Administrator must have to navigate some of the on-going challenges of the 737 MAX and to rebuild the global trust in the FAA’s confidence and ability to appropriately certify new aircraft design.” That is what he said in an interview with POLITICO, but he said it publicly on a number of other occasions.

There are two qualities that he mandated in the next FAA Administrator as more important than any other—indeed in life. Those are independence and integrity—are precisely the qualities that Stephen Dickson lacks. It is that failing which brings me to the floor now to oppose his nomination.

Sully Sullenberger highlighted the particular experience that exemplified that failing, which is Stephen Dickson’s involvement in a whistleblower case. As I know from my experience as the U.S. attorney and attorney general, whistleblowers are the ones who bring information to light that can help save lives. Whether it is in the criminal area or air safety or drug effectiveness or many other areas, including other areas of transportation safety, whistleblowers play a vital role, so they need protection. They should never be retaliated against. They should never be objects of retribution. They should be protected and encouraged. That is what an air safety expert who really cares about safety—someone who respects independence and integrity—would do.

That is exactly the opposite of what Stephen Dickson appears to have done in the case of Karlene Petitt.

Ms. Petitt’s case was brought to our attention after Stephen Dickson’s testimony to the Commerce Committee, so we had no real opportunity to ask him about it in his confirmation hearing. In fact, we never learned about Ms. Petitt’s case or a deposition that Dickson gave for it until after that hearing. He didn’t disclose it because he purportedly interpreted a Senate Commerce Committee questionnaire as asking about personal matters and my behavior both in general and as an officer of a large public company or any instance in which I was named as a party to a proceeding.” He didn’t think that a court case or a deposition fit that definition.

The simple fact is that Ms. Petitt alleged she was subject to retaliation after presenting Mr. Dickson and other Delta officials at the time, the current CEO, Ed Bastian, with a written report regarding Delta’s “Flight Operations’ Safety Culture” in January 2016. That report alleged significant facts that should have been investigated. In following its supposed policy, Delta did not.

Following its supposed policy, Delta did not. Ms. Petitt alleged she was hired to work at the MUH as an air safety expert who really cares about safety—someone who respects independence and integrity—would do. The psychiatrist who first evaluated her concluded that Ms. Petitt must have suffered from a mental illness and was entirely fit for duty.

The appearance and seemingly the reality is that her safety concerns were meant to be buried rather than taken seriously. Those are precisely the two qualities that he highlighted those two qualities: independence and integrity—integrity not only in past careers but in dealings with the U.S. Senate, in full disclosure with respect to whistleblowers, in highlighting public interest and the facts of the case. His failure to disclose it and his reaction to it would itself be disqualifying, but there are other grounds as well.

He is simply not the right person for this agency at this time. Integrity and independence are now more important than ever because the airline industry and particularly Boeing need new leadership in oversight and accountability. New leadership from the FAA is critically important in light of its failure to ground those 737 MAX airplanes ahead of the rest of the world—in fact, the FAA follows the rest the world—and because of their delegation of authority for certification to Boeing and manufacturers generally. That delegation of authority essentially puts the fox in charge of the henhouse. It may have been for cost savings to the FAA because they could allow Boeing to hire, pay, and fire the certifiers, but at some level, it meant that Boeing then controls the safety and scrutiny supposedly exercised by an independent FAA. That independence is critically important.

Mr. Dickson comes from a long career at Delta Airlines—in fact, a record at Delta that raises questions about his independence from the industry and at a time when that agency must guarantee its independence from that industry.

Our next FAA Administrator will, in fact, have enormous challenges in restoring public trust. This agency has been undermined by its failure to ground airplanes, to exercise independent judgment, and to do the kind of scrutiny necessary and what is needed, in fact, in new leadership. The FAA’s broken system—at least in public perception—requires a new voice, untainted by connections to the industry. We have an opportunity to find someone who will restore that confidence in America and worldwide.

He is simply not the right person for this job, and I urge my colleagues to oppose him and to respect the advice given to us by Sully Sullenberger, who highlighted those two qualities: independence and integrity—integrity not only in past careers but in dealings with the U.S. Senate, in full disclosure with respect to whistleblowers, in highlighting public interest and the facts of the case. That is the kind of independence and integrity we need. I still have hope that we can find it if my colleagues join me in opposing this nomination.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, on April 8, this year I came to the Senate to speak about the end of the special counsel’s investigation. Now that Special Counsel Mueller is set to testify tomorrow in the House of Representatives, I would like to reiterate several points I made in that speech that I believe are still very relevant today.

I noted that the facts show the real collusion was actually brought about by the Democrats. It is pretty well documented that the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee hired Fusion GPS to do opposition research against Candidate Trump. Fusion GPS then hired Christopher Steele, a former British intelligence officer, to compile the famous Steele dossier. That document was central to the fake collusion narrative, and it reportedly used Russian Government sources for information.

So the Democrats paid for a document created by a foreign national that relied on Russian Government
sources. Let’s also not forget about news reports that the Democratic National Committee interfaced with the Government of Ukraine to try and get dirt on Candidate Trump—not Trump but the Democrats. Now that is the definition of collusion. Maybe that is why the Democrats seem totally uninterested in figuring out the origins of the Russian investigation because they were a prime mover in making it all happen.

Now, they have asked the Justice Department to produce the Mueller report’s underlying evidence, including all intelligence-related information. I agree with the need to see as much information as possible. In fact, I have cosponsored a bill that would do just that, but the Democrats’ fury over Mueller’s findings and their inconsistent positions makes me think all of this is more about politics than principle.

As I have said repeatedly, to guard against political gamesmanship, there is only one legitimate way to do this. Let’s see all the documents, every one of the documents; meaning, that if Congress is going to review the Mueller report’s underlying information, it should be able to review information relating to how—absolutely how the Russia investigation started. Anything less will fail to provide the full picture.

Furthermore, to be very consistent, we shouldn’t stop at the Russia investigation. The Democrats want all of the Mueller information but seem to be turning a very blind eye to other investigations where Congress, as well as the public, have yet to see it all. Again, that leads me to believe that their request for Mueller-related documents is a political ploy.

Take, for example, the Clinton investigation. As I have written about publicly before, the Justice Department inspector general produced to Congress a high document regarding this Clinton investigation. That document raises additional questions for the FBI and the Justice Department. These agencies ought to produce additional information to Congress and answer these questions to provide full accounting of what transpired.

Here is an excerpt, then, from the inspector general’s unclassified report on the Clinton investigation:

“Although the Midyear team [that happened to be the code word for the Clinton investigation] drafted a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General late May 2016 stating that review of the highly classified material was necessary to complete the investigation, and requesting permission to access them, the FBI never sent this request to the Department.”

So this tells us four things. One, the FBI apparently was aware of highly classified information potentially relevant to the Clinton investigation in its possession; secondly, that the FBI drafted a memo in May of 2016 to get access to the information; three, that memo said review of the information was necessary to complete the investigation; and fourth, the fact that the memo was never sent.

So, with great emphasis, how could the Obama administration’s FBI finish the investigation if they never got access to all potentially relevant information?

Now, there ought to be great Democratic outrage at that apparent failure, and there doesn’t seem to be. Will the Democrats’ Department for all underlying information relating to Hillary Clinton’s investigation?

Then there is another example. What about the case called Uranium One? I have been pushing for years for more answers about this transaction that allowed the Russian Government to acquire U.S. uranium assets. I have received classified as well as unclassified briefings about this matter. My staff recently went to FBI headquarters to review additional classified material, and I have identified some FBI intelligence reports that may shed more light on the Uranium One transaction. However, the Attorney General has refused to provide access to those other documents.

Well, if the Democrats demand intelligence-related information from the Justice Department regarding the Mueller report, there should be no reason whatsoever why they shouldn’t do the same for Uranium One.

The American people rightly ought to expect something as simple as consistency. If you aren’t consistent with what you ask for, then you will not have any credibility.

My attitude and approach is straightforward and nonpartisan. Let’s see it all—Russia, Clinton, Uranium One, all of it. As I said on April 8, sunlight is the best disinfectant.

As we listen to and watch tomorrow’s testimony going on in the House of Representatives, with Mueller coming back to tell us probably nothing new because he said he isn’t going to say anything that isn’t already in the 488-page report, let’s keep that in mind. Let’s see all of it—Russia, Clinton, Uranium One, as well as anything the Democrats are asking for in regard to the Mueller report.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, for every American who is old enough to remember, the attacks of September 11, 2001, can be recalled as if they happened yesterday. It is one of those rare, almost generational moments that stand in the forefront of our Nation’s collective memory. But even if we lined up all 100 Members of the Senate and asked them where they were that morning, they could tell you.

I was in Austin, at home, on the telephone talking to then-Governor Perry, now the Secretary of Energy. My wife got my attention and said: Hold on. You are going to want to see this.

I turned to look at the television just as the Second Tower of the World Trade Center. I don’t have to tell you; we all remember the heartbreaking, confusion, and anger that welled up in all of us as we saw those images.

In the days and months and years since that attack, we have hit the Clinton administration on “never forget” the events of September 11. I think that is one of the pivotal moments in our Nation’s history. We will never forget the 3,000 lives that were lost that day, the loved ones they left behind, or the courage demonstrated by the brave first responders who came from across the country to help in the aftermath of those horrific attacks.

Today, Members of the Senate had an opportunity to vote on legislation to permanently authorize the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund. This fund was created to support those who answered the Nation’s call to duty on 9/11 and in the months that followed that attack.

Now, nearly 18 years later, first responders from across the country are being diagnosed with cancers, respiratory diseases, and other illnesses because of their dangerous work on that day. For them, each day serves as a tragic reminder of the heartbreaking images most of us just witnessed on a television screen.

The legislation we passed today is the Never Forget the Heroes: Permanent Authorization of the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Act. As the name suggests, it permanently authorizes funding to support those American heroes who led lifesaving recovery operations following the attacks on 9/11. As I suggested, many of the diseases that affect these men and women, such as cancers and respiratory diseases, may not have become apparent for years after 9/11. It is the nature of these diseases.

Ensuring the longevity of this fund is critical to providing these heroes with the resources they need, whether that life-changing diagnosis comes today or 50 years from now. It is part of our commitment as Americans to support our first responders and the heroes who ran away from but toward the danger on that fateful day.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have worked to support our first responders who were there for our communities during the most difficult times. The 9/11 first responders represent the very best of America, and they deserve every ounce of assistance we are able to provide.

This legislation received 402 votes in the House of Representatives and 97 votes here in the Senate, something nearly unheard of these days. I appreciate our colleagues who have been
working to get this legislation passed to provide these men and women with some peace of mind. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors, and I am now glad it is headed to the President’s desk for his signature.

DRUG COSTS

Madam President, a survey last summer found that many Texans are struggling to afford the rising cost of their healthcare. Three out of five surveyed reported forgoing or postponing care because of the cost barrier. That includes skipping their pills in half, stopping doses, or not filling a prescription because they simply couldn’t afford to do so. With healthcare costs on the rise, things aren’t expected to get any easier unless we do something about it.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services estimated that between 2018 and 2027, customers can expect to see prescription drug spending increase by an average of 6.1 percent a year. That is a faster increase than hospital stays, doctors’ visits, or any other healthcare expenditure. There seems to be bipartisan agreement that something must be done. But the real question is what that something is: What are your ideas about how to make that something happen?

Many of our progressive Democratic friends have embraced Medicare for All as the solution to the problems that exist in our healthcare delivery system. Their proposal, though, would kick about 180 million Americans off of their private insurance and force them into one big government-run plan. It would drain the vital program that seniors have relied upon for more than a century and replace it with a watered-down version that would result in long waiting lines for inferior care. The government would tell you what clinic you had to go to, what doctor you could see, and what prescriptions you could actually take. You would lose your freedom and power to decide what is best for your family when it comes to your healthcare. You would have to simply take what you could get on somebody else’s schedule.

Last but not least, Medicare for All would completely bankrupt our country. I think this approach is akin to having a pipe burst in your house, but instead of repairing it, tearing the whole thing down and rebuilding it from scratch. It is unnecessary. It is unpopular. It is unneeded and goes against all logic.

Don’t get me wrong. Our healthcare system is not perfect, but Medicare for All is actually worse, and it would create more problems than it would solve. Instead, I support targeted reforms that have been offered by a number of our colleagues here—most on a bipartisan basis—to lower healthcare costs and give people more choices in terms of what fits their needs the best.

On Thursday, the Senate Finance Committee will mark up a package of bills that will aim to reduce prescription drug costs for seniors and families. Last month, the Senate HELP Committee overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan bill to reduce out-of-pocket healthcare costs and increase transparency and eliminate surprise medical bills. A few weeks ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, unanimously reported out legislation that would prevent big pharmaceutical companies from gaming the patent system.

All of these reforms are intended to repair the problems that exist without completely leveling the existing healthcare system. For example, the package that passed the Judiciary Committee included a proposal I introduced with our colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, called the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. This bill takes aim at two practices often deployed by pharmaceutical companies to stomp out competition and protect their bottom line.

First, this bill targets a practice known as product hopping. When a company is about to lose exclusivity of a drug, its profit margin on that product is about ready to run out—they often develop some sort of minor reformulation and then yank the original patented drug off the market. That prevents generic competition. There is no doubt that one of the things that has warranted a new patent, but, too frequently, we are seeing this deployed as a strategy to box out generic competition.

About 90 percent of the drugs we all take are generic and not branded drugs under a patent. That means we get less expensive drugs that are just as effective as the original branded product. That is the way our system is supposed to work, by making generic drugs more readily available and affordable. By defining product hopping as anti-competitive behavior, the Federal Trade Commission would be able to take action against those who engage in this practice.

Our bill would also target something known as patent thickening by limiting the patents companies can use to keep competitors away. Some drug companies like to layer on patent after patent in an attempt to make it virtually impossible for biosimilar manufacturers to bring a competing product to market. While the patent on the actual drug formula may have expired, there are still, in some cases, hundreds of other patents to sort through that discourage competition.

This bill would limit the number of patents these companies can use and streamline the litigation process so that companies are spending less time in the courtroom and, hopefully, more time in the laboratory developing life-saving innovative drugs. Competitors would be able to resolve patent disputes faster and bring their drugs to market sooner. Of course, better competition means better prices for patients.

It is also good news for taxpayers. Just last week, we received the cost estimate of this bill from the Congressional Budget Office, and they found it would lower Federal spending by more than one-half billion dollars over 10 years. This is just the savings to the Federal Government under Medicare and Medicaid. There would undoubtedly be additional significant savings for consumers with private health insurance.

The Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act does not prevent manufacturers from making improvements to their products, and it doesn’t limit patent rights. It also doesn’t hamper innovation, and it doesn’t spend money we don’t have on a system we don’t really want. It simply stops those who knowingly game and abuse our patent system.

Our country is proudly a leader in pharmaceutical innovation, partly because we offer robust protection for intellectual property. When you create a new drug, you are granted a patent, an exclusive right to sell that drug for a period of years. But this legislation ensures that those who game the system—the bad actors—are no longer able to take advantage of these innovation protections in order to maintain their monopolies at the expense of the American people after their patent should have expired.

I believe there is more we can do to improve our healthcare system and bring down out-of-pocket costs for the American people, but instead of tearing down the whole house, let’s make the repairs we actually need.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Dickson nomination expire at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, July 24; further, that following the disposition of the Dickson nomination, the Senate vote on the cloture motions for the Berger and Buescher nominations; finally, that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on the confirmation of those nominations in the order listed at 3 p.m. and, if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH DARLING

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am lifting my hold on the nomination
of Elizabeth Darling to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I will not object to any unanimous consent request concerning the nomination of Ms. Darling at this time. Please remember toUrl this page in the Executive Calendar in the section titled Notice of Intent to Object.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO STEVE ANTONLINE

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, it is an honor to recognize the legacy of Steve Antoline as fearless leader in business, a dedicated philanthropist, and a proud West Virginian who has made substantial contributions to our home State.

One of the greatest milestones we achieved when I was West Virginia’s Governor was when the Boy Scouts of America committed to bringing a world-class scouting facility to the Mountain State, and Steve was a vital part of that process. Today, the Summit Bechtel Reserve is homebase every year to 25,000 Boy Scouts and youth from across the country. I assembled government officials, business leaders, and private volunteers into what I called the West Virginia Project Arrow Task Force in order to convince the National Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America of what we already knew—that the ideal place for this facility was in the adventurous terrains and magnificent mountains of West Virginia. The Boy Scouts and West Virginia truly are a perfect match—an organization that builds character, inspires reverences, and promotes the values of hard work and compassion, and a State whose people live and breathe those values every day.

Steve was able to create and manage so many wonderful programs through the camp. He worked on the Reaching the Summit Boy Scout Community Service Initiative, organizing and garnering support for more than 34 projects that utilized countless hours of community service for Nicholas County. Also in Nicholas County, he serves as the chairman of the Young Life Wild Ridge Camp Executive Committee and also as a sponsor of the Young Life organization for the country. With Steve’s input, Young Life is currently in the early stages of building the Wild Ridge Camp, which will host more than 22,000 children per year, providing educational opportunities to develop leadership skills, civic responsibility, and moral values.

As one of the founding fathers of the Summit Bechtel Reserve Scout Camp, I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to his legacy than the Steve Antoline Family Center at the Camp. The coal from that property helped build the Panama Canal. The timber that from that property helped build the boats that helped win WWII. It has so much historical value, and now it builds the tallest timber—our future leaders. And as Scouts walk by the newly dedicated bronze tribute in honor of Steve’s legacy, it is my hope they are inspired by the man who has surrounded them with opportunities here in West Virginia.

The Conservation Center will offer hands-on exhibits, projects, and a laboratory for Scouts and youth to further understand and promote conservation efforts. This project is being designed and built by Steve, along with collaborative efforts by Boy Scouts of America and West Virginia University.

Beyond the camp, Steve has contributed greatly to the surrounding region. He has founded and operated various companies that include operations in natural gas, production, excavation, contracting, property development and biocleanse research companies. Among his many accomplishments for West Virginia is Superior Highwall Miners, Inc., a business based in Beckley that grew into the world’s largest manufacturer of highwall mining equipment. Among his many other accomplishments are creating countless jobs and showcased West Virginia’s vast potential across the globe.

Steve serves as cochairman of the new WVU Children’s Hospital Building Campaign and also serves on the hospital’s advisory board. He is the owner of New River Labs, LLC and KEM Research Group, research company performing state-of-the-art diagnostic services for esophageal, cervical, melanoma, pancreatic, prostate, and many other forms of cancer. At Summit Resources, Inc., Steve serves as owner and president, specializing on excavation, land management, and investment. Other organizations he has been involved with include the Remembrance and Miners Organization, the Norma Mae Huggins Cancer Research Foundation, YMCA, Beckley Chamber of Commerce, and the Fayette and Nicholas County chapter of the American Red Cross.

Put simply, Steve is a West Virginian, through and through. He knows our communities inside and out and has directed his endeavors to give back to the people of West Virginia, particularly to our future leaders. He has a passion for providing our State’s youth with every opportunity possible to achieve success. With thanks to his efforts at Summit Bechtel and beyond, countless opportunities have been created and will continue to come to fruition in the days and years ahead.

I wish the very best for Steve and his family; his wife, Jamie; his children, Emily, Madison, and Kristopher; and his grandchildren Nina and Hunter. I know that Steve and all West Virginians in celebrating Steve’s lifelong commitment to excellence in the Mountain State.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this week, I have the opportunity to introduce the U.S. Senate Small Business of the Week. Small businesses provide essential services to our Nation’s communities. In my home State of Alaska, I am always cognizant of the importance and key role that small businesses play in our economy. The small businesses that contribute to the local economy and step in when a community is in need. It is my honor to name ChemTrack Alaska of Anchorage, AK, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

ChemTrack was founded as a construction company by Sig Jokiel in 1973. Shortly after its inception, the company shifted focus and rebranded itself into an environmental services and engineering company when Chuck Ronan joined the team in 1983. After studying business at the University of New Hampshire, Sig’s daughter, Carrie, joined the company, who became the company’s majority partner in 2010, brought business expertise and project management skills to ChemTrack. Throughout the company’s 46-year history, it has company shifted focus and rebranded itself into an environmental services and engineering company when Chuck Ronan joined the team in 1983. After studying business at the University of New Hampshire, Sig’s daughter, Carrie, joined the company, who became the company’s majority partner in 2010, brought business expertise and project management skills to ChemTrack. Throughout the company’s 46-year history, it has

ChemTrack’s commitment to developing creative environmental engineering solutions enables the company to contribute to local projects in Alaska’s great outdoors. As a successful contractor and a certified 8(a) economically disadvantaged woman-owned small business, ChemTrack has completed projects for both private businesses and government clients.

ChemTrack helped clean up Alaska’s shorelines after the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and later, was awarded a basic ordering agreement by the U.S. Coast Guard in 2012, enabling them to provide containment cleanup and mitigate the harmful effects of oil spills and hazardous substance incidents all over the state of Alaska.

Carrie is renowned as an advocate for small businesses at both the Federal and State level. During her testimony in front of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship in June 2018, Carrie discussed the SBA’s contracting opportunities, and provided insight on her experience operating a woman-owned small business. As a graduate of the SBA Emerging Leaders program, Carrie is very active in her community and even mentors other Alaskan businesses through the Women’s Power League of Alaska. Carrie’s distinction as a local leader is evidenced by her inclusion in the Alaska
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Journal of Commerce’s Top 40 Under 40 list of 2014 and her selection as the 2018 Enterprising Women of the Year Award.

Back home in Alaska, Carrie serves on the Associated General Contractors board of directors, as well as the Boards for Women Impacting Public Policy and the Alaska State Hockey Association. She also completed a 6-year term with YWCA, where she served as president for 2 years, and is a member of the Society of American Military Engineers and National Contracting Management Association. Carrie’s abilities as an athlete complement her business skills. She was inducted into the Sports Hall of Fame at the University of New Hampshire in 2014 and served as an ambassador for Women’s Ice Hockey in Fast and Female International Program.

ChemTrack has successfully pursued a two-pronged mission of profit and stewardship. By employing its engineering proficiency to aid in disaster recovery, ChemTrack has shown us what can be achieved when individuals and businesses apply their specific skills to help better their community.

ChemTrack has grown from a small consulting company to a successful environmental engineering contractor with a clear track record of community involvement. I am honored to recognize Carrie and the entire team at ChemTrack Alaska as the Senate Small Business of the Week, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.

TRIBUTE TO MAHLON PAUL MANSON

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Mahlon Paul Manson, a Montanan and decorated veteran of the Vietnam war.

Montanans and all Americans owe Paul the deepest gratitude for his service to this Nation.

Paul was born in San Diego, CA, on September 17, 1948. When he was in first grade, his mother and three sisters moved to Deer Lodge, MT, where he spent his youth. Paul completed high school in 1967 and enlisted in the Army, worked for the Forest Service shortly after, graduated in 1996 and began work with a clear track record of community involvement. I am honored to recognize Carrie and the entire team at ChemTrack Alaska as the Senate Small Business of the Week, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(RECEIVED)
S. 2207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand refundability and increase the deduction of the research credit for certain small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:
S. 2216. A bill to require online retailers to prominently disclose product country-of-origin information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):
S. 2217. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish a safety net program for commercial fishermen and aquaculture producers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):
S. 2218. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MANCHIN:
S. 2219. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that over-determined ineligible for the family caregivers eligible for caregiver programs, and to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize care-givers of clinical determinations relating to Veterans Affairs to formally recognize care-givers of clinical determinations relating to Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Virginia:
S. 2220. A bill to require the Commandant of the Coast Guard to take certain steps to improve Coast Guard shore infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BARRON):
S. 2221. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to repay the credit risk premium paid with respect to certain railroad infrastructure loans after the obligations attached to such loans have been satisfied; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDEN):
S. 2222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a better defined recapture provision incentive program for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. SMITH):
S. 2223. A bill to prohibit agreements between employers that directly restrict the current or future employment of any employee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):
S. 2224. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and to permanently extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:
S. 2225. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that over-the-road bus drivers are covered under the maximum hours requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MURKLEY):
S. 2219. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, to receive notification, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):
S. 2222. A bill to modify the exemption for trade secrets and commercial or financial information in the Freedom of Information Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS:
S. 2221. A bill to prohibit the expansion of immigration detention facilities, to improve the oversight of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:
S. 2220. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financing to persons with seriously delinquent tax debt, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CORTÉZ MADDOX, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):
S. 2221. A bill to facilitate a national pipeline of spectrum for commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):
S. 2222. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. UDALL, and Ms. STEIN):
S. 2223. A bill to provide for the basic needs of students at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SANDERS):
S. 2224. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. WARREN):
S. 2225. A bill to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CORKER):
S. 2226. A bill to posthumously advance Lieutenant Colonel Richard E. Cole, United States Air Force, to colonel on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. Daines (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
S. 2227. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MURPHY:
S. 2230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:
S. 2221. A bill to establish American opportunity accounts, to modify estate and gift tax rules, to reform the taxation of capital income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUTZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):
S. 2222. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. PETERS):
S. 2224. A bill to establish a consortia of universities to advise the Secretary of Defense on cybersecurity matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN:
S. 2225. A bill to discharge the qualified loan amounts of each individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 2226. A bill to require agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):
S. 2227. A bill to authorize the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to seek civil monetary penalties to deter violations of section 2 of the Sherman Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):
S. 2228. A bill to authorize the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to seek civil monetary penalties to deter violations of section 2 of the Sherman Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):
S. 2229. A bill to codify an Executive order preparing the United States for the impacts of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. PETERS):
S. 2240. A bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HENRICH (for himself and Ms. McCLINTOCK)

S. 2241. A bill to provide for a study on the protection of Native American seeds and traditional foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. HARRIS)

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of comprehensive systems by dentists' campaigns to detect and report such acts; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. CRASSELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. Sasse, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KINNIP, and Mr. BLACKBURN)

S. Res. 280. A resolution commending the officers and personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for their work during the crisis at the U.S.-Mexico border; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. HARRIS)

S. Res. 281. A resolution committing to elevate the voices, leadership, and needs of communities that face systemic barriers in the effort to end sexual violence and support survivors with disabilities, survivors of color, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual abuse, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. ROSENBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BURSH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERSKINE, Mr. FISCHER, Mr. GARDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLIS, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HENRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOWNELL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INOHOE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Mrs. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKKAY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERRILL, Mr. MORA, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERSUAD, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RUSKIN, Mr. Sasse, Mr. SCHUETZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TASCHE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TAKENII, Mr. TATE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARRER, Ms. WARE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG)

S. Res. 282. A resolution honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 102

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 102, a bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries.

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to develop a national strategy to prevent targeted violence through behavioral threat assessment and management, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to modify the exemptions from certain Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 coverage to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, 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.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CAVER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) 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.

S. 814

At the request of Ms. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.
of S. 1191, 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.

At the request of Mr. Booker, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Booker, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1323
At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1234, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review and report on certain laws, safety measures, and technologies relating to the illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes.

S. 139
At the request of Mr. Udall, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1095, a bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran.

S. 123
At the request of Ms. Warren, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 977
At the request of Ms. Warren, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 977, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1039
At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes.

S. 1393
At the request of Mr. Young, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Burr) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review and report on certain laws, safety measures, and technologies relating to the illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes.

S. 1499
At the request of Mr. Udall, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review and report on certain laws, safety measures, and technologies relating to the illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes.

S. 129
At the request of Mr. Murphy, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1528
At the request of Mr. Murphy, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1572
At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1572, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 1575
At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1575, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to make available to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention copies of consular reports of death of United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 1590
At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1623
At the request of Mr. Wicker, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) and the Senator from Nebraska (Ms. Fischer) were added as cosponsors of S. 1625, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1728
At the request of Mr. Markley, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer’s semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1737
At the request of Mr. Murphy, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) were added as cosponsors of S. 1737, a bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits.

S. 1753
At the request of Mr. Sanders, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1773, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1773
At the request of Mr. Wicker, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Tennessee (Ms. Blackburn) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. Fischer) were added as cosponsors of S. 1822, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

S. 1822
At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1867, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1867
At the request of Mr. Wicker, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Kentucky (Ms. Duckworth) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to provide federal financial assistance to public schools to expand class size reduction, to reduce segregation, and to improve student achievement and development, and for other purposes.

S. 1906
At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.
ROSEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 1936

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1936, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes.

S. 2141

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ-Masto, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2141, a bill to establish the Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure on National Forest System lands, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2043, a bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

S. 2083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2083, a bill to prohibit the Bureau of the Census from including citizenship data in the legislative redistricting data prepared by the Bureau.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2072, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2019, in 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.

S. 2090

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2090, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2101, a bill to improve access to affordable insulin.

S. 2107

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2107, a bill to enhance the rights of domestic workers, and for other purposes.

S. 2147

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2147, a bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to provide alternative penalties for forfeiture violations for persons who commit such violations.

S. 2165

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2165, a bill to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes.

S. 2173

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2173, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2185

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2185, a bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 2199

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2193, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 2214

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. RES. 252

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a better defined recruitment and retention incentive program for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill with my friend and colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, that will benefit the brave women and men who volunteer as emergency personnel: The Volunteer Emergency Services Recruitment and Retention Act.

Across our Nation, volunteer emergency personnel play a critical role in ensuring the safety of our communities and the well-being of our neighbors. They serve as the firefighters, EMS, and other first responders that we depend on in our times of need. The State of Maine, for example, has approximately 9,785 firefighters who serve the State’s 1.3 million citizens. Maine is largely a rural State, and more than 90 percent of firefighters are volunteers. Without these dedicated volunteers, smaller communities would be unable to provide firefighting and other emergency services at all.

Often, communities seek to recruit and retain volunteers by offering modest benefits. One of the most common benefits are Leave and/or Volunteer Pay Programs or LOSAPs. These are retirement accounts provided to volunteer emergency responders. The legislation we are introducing today would support these efforts by helping to ensure that these nominal benefits to volunteers are not undermined in and out of court or needlessly held back by regulations. Specifically, the Volunteer Emergency Services Recruitment and Retention Act...
Act would simplify how LOSAPs are taxed without increasing or reducing Federal spending or taxes. It would do this by eliminating burdensome and confusing IRS requirements that make it unnecessarily difficult for volunteer emergency personnel to receive benefits and for departments to administer plans.

Mr. President, we should take care to protect our volunteer emergency personnel who serve this country with such bravery. Our legislation would help achieve that goal, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—COMMENDING THE OFFICERS AND PERSONNEL OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION FOR THEIR WORK DURING THE CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASKIA, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. EINSTEIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Whereas U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this preamble as “CBP”) is charged with protecting the borders of the United States and facilitating travel and trade;

Whereas the Southern border of the United States is experiencing unprecedented numbers of vulnerable individuals attempting to enter the country;

Whereas, in June 2019, 104,341 individuals were apprehended at the Southern border, which is an increase of more than 140 percent, compared to June 2018;

Whereas, as of June 2019, the number of individuals apprehended or determined to be inadmissible by CBP at the Southern border in fiscal year 2019 surpassing the fiscal year 2014 total of 569,287, which was the highest such number in the preceding 5 years;

Whereas the Homeland Security Advisory Council expects Southwest border migration numbers to approach or exceed 1,000,000 individuals in fiscal year 2019 unless immediate action is taken;

Whereas, historically, the majority of individuals arriving at the Southern border have been single adult males from Mexico, but by May 2019, 28 percent of all border enforcement actions were associated with unaccompanied children and family units;

Whereas, due to the constant and increasing flow of migrants crossing the Southern border between ports of entry, financial and human resources are being diverted from the security and law enforcement duties of CBP, resulting in:

1. fewer seizures of narcotics and illicit currency; and
2. increased wait times at ports of entry, leading to warnings of possible produce shortages and interruptions in supply chains;

Whereas more than 40 percent of CBP resources are currently being absorbed by the humanitarian crisis at the Southern border;

Whereas the final emergency interrim report published by the Homeland Security Ad-

visory Council on April 16, 2019, notes that a substantial number of individuals who are apprehended by CBP require significant personal and medical care that exceeds the ability and resources of volunteer and local humane attempts by CBP to care for such individuals in CBP custody;

Whereas CBP officers and personnel have raised concerns over overwhelming immediate risks to—

1. the health and safety of the migrants; and
2. CBP officers;

Whereas CBP officers are experiencing both physical illness and severe mental and emotional distress as a result of the crisis at the Southern border;

Whereas, in May 2019, the Commissioner of CBP requested an additional $2.100,000 for the Employee Assistance Program of CBP in order to offer additional counseling services to CBP officers and personnel to respond to “unanticipated critical incidents and other emerging crises, such as the unexpected response required for migrant caravans, employee suicides, and the need for a financial wellness program”;

Whereas, in the face of the most difficult circumstances, CBP officers and personnel continue—

1. to work untaunted to protect the Southern border and facilitate trade;
2. to care for the migrants in CBP custody: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

1. commends the men and women of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including Border Patrol personnel, Office of Field Operations personnel, Air and Marine Operations personnel, Office of Trade personnel, and all support personnel and their allies for their continued honorable service during the challenging humanitarian crisis at the Southern border;

2. calls on Congress to pass legislation to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and to manage the increasing flow of migrants attempting to enter the United States;

SENPTE RESOLUTION 281—COMMITTING TO ELEVATE THE VOICES, LEADERSHIP, AND NEEDS OF COMMUNITIES THAT FACE SYSTEMATIC BARRIERS IN THE EPFERENCE OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND SUPPORT ALL SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE, INCLUDING IMMIGRANT SURVIVORS, SURVIVORS WHO ARE INCARCERATED, SURVIVORS WITH DISABILITIES, SURVIVORS OF COLOR, AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE SURVIVORS, SURVIVORS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE, AND LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSSEXUAL, QUEER, AND INTERSEX SURVIVORS

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Whereas' sexual violence and gender-based violence are tools of oppression and forms of discrimination that can deprive individuals of equal access to educational opportunities;

Whereas survivors of sexual violence face a significant number of health problems, including chronic conditions, suicide, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder;

Whereas discrimination on the basis of sex includes discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes, pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions;

Whereas the 2015 United States Transgender Survey found that—

1. 47 percent of transgender people have been sexually assaulted; and
2. among transgender people of color, 65 percent of Native Americans, 59 percent of multiracial people, 58 percent of Middle Eastern people, and 53 percent of African Americans have been sexually assaulted;

Whereas the Association of American Universities’ Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct found that nearly 1 in 4 transgender, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, or questioning students experienced sexual violence while pursuing an undergraduate degree;

Whereas the National Sexual Violence Resource Center found that 78 percent of transgender or gender non-conforming youth are sexually harassed during the period beginning in kindergarten and ending in 12th grade;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2018 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that—

1. 44 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender teen girls reported experiencing sexual violence, compared to 21 percent of all girls;

2. 40 percent of gay men and 37 percent of bisexual men have experienced sexual violence other than rape, compared to 21 percent of heterosexual men;

Whereas the National Women’s Law Center 2017 Let Her Learn Survey found that 38 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender teen girls reported experiencing sexual violence, compared to 21 percent of all girls;

Whereas, according to the Department of Justice, people with disabilities are 3.5 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault than people without disabilities;

Whereas, according to the Vera Institute of Justice—

1. children with disabilities are 3 times more likely than children without disabilities to be sexually abused; and

2. 83 percent of women and 32 percent of men with cognitive disabilities reported being victims of sexual assault;

Whereas women of all races and ethnicities face some risk of sexual assault, and, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2018 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 33 percent of multiracial non-Hispanic women, nearly 27 percent of indigenous women, 22 percent of Black women, nearly 19 percent of White non-Hispanic women, more than 14 percent of Hispanic women, and 7 percent of Asian American and Pacific Islander women in the United States have experienced rape;

Whereas, according to a research report by the National Institute of Justice, 56.1 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced intimate partner violence;

Whereas sexual violence also affects adolescent girls and, according to the National Women’s Law Center’s 2017 Let Her Learn Survey, 1 in 5 girls aged 14 to 18 has been kissed or touched without consent, including 24 percent of Latina girls, 23 percent of Native American girls, and 22 percent of Black girls;

Whereas studies show that sexual violence and gender-based violence are underreported crimes, indicating that the rates of sexual violence impacting women may be even higher than these estimates;

Whereas too many survivors from communities that face systemic barriers are ignored, blamed, and censored; and
declares that the Senate—

1. recognizes the significant impact that sexual violence and gender-based violence have on survivors of all races and ethnicities and their communities;

2. applauds every effort to support and protect survivors of all races and ethnicities;

3. commits to working with the Congress to expand access to resources for survivors of all races and ethnicities;

4. commits to working with the Congress to end impunity for perpetrators of sexual violence and gender-based violence;
Whereas communities that have been disproportionately harmed by the criminal justice system, including Black women and girls, may be less likely to report sexual violence because of fear or stigma;

Whereas incarcerated women report extensive histories of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse;

Whereas according to the Department of Justice, ‘‘allegations of sexual misconduct were made in all but one state prison and 41% of local and private jails and prisons’; and

Whereas harassment is a key predictor of involvement in the juvenile justice system;

Whereas according to the Annie E. Casey Foundation, 9% of girls in the juvenile justice system have experienced physical or sexual abuse, and many of those girls experience criminal penalties for their responses to sexual abuse;

Whereas communities of color are overrepresented in jails and prisons in the United States and disproportionately impacted by violence, including sexual violence, in the criminal justice system;

Whereas youth of color, youth with disabilities, and youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or gender non-conforming are overrepresented in the child welfare system;

Whereas lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth are overrepresented in the youth homeless population, making them particularly at risk for sexual violence;

Whereas the Center for American Progress reports that 22% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and gender non-conforming survivors of sexual assault, harassment, and affirmative consent; and

Whereas less than 40 percent of all high schools teach all of the topics listed for prevention programs; and

Whereas, according to the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, there is an incomplete lack of culturally and linguistically appropriate and relevant services and accommodations;

Whereas current support systems mandated by Federal law for survivors of sexual violence are neither comprehensive nor fully representative of the vast and pervasive elements within rape culture; and

Whereas Congress is working to confront pervasive sexual violence in the workplace, in schools, and in every area of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commits—

(A) to elevating the voices, leadership, and needs of LGBTQ survivors of sexual violence and gender-based violence; and

(B) to demonstrate proactive leadership in the effort to end sexual violence and gender-based violence; and

(2) supports efforts to raise awareness of the history of sexual violence prevention programs;

(3) calls upon this Chamber—

(A) to ensure that responding to the needs of sexual violence survivors is a legislative priority; and

(B) to demonstrate proactive leadership in the effort to end sexual violence and gender-based violence; and

(C) to reject setbacks of enforcement and interpretations of protections against harassment under—

(i) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in employment programs based on race, color, or national origin;

(ii) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in education programs based on race, color, or national origin, sex (including on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes, or related medical conditions), or religion;

(iii) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in employment programs based on sex (including on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes, pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions); and

(iv) titles I and II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination based on disability in employment and public schools, respectively; and

(v) section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) intersect; and

(B) to address sexual violence and gender-based violence in an educational setting, it must be acknowledged that—

(i) protections under these comprehensive civil rights laws—

(I) are intersecting; and

(ii) address how sexual violence and gender-based violence affect equal access to education; and

(iii) without prompt and equitable responses to sexual violence, schools may be in violation of civil rights laws;

(5) affirms the pursuit of legislative solutions that—

(A) address the unique needs and experiences of survivors of sexual violence from communities that face systemic barriers, including immigrant survivors, survivors who are incarcerated, survivors with disabilities, survivors of color, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual assault, harassment, and rape among non-LGBTQ survivors; and

(B) clarify and strengthen existing protections from sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination, housing, education, public accommodations, and Federally funded programs;

(C) allocate resources based on the needs and vulnerability of diverse survivor populations; and

(D) allocate resources for disaggregated research initiatives that shed light on the disproportionate levels of sexual violence and gender-based violence, and the impact of sexual violence and gender-based violence on diverse survivor populations;

(6) calls upon the Executive branch to faithfully and robustly enforce laws that protect survivors of sexual violence and communities at higher risk of sexual violence and gender-based violence from harassment, discrimination, and mistreatment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—HONORING FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BAlDWIN, Mr. BARRASO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDOZo, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. Daines, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ESRNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. 
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Whereas John Paul Stevens was born in Chicago, Illinois, on April 20, 1920, to Ernest James Stevens and Elizabeth Street Stevens; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens graduated from the University of Chicago with a bachelor’s degree in English; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens served as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy during World War II and was awarded the Bronze Star; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was the last living Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to have served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens attended Northwestern University School of Law on the GI Bill, where he served as editor-in-chief of the Northwestern University Law Review and, in 1947, graduated first in his class; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens served as a law clerk to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Wiley B. Rutledge; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was an accomplished attorney in private practice in Chicago, Illinois, and also worked as a Congressional aide; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was nominated by President Richard M. Nixon to be a judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 1970; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was nominated by President Gerald R. Ford to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1975; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens served with distinction on the Supreme Court of the United States for nearly 35 years; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens retired from the Supreme Court of the United States in 2010 at the age of 90; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens had the third-longest tenure of any Justice to ever sit on the Supreme Court of the United States; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was a brilliant jurist, an astute writer, and a courteous but incisive questioner from the bench; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens, during his decades of service on the Supreme Court of the United States, was committed to safeguarding the rights and liberties protected by the Constitution and respecting the common sense of the American people; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens recognized and cherished the importance of the judiciary as an impartial guardian of the rule of law; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens showed that fair and reasoned judgment transcends political labels and ideological categories; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was one of the most influential and memorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; 
Whereas Chief Justice John Roberts stated that John Paul Stevens’ “unrelenting commitment to justice has left us a better nation”;
Whereas John Paul Stevens was respected by colleagues, litigants, and the American people, and will be remembered as one of the great Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was a man of Midwestern courtesy, humility, wit, and wisdom; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was an avid player of tennis, golf, ping-pong, and bridge, was a lifelong fan of the Chicago Cubs, and was well known for his fondness of bow ties; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama in 2012; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was married to Elizabeth Jane Sheeren from 1942 to 1970, and had 4 children, John, Kathryn, Elizabeth, and Susan; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens was married to Maryan Mulholland Simon from 1980 until her death in 2015; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens, at the time of his death, was a grandfather of 9 and a great-grandfather of 13; 
Whereas John Paul Stevens passed away on July 16, 2019, at the age of 99; and 
Whereas the United States is deeply indebted to John Paul Stevens, a giant figure in American law: Now, therefore, be it: 
RESOLVED, That: 
(1) extends heartfelt sympathies to the family and friends of Justice John Paul Stevens; 
(2) commends Justice John Paul Stevens for his decades of service to the United States, including his nearly 35-year tenure on the Supreme Court of the United States; and 
(3) acknowledges the enormous contributions of Justice John Paul Stevens to the United States and to American law.
There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 8, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 24; and 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, the morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Dickson nomination under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator MERKLEY for up to 75 minutes.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA WARD AND MEREDITH BOOKER

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to recognize two members of my team who are leaving the Senate after their years of dedicated and important work. Becca Ward will be leaving on August 7, and Meredith Booker will be leaving on Friday, July 26.

Both of them joined my team as interns. They have worked their way up within Team Merkley and have made tremendous contributions to my office and to our Nation. I know they are both going to do extraordinary things in the next chapters of their lives, but, first, it is worth reflecting on their service in the U.S. Senate.

Becca Ward has been an invaluable member of our team for 6 years. She started as an intern in my Oregon office, and she worked her way up to be my lead adviser on climate chaos and energy policy. Becca joined Team Merkley as a full-time staff assistant in 2013. Over the years, she rose to be a legislative correspondent and then a legislative aide. She drafted and sent responses to more than 225,000 Oregonians who were concerned about the climate and the environment.

Becca’s terrific work made it clear that she was capable of more, so she became my top policy adviser on the threat of climate chaos. Climate chaos presents an existential threat to our planet. Her professionalism, her substantive expertise, her creativity, and the network she has proved to be powerful tools in our work to advance a progressive climate agenda.

When Becca first started working on climate change, she took the lead and the effort to protect the Arctic Ocean from oil and gas drilling, which led to the introduction of the Stop Arctic Ocean Drilling Act. Over the course of her years on this portfolio, she has helped a lot with the mission 100 bill, which aims to transition the United States into a 100-percent clean energy economy. She also kept it in the Green New Deal, which has set a high bar for progressive climate efforts in the future. Just last week, she led my staff through the introduction of the Good Jobs for 21st Century Energy Act—a bold, new bill that required extensive coordination between the environmental community and the labor community. It is designed to create good-paying, family-wage jobs and to have high labor standards—a race to the top in employment during the transition to clean energy.

Becca’s efforts to take on the global challenge of climate chaos hasn’t been limited to the United States. She has repeatedly traveled with me and on behalf of the Senate to meetings with the Parties and to other international events to engage in the diplomacy that is necessary for a true global response to a global crisis. She has shepherded my efforts through the Appropriations Committee, to maintain funding for climate programs and to introduce and pass bipartisan amendments that support the Green Climate Fund.

In addition to her substantive policy responsibilities, she has been an incredible team player and a remarkable individual to have with us. I think it is safe to say that Becca will likely go down in Team Merkley history as the top-notch performance to every project first, it is worth reflecting on their service in the U.S. Senate.

Becca has contributed by collaborating with the team on the largest project of our office would agree. She is the best organized member of our team.

Meredith joined our team as an intern in August of 2016 and quickly became a key advisor on the climate portfolio. Her meticulously crafted policy tracker spreadsheet has helped our team stay on track in many areas and will remain a lasting part of her legacy here on Capitol Hill. It doesn’t matter whether it is the smallest project or the biggest high-stakes moment, Meredith always gets it done and does it done well.

This work ethic has extended from volunteering countless time to pitching memos, or project fall through the cracks. She managed re-introduction of the American Savings Act to expand high-quality retirement savings accounts to every American.

She managed our annual August Breastfeeding Month resolution to recognize the importance of breastfeeding
to American families and to the health of the children and the health of the mothers.

Just a short time ago, when the Department of Agriculture laid out a plan to destroy Civilian Conservation Corps centers across the country, she dove into the tricky and wonky world of that and proceeded to work intensely to prevent that from happening and worked successfully to do that.

She threw herself into the challenge of the Integrity Act, designed to make IRA work more cost-effectively for working Americans rather than be a loophole for the megawealthy.

Though we have always known we were lucky to have Meredith on Team Merkley, she has truly stepped up and gone above and beyond in the last year, after my June 2018 trip to Brownsville led to intensive work on the issue of family and child separation and to a lot of efforts by many parties to push back on President Trump’s cruelty to migrant families. When President Trump proposed locking families up in internment camps, she led the drafting of the No Internment Camps Act to say that we will never repeat that shameful chapter in our history.

When President Trump threw thousands of children into unregulated child prisons at Tornillo and Homestead, she leapt into action and worked with the immigration team to draft the Shut Out Child Prison Camps Act to end this horrific practice.

Just a few weeks ago, she was instrumental to the introduction of the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act, legislation to ensure we treat children with dignity and respect, and that act already has 40 Senators sponsoring it.

As I have traveled to investigate the Trump administration’s policies toward migrants over the last year, Meredith’s codel, or congressional delegation, has become legendary. Whether they are assembled in support of trips to Texas or Central America—or when she joined the trip herself, as she did earlier this year when we went to the child jail in Homestead, FL—you have never seen a binder assembled with so much meticulous care and attention to detail.

In addition to her many accomplishments supporting legislation and oversight trips, she worked with countless outside groups to organize a hugely successful hearing through the Democratic Policy and Communications Center, or DPCC, on family separation in June of 2018. She reprised that role outside groups to organize a hugely successful hearing on family separation and to a lot of efforts by many parties to push back on President Trump’s cruelty to migrant families. When President Trump proposed locking families up in internment camps, she led the drafting of the No Internment Camps Act to say that we will never repeat that shameful chapter in our history.

When President Trump threw thousands of children into unregulated child prisons at Tornillo and Homestead, she leapt into action and worked with the immigration team to draft the Shut Out Child Prison Camps Act to end this horrific practice.

Just a few weeks ago, she was instrumental to the introduction of the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act, legislation to ensure we treat children with dignity and respect, and that act already has 40 Senators sponsoring it.

As I have traveled to investigate the Trump administration’s policies toward migrants over the last year, Meredith’s codel, or congressional delegation, has become legendary. Whether they are assembled in support of trips to Texas or Central America—or when she joined the trip herself, as she did earlier this year when we went to the child jail in Homestead, FL—you have never seen a binder assembled with so much meticulous care and attention to detail.

In addition to her many accomplishments supporting legislation and oversight trips, she worked with countless outside groups to organize a hugely successful hearing through the Democratic Policy and Communications Center, or DPCC, on family separation in June of 2018. She reprised that role this week—in fact, today—working to help organize another DPCC hearing on the treatment of children at the southern U.S. border. It occurred just earlier this afternoon, with the focus on stopping the cruel treatment of migrant children.

She has done all this without letting that effort to respond to Oregonians’ letters fall through the cracks. She probably holds the record for our team responding to constituent mail, having responded to more than 256,000 emails in less than 3 years and, in doing so, created 350 unique letters for those responses. That means, on average, that Meredith has created nearly 150 letters per year and sent approximately 100,000 responses per year. That is a lot of commitment to folks back home, and Meredith is very proud of that work.

America is very lucky that Meredith is taking her talents to the legal arena. She will be starting at Loyola University of New Orleans this fall, working toward her law degree. Knowing how much she has already done with a law degree—probably more than most fully accredited lawyers—I know the world is going to benefit enormously as she pursues that degree and puts it to work in the fight for justice and equality. The world of justice and equality will benefit just as we experience the loss of her talents here in the Senate.

Meredith, we are tremendously grateful for your contributions and will deeply miss you on Team Merkley. We will absolutely miss you and you will leave a tremendous hole in our team. Your final assignment is to make sure that we have some very talented people to carry on the terrific work you have been doing. Thank you.

**MUELLER REPORT**

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, as our Founders worked to design what would become the Constitution of the United States, they had certain core principles in mind—certain principles that were the exact opposite of the way government worked in Europe. They did not want to see America be a land run by a dictator or a King. They wanted to make sure that power was distributed between voting Americans, a principle Jefferson called the equal voice principle, because distributed power among the people would lead to laws by and for the people, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for the King’s circle above the law, not laws by and for...
Office of Legal Counsel policy against indicting a sitting President, result in multiple felony charges for obstruction of justice. The Mueller report describes several acts that President Trump ordered or directed that obstructed or attempted to obstruct the truth-finding process, as to which the evidence of corrupt intent is overwhelming. The question at issue is whether the President had criminal intent to impede the investigation. The burden rests on the prosecution to prove the President's criminal intent. It has to be shown beyond a reasonable doubt that the President ordered or directed someone else to commit an obstruction of justice. If the obstruction charge has any basis in the law, it obviates the need for impeachment proceedings. The President is not a coequal of the Senate. The President's constitutional powers cannot grant him absolute immunity. The obstruction charge is based on the evidence that the President obstructed the Special Counsel investigation in 12 different ways, of which the investigation into the conduct of the President's campaign advisors is a central one. The President has committed multiple crimes.

What happened to the principle of equal justice under the law? There are 1,000 Federal prosecutors who said that the President has committed multiple felony crimes. Surely, felony crimes qualify. While there may be a discussion of ex-fusion to conduct his responsibilities as Attorney General, he would not have been able to serve as Attorney General of the United States. The President has a responsibility to defend that principle.

Firing of Comey. The attempt to obstruct the truth-finding process is overwhelming. The President's efforts to fire Mueller and to falsify evidence about that effort make it clear that his purpose was to limit the scope of Mueller's investigation to exclude his conduct; and the President's efforts to prevent witnesses from cooperating with the investigators probing him and his campaign.

This statement goes on in some detail, but the point that needs to be repeated is this point: 'Each of us believes that the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s report would, in the case of any other person . . . result in multiple felony charges.'

In other words, 1,000—in fact, more than 1,000—Federal prosecutors who were appointed by, and are members of, the President's Cabinet, who have heard the evidence, who have reviewed the Mueller report and have said yes on all three—criminal intent, nexus to an issue? The third is, was there criminal intent?

There are four cases in which capable prosecutors have concluded, after a discussion of each case, that there is no choice but for the House to act. In the failure of Attorney General Barr to honor the principle that our Nation was founded on, equal justice under the law, the only recourse is the House of Representatives.

Down this hallway, through these double doors, not far away, is the House of Representatives, which is charged under the Constitution with determining if a President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. While there may be a discussion of exactly what is meant by high crimes and misdemeanors, surely they entail acts of obstruction of justice for which any other American would have been indicted. Surely, felony crimes qualify.

They also do not determine guilt or innocence. The House plays the role of Federal prosecutors who are deciding whether to indictment. Is the evidence sufficient to say it is credible and substantial that the individual conducted a felony crime? The answer by 1,000 Federal prosecutors is absolutely.

It can’t be done by the Supreme Court. It can’t be done by the judiciary as long as the Attorney General is blocking it. It can be done only by the House. That is why the House has to act now and has to proceed to put together a committee on impeachment or this principle means nothing. Then it would come to this Chamber to hold an actual trial. But there will be no trial if there is no indictment. There is no trial in the Senate Chamber if there is no impeachment, and there is no credibility to this principle in America if the House doesn’t act.

So I call on the committee to convene that committee and to conduct that impeachment inquiry, and if they come out of that inquiry with 1,000 Federal prosecutors, they must act and vote to impeach.

This cannot be about politics: Is it a smart thing to do? How will it affect the next election? Will it put our Presidential candidates in a strange space? Let’s do an opinion poll of America. No, absolutely not.

Our institutions are under assault, and we have a responsibility because we took an oath of office to the Constitution to defend this principle. The House took the same oath, and they have a responsibility to defend that principle.

I am going to take the time to lay out four of those charges of obstruction justice just to set the stage for tomorrow.

This is what is referred to as a “heat map,” put out different cases in which the President interfered with the judicial process, and then it proceeds to ask: Is there substantial evidence of the three things that are needed as a foundation for saying that a felony crime has been committed?

The first is, was there an obstructive act? The second is, was there a nexus to an issue? The third is, was there criminal intent?

There are four cases in which capable individuals have reviewed the Mueller report and have concluded that those two things are red. Let’s take a look at this. First, let’s turn to this issue of efforts to fire Mueller. I am reading now from page 87 of this heft report on the investigation, the special counsel’s report.

On page 87, under “Analysis,” it proceeds to say: “In analyzing the President’s direction to McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice. Then he walks through each of these three pieces: Obstructive act. As with the President’s firing of Comey, the attempt to remove the Special Counsel would qualify as an obstructive act if it would naturally obstruct the investigation and any grand jury proceedings that might flow from the inquiry. Even if the removal of the lead prosecutor would not prevent the investigation from continuing under a new appointee, a factfinder would need to consider whether the act had the potential to delay further action in the investigation, thereby impeding the investigation.

Nexus to an official proceeding (the second test). To satisfy the proceeding requirement, it would be necessary to establish a nexus

A threshold question is whether the President in fact directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed. After news organizations reported that in June 2017 the President had ordered McGahn to remove Special Counsel, the President publicly disputed these accounts, and privately told McGahn that he had simply wanted McGahn to look into potential conflicts of the Office of the Department of Justice’s attention. . . . Some of the President’s specific language that McGahn recalled from the calls is consistent with his description. Subsequent actions, however, supports the conclusion that the President went further and in fact directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the Special Counsel removed.

First, McGahn’s clear recollection was that the President directed him to tell Rosenstein not only that conflicts existed but that they resulted in a decision to fire the Special Counsel. McGahn’s credible witness with no motive to lie or exaggerate given the position he held in the White House. McGahn spoke with the President twice and understood the directive the same way both times, making it unlikely that he misheard or misinterpreted the President’s request. In response to that request, McGahn decided that he did not want to participate in events that he described as akin to the Saturday Night Massacre.

That is a reference to Watergate. He called his lawyer, drove the White House, picked up his office, prepared to submit a resignation letter with his chief of staff, told Priebus that the President had asked him to “do crazy shit,” and informed Priebus and Bannon that he was leaving. Those acts would be a highly unusual reaction to a request to convey information to the Department of Justice.

Second, in the days before the calls to McGahn, the President, through his counsel, had already brought the asserted conflicts to the attention of the Department of Justice. Accordingly, the President had no reason to have McGahn call Rosenstein that weekend to raise conflicts issues that already had been raised.

Third, the President’s sense of urgency and repeated requests to McGahn to take immediate action on a weekend—“You gotta do it. You gotta do it. You gotta do it.”—support McGahn’s recollection that the President wanted the Department of Justice to take action to remove the Special Counsel. Had the President instead only have the Department of Justice re-examine asserted conflicts to evaluate whether they posed an ethical bar, it would have been unnecessary to set the process in motion on a Saturday and to make repeated calls to McGahn.

Finally, the President had discussed “knocking out Mueller” and raised the possibility of interest in a May 23, 2017 call to McGahn, reflecting that the President connected the conflicts to a plan to remove the Special Counsel. Indeed in the days before June 17, 2017, the President made clear to Priebus and Bannon, who then told Rudy, that the President was considering terminating the Special Counsel. Also, during this time period, the President reached out to Christie to get his thoughts on firing the Special Counsel. This evidence shows that the President was just seizing the examination of whether conflicts existed but instead was looking to use asserted conflicts as a way to terminate the Special Counsel.

So those are the obstructive acts, efforts to fire special counsel.

Nexus to an official proceeding (the second test). To satisfy the proceeding requirement, it would be necessary to establish a nexus
between the President’s act of seeking to terminate the Special Counsel and a pending or foreseeable grand jury proceeding.

Substantial evidence indicates that by June 2017, the President knew his conduct was under investigation by a federal prosecutor who could present any evidence of federal crimes to a grand jury. On May 23, 2017, while warning the Attorney General that his “biggest exposure” was not his act of firing Comey but his “other contacts” and “calls,” and his “ask re: Flynn,” by early June the media reported that the President was under investigation for obstruction of justice and the Special Counsel was interviewing witnesses to determine possible obstruction—spurring the President to write critical tweets about the Special Counsel’s investigation. The President called McGahn from Camp David on Saturday from Camp David. The evidence accordingly indicates that news that an obstruction investigation had been opened is what led the President to call McGahn to have the Special Counsel terminated.

There also is evidence that the President knew he had not made those calls to McGahn. The President made the calls to McGahn after McGahn had specifically told the President that the White House Counsel’s Office—and McGahn himself—could not be involved in pressing conflict claims and that the President should consult with his personal counsel if he raised such issues related to McGahn. And on June 16, 2017, the day before he directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the President publicly acknowledged that his conduct was under investigation by a federal prosecutor, tweeting, “I am being investigated for firing the FBI Director by the man who told me to fire the FBI Director.”

That covers the nexus to an official proceeding, but what about this third issue, this issue of intent?

Reading again from the special counsel’s report evaluating this, going to the issue of intent on efforts to fire Mueller:

Substantial evidence indicates that the President’s efforts to remove the Special Counsel were linked to the Special Counsel’s overriding concern that investigation had invaded the President’s conduct—and, most immediately, to reports that the President was being investigated for potential obstruction of justice.

Before the President terminated Comey, the President considered it critically important that he was not under investigation and that he was not in any way being investigated. As described in Volume II ... advisors perceived the President, while he was drafting the Comey termination letter, to be concerned more than anything else about getting out that he was not personally under investigation. When the President learned of the appointment of the Special Counsel on May 17, 2017, he expressed further concern about the investigation, saying “[t]his is the end of my Presidency.” The President also faulted Sessions for recusing, saying “you and Lewandowski were supposed to protect me.”

On June 14, 2017, when the Washington Post reported that the Special Counsel was investigating the President for obstruction of justice, the President was facing what he had wanted to avoid: a criminal investigation into his own conduct that was the subject of widespread media attention. The evidence of obstruction and potential obstruction investigation prompted the President to call McGahn and seek to have the Special Counsel removed. By mid-June, the Department of Justice clearly stated that the Special Counsel’s service and the President’s advisors had told him that the claimed conflicts of interest were “silly” and did not provide a basis to remove the Special Counsel. On June 13, 2017, the Acting Attorney General testified before Congress that no good cause existed and the President dictated a press statement to Sanders saying he had no intention of firing the Special Counsel. By early June, the media reported that the President was under investigation for obstruction of justice and the Special Counsel was interviewing witnesses to determine possible obstruction—spurring the President to write critical tweets about the Special Counsel’s investigation. The President called McGahn from Camp David on Saturday from Camp David. The evidence accordingly indicates that news that an obstruction investigation had been opened was what led the President to call McGahn to have the Special Counsel terminated.

So there it is—obstruction, a nexus to an investigation, and criminal intent. Those are the efforts to fire Mueller. That is the first one laid out in the first one that I am reading from page 97, continuing through page 98.

In analyzing the President’s efforts to have Lewandowski deliver a message directing Sessions to permit the Special Counsel investigation would be confined to future election interference, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice.

Looking first to the obstructive act. The President’s effort to send Sessions a message through Lewandowski would qualify as an obstructive act if it would naturally obstruct the investigation in any grand jury proceedings that might flow from the inquiry.

The President sought to have Sessions announce that the President “shouldn’t have a Special Prosecutor/Counsel” and that Sessions should tell the Special Prosecutor to explain this is very unfair and let the Special Prosecutor move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections so that nothing can happen in future elections.” The President wanted Sessions to disregard his recusal from the investigation, which had followed from a former Deputy Attorney General and the President knew “for a fact” that “there were no Russians involved in the campaign” because he “was there.” The President further directed that Sessions should explain that the President should not be subject to an investigation “because he hasn’t done anything wrong.” Taken together, the President’s directives indicate that Sessions was being instructed to tell the Special Counsel to end the existing investigation into the President and his campaign, with the Special Counsel being permitted to “move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections.”

So the obstructive act was perceived to box in the Mueller investigation so it wouldn’t touch on the President. But is there a nexus to an official proceeding? That is next addressed in the Mueller report as follows:

As described above, by the time of the President’s initial one-on-one meeting with Lewandowski on June 19, 2017, the existence of a grand jury investigation supervised by the Special Counsel was public knowledge.

I bet you would like to know what comes next, but take a look here. I can’t tell you because it has been blacked out. So whatever it was, it created a key point about the nexus to the official proceeding. The section goes on after the blacked out section:

To satisfy the nexus requirement, it would be necessary to show that limiting the Special Counsel’s investigation would have the menacing and probable effect of impeding grand jury proceedings.

So nexus and substantial evidence. Let’s go to intent. Again, I am reading from page 97:

Substantial evidence indicates that the President’s efforts to have Sessions limit the scope of the Special Counsel’s investigation to future election interference was intended to prevent further investigative scrutiny of the President’s and his conduct.

That sums it up. Then it goes on in some greater detail:

As previously described, see Volume II ... the President knew that the Russian investigation was focused in part on his campaign, and he perceived allegations of Russian interference to cast doubt on the legitimacy of his election. The President further knew that the investigation had been intended to include his own conduct and whether he had obstructed justice. Those investigations would not proceed if the Special Counsel’s jurisdiction were limited to future election interference only.

The timing and circumstances of the President’s actions support the conclusion that he had that result in mind. The critical direction that Sessions should limit the Special Counsel’s investigation came just 2 days
after the President ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, which itself followed public reports that the President was personally under investigation for obstruction of justice. The sequence of events raises an inference that after seeking to terminate the Special Counsel, the President sought to exclude his and his campaign’s direct role in the investigation’s scope. The President raised the matter with Lewandowski again on July 19, 2017, just days after emails and information about the June 17, 2017 events between President’s counsel and senior campaign officials had been publicly disclosed, generating substantial media coverage and public interest.

The manner in which the President acted provides additional evidence of his intent. Rather than rely on official channels, the President met with McGahn alone in the Oval Office. The President selected a loyal “devotee” outside White House channels, including McGahn, who had previously resisted contacting the Department of Justice about the Special Counsel. The President also did not contact the Acting Attorney General, who had just testified publicly that there was no cause to remove the Special Counsel. But the President directed McGahn to use Sessions to restrict and redirect the Special Counsel’s investigation when Sessions was recused and could not properly take action on it.

The July 19, 2017 events provide further evidence of the President’s intent. The President followed up with Lewandowski in a separate one-on-one meeting one month after he first dictated the message for Sessions, demonstrating he still sought to pursue the request. And just hours after Lewandowski assured that the message would soon be delivered to Sessions, the President gave an unplanned interview to the New York Times. The President publicly raised questions about his job security. Four days later, on July 22, 2017, the President directed Priebus to obtain Sessions’ recusal. That evidence could raise an inference that the President wanted Sessions to realize that his job might be on the line as he evaluated whether to comply with the President’s direction that Sessions publicly announce that, notwithstanding his recusal, he was going to confine the Special Counsel’s investigation to future election interference.

It is laid out in great detail—an obstructive act, a nexus to an official proceeding, and the issue of intent. This did not happen by accident—not on the efforts to fire Mueller and not on the efforts to curtail the Mueller investigation.

Now we will go to the third major point here—the order to McGahn to deny the attempt to fire Mueller. This analysis in the special prosecutor’s report would be our go to point for 2018.

In analyzing the President’s efforts to have McGahn deny that he had been ordered to have the Special Counsel removed, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice.

**First, obstructive act.**

The President’s repeated efforts to get McGahn to create a record denying that the President had directed him to remove the Special Counsel would qualify as an obstructive act if it had a natural tendency to constrain McGahn from testifying truthfully or to undermine his credibility as a potential witness to an official proceeding or to a proceeding or to further scrutiny of the President’s conduct towards the investigation.

There is some evidence that at the time the New York Times and Washington Post stories were published in late January 2018, the President believed the stories were false and tha he now ordered him to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. The President correctly understood that McGahn had not told the President directly that he had not sought to terminate the Special Counsel, and that the President told Priebus and Porter that he had not sought to terminate the Special Counsel, and in the Oval Office meeting with McGahn, the President instructed McGahn to have McGahn refute the story. I never said ‘fire.’” That evidence could indicate that the President was not attempting to persuade McGahn to create a record denying he had his own but different recollection of the substance of his June 17 conversations with McGahn and McGahn’s reaction to them. Other evidence cuts against that understanding of the President’s conduct.

That is an important line to understand. Is it possible that the President simply had a different recollection? And the answer in the special prosecutor’s report is this: “Other evidence cuts against that understanding.”

The special counsel continues:

As previously described, see Volume II . . . substantial evidence indicates that the President had directed him to have the Special Counsel removed, including the timing and context of the President’s directive; the manner in which McGahn recanted, and the fact that the President had been told the conflicts were insubstantial, were being considered by the Department of Justice, and McGahn had previously asserted that the President’s personal counsel rather than bought to McGahn. In addition, the President’s subsequent denials that he told McGahn removal as well as McGahn’s recanted as were moved carefully worded. When first asked about the New York Times story, the President said, “Fake news, folks. Fake news. A typical New York Times fake story.” And when the President spoke with McGahn in the Oval Office, he focused on whether he had used the word “fire,” saying, “I never said to fire Mueller. I never used the word ‘fire.’”

He then said:

“Did I say the word ‘fire?’ The President’s assertion in the Oval Office meeting that he had never directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed thus runs counter to the evidence.

In addition, even if the President sincerely disagreed with McGahn’s recollection of the June 17, 2017 events, the evidence indicates that the President knew by the time of the Oval Office meeting that McGahn’s account of the conversation that McGahn raised firm in his views. Shortly after the story broke, the President’s counsel told McGahn’s counsel that the President wanted McGahn to make a statement that he was not asked to fire the Special Counsel, but McGahn responded through his counsel that that aspect of the story was accurate and he therefore could not petition that the President’s recant. The President then directed Sanders to tell McGahn to correct the story, but McGahn told her he would not do so because the story was supported by the President’s order. Consistent with that position, McGahn never issued a correction. More than a week later, the President ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the President told Sanders and as his counsel had told the President’s counsel, that the President had in fact ordered him to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. That evidence indicates that by the time of the Oval Office meeting the President was aware that McGahn had not told the story was false and did not want to issue a statement or create a written record denying facts that McGahn believed to be true. The President’s conduct towards the investigation would be consistent with the President’s requests for McGahn to repudiate facts that McGahn had repeatedly said were accurate.

So that is the evidence of the order to McGahn to deny that he had been instructed to fire the President. But is there a nexus to an official proceeding—the second test? The special counsel’s report continues to address that issue.

Nexus to an official proceeding. By January 2018, the Special Counsel’s use of a grand jury had been further confirmed by the return of several indictments. The President also was aware that the Special Counsel was investigating obstruction of justice because, among other reasons, on January 8, 2018, the Special Counsel’s office provided his office with a memo asking for a possible interview with the President. The President knew that McGahn had personal knowledge in many of the events the Special Counsel was investigating and that McGahn had already been interviewed by Special Counsel investigators. And in the Oval Office meeting, the President indicated he knew that McGahn had told the Special Counsel Office about the President’s effort to remove the Special Counsel. The President challenged McGahn for disclosing that information to the Special Counsel investigators and that McGahn had repeatedly spoken to investigators and the obstruction inquiry was not complete, it was foreseeable that he would be interviewed again on obstruction-related topics. If the President were focused solely on a press strategy in seeking to have McGahn refute the New York Times article, a nexus to a proceeding or an investigation or any grand jury investigation that might grow out of it.

To establish a nexus, it would be necessary to show that the President’s actions would have the natural tendency to affect such a proceeding or that they would hinder, delay or prevent the communication of information to the investigators as they had spoken to Special Counsel investigators before January 2018, the President could not have been seeking to influence his prior statements in those interviews because McGahn had repeatedly spoken to investigators and the obstruction inquiry was not complete, it was foreseeable that he would be interviewed again on obstruction-related topics. If the President were focused solely on a press strategy in seeking to have McGahn refute the New York Times article, a nexus to a proceeding or an investigation or any grand jury investigation that might grow out of it.

Substantial evidence indicates that in response to McGahn’s dispute that he was ordered to have the Special Counsel terminated, the President acted for the purpose of influencing McGahn’s account in order to prevent further scrutiny of the President’s conduct towards the investigation.
That summarizes the intent.

Let me just repeat a piece of that.

Substantial evidence indicates that in repeatedly urging McGhan to dispute that he was ordered to have the Special Counsel terminated.

In other words, his repeated efforts to have McGhan lie—

the President acted for the purpose of influencing McGhan’s account in order to deflect or prevent further scrutiny of the President’s conduct.

Several facts support that conclusion. The President made repeated attempts to get McGhan to change his story.

Not just one, but repeated attempts. As early as the day of the time of the last attempt, the evidence suggests that the President had been told on multiple occasions that McGhan believed the President had ordered him to have the Special Counsel terminated. McGhan interpreted his encounter with the President in the Oval Office as an attempt to test his mettle and see how committed he was to his memory of what had occurred. The President had already laid the groundwork for pressing McGhan to alter his account by telling Porter that it might be important to McGhan if he chose to deny the story, and Porter relayed that statement to McGhan. Additional evidence of the President’s intent might be gleaned from McGhan’s counsel and said that McGhan could not design no matter what happened in the Oval Office that day. The President’s counsel was well aware of McGhan’s resolve not to issue what he believed to be a false account. In fact the President’s counsel had been alarmed by the prospect of the President’s meeting with McGhan that he called McGhan’s counsel and said that McGhan could not forbid no matter what happened in the Oval Office that day. The President’s counsel reflected his understanding—and his displeasure—that those events would be part of an obstruction-of-justice inquiry.

So there it is—the intent, all laid out very, very clearly in this report—obstructive acts, a nexus to an official proceeding, and the clear intent.

So let’s turn to the fourth issue: Conduct toward Manafort.

And a third person who has been blacked out in this book can be found on page 131 of the special counsel’s report.

In analyzing the President’s conduct towards Flynn, Manafort—

and a third person blacked out in this book appeared to have been connected to pending or anticipated official proceedings involving each individual.

The President’s conduct towards Flynn principally occurred when both were under criminal investigation by the Special Counsel’s Office and press reports speculated about whether the investigation involved the Special Counsel’s investigation. And the President’s conduct toward Manafort was directly connected to the official proceedings involving them. The President made statements about Manafort and the charges against him during Manafort’s criminal trial. And the President’s comments about the proceedings occurring when it was clear the Special Counsel continued to oversee grand jury proceedings.

So there is the nexus laid out very clearly in this report on this effort to influence Manafort’s testimony.

And to then intent, page 132.

Evidence concerning the President’s conduct towards Manafort indicates that the President intended to encourage Manafort to not cooperate with the government. Before Manafort was convicted, the President repeatedly stated that Manafort had been treated unfairly. Manafort was convicted on eight felony charges and potentially faced a lengthy prison term, the President said that Manafort was a “brave man” for his cooperation. The President was already on record that he said he had a “wonderful family.”

And when the President was asked whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort. The White House said it would not comment on individual cases. The President stated that those events would be part of an obstruction-of-justice inquiry.

So let’s turn to the fourth issue: Conduct toward Manafort.

The evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe that he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government as means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

To read that again:

The evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe that he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government as means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

The special counsel continues under intent.

We also examined the evidence of the President’s intent making public statements about Manafort at the beginning of his trial and when the jury was deliberating.

Some evidence supports a conclusion the President intended, at least in part, to influence the jury. The trial generated widespread publicity, and as the jury began to deliberate, commentators suggested that additional information about intent, whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort, might be helpful. The comments could, if they reached jurors, have the natural tendency to engender sympathy for Manafort among jurors, and a factfinder could infer that the President intended that result. But there are alternative explanations to the President’s comments, including that he genuinely felt sorry for Manafort or that his goal was not to influence the jury but influence public opinion. The President’s comments could also have been intended to communicate a message that a pardon was possible. As described above, the President made his comments about Manafort being “a very good person” and that “it’s very sad what they’ve done to Paul Manafort” right after calling the Special Counsel’s investigation a “rigged witch hunt.” The President’s statements could, if they reached jurors, have the natural tendency to engender sympathy for Manafort among jurors, and a factfinder could infer that the President intended that result.

You might be very interested in the additional information about intent, but I can’t read it to you because it is blacked out. Nonetheless, in that previous paragraph, it is clearly declared that the evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government as means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.
as a means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

Those are the first four cases of obstruction of justice in which a special prosecutor lays out substantial evidence on the obstructive act, on the nexus, and on the intent on the efforts to fire Mueller, on the efforts to curtail the Mueller investigation, on the order to McGahn to deny that he had attempted to fire Mueller, and on the effort to influence Manafort by alluding to a potential pardon.

There is a lot more in this book—many other cases that, in the eyes of analysts, isn’t as strong as the first four, but the evidence could support it, whether it is substantial evidence, but still very serious stories of efforts to obstruct justice.

Ordinary Americans might say: If, in fact, the special prosecutor found all three standards met on at least four of these cases, then why hasn’t the President been indicted? Well, indictment has to come from the executive branch and the Attorney General, who runs the Department of Justice, who isn’t going to do it. There is a policy within the White House that basically says a President can’t be indicted. Pull out your Constitution and try to find where the Constitution says that a President can’t be indicted. Try to find that because it is not in there.

“Equal justice under law.” That is what our Constitution is about, not the case of a King who is above the law, so we have a democratic republic, if we can keep it.

But that means that we are in this principle “equal justice under law,” and if the special prosecutor is not going to make recommendations based on the White House executive branch principle that a President can’t be indicted and the Department of Justice is not going to do it, there is only one option, and that is the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has the huge responsibility of defending this principle “equal justice under law.” No one else is going to do it. It can’t be done here in the Senate because the Constitution says the responsibility is in the House of Representatives to decide whether to impeach a President.

There has been a lot of discussion of politics: Is this a smart thing to do? Does it take up too much time? How will people respond? I can tell you this, if the House fails to act, then this “equal justice under law” means nothing.

This book is full of events that a thousand former Federal prosecutors have told us constitutes criminal conduct, and that is why the House must, in defending their oath of office to the Constitution, bring a committee together and defend the Constitution—the vision—that no one in the United States of America, not even the President, is above the law. It is time—past time—to convene impeachment proceedings.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DAVID L. NORQUIST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE PATRICK M. SHANAHAN, RE-SIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 23, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MARK T. ESPER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.
RUDY GIULIANI COMMENTS REGARDING THE IRANIAN REGIME OF TERROR

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to include the following remarks about the situation in Iran that I believe are relevant and should be widely shared. The comments, from former New York City Mayor and attorney to the U.S. President Rudy Giuliani, address peaceful regime change in Iran and the work of the Iranian Resistance as it has emerged.

Giuliani delivered this speech at the International Gathering at Ashraf-3, Tiranova, Albania, which is home to members of the Iranian opposition, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (PMOI/MEK). More than 350 bipartisan dignitaries and parliamentarians from 47 countries attended the conference. I offer these comments for thoughtful discussion as follows:

Giuliani: “Thanks to you and particularly to the people who live here in Ashraf 3. You'll be the ones who lead your people to freedom and you'll be honored forever in Iranian history and in the history of those who love and are willing to die for freedom. God bless you.

This organization has grown and grown and grown and I feel in this room today a kind of optimism that I don't remember feeling before when we were in Paris. I feel an optimism maybe because you've done an ac- clement here in Ashraf. If we were to build this in New York City, it would take 15 years and 14 corruption investigations. I was here a year and a half ago, this wasn't here.

And of course, all of this is possible because of the leadership of Madame Maryam Rajavi, a truly exceptional leader. Just like her husband Massoud Rajavi, who began this movement in one very brave act. He refused to swear allegiance to the Supreme Leader Khomeini. He said, ‘No, I will not swear allegiance to you. I will not deliver my nation to a tyrant.’

I'm here to say three things. First, I accuse the Ayatollah and all of their acolytes and followers of mass murder, crimes against humanity. We should be embarrased for our countries if they haven't stood up against this. There's no middle ground here. These people have killed at least 120,000 members and associates of this great organization. You see the book. You go through the sad, tragic, but heroic exhibits they have of the martyrs to freedom. Look at the photograph of the people in the infirmary being treated for injuries, slaughtered just a few years ago. Killed 52 of them. The other killed 12,000 people and we found them and it took years and we brought them to justice. The people who slaughtered 30,000 people in 1988 should be identified, they should be prosecuted, and they should either be imprisoned for life or executed. They're criminals. They're murderers. They are not leaders of countries. They are no better than the murderer in the street except they're worse because they're mass murderers.

I am proud of my government because we have stood up. We looked at that agreement that would make Iran a nuclear power and we said tear it up. We're not going to put nuclear weapons into the hands of a maniac, well, I say to the leaders of Europe, you can be liberators too. You can go down in history as fighters for freedom.

Isn't that what we're doing, they didn't just running a government and making money and giving blood money to Iran? How can you do commerce with them? We all know they're the largest sponsor of terrorism in the world. What does that mean? That means they fund and they supply murderers not only in their own country but all over the world. Who gives them money, when you give them money, when you relieve them of a debt, which my government did in the prior administration, and put over a billion dollars back in their hands, you are enabling them to finance their murdering. Their money use it for? Their people know, their people know that when they get money, when a French company or a German company does business with them, that money, that profit is going to be used to kill people in Syria or to kill people somewhere else or to send people to Albania to kill us or to send people to France like they did last year to kill Madame Rajavi and us. That's what they're funding, don't you realize it? That makes you complicit.

Number two, let's make it clear, there is an alternative to this horrible regime of terror. This isn't one of those situations in which we have the choice of posing with a hor-rible dictator and we don't know if a more miserable one will come along. Right? And when we saw that happen, we saw it happen in Egypt, in some ways we saw it happen in Libya.

But here we don't have that problem. We've got the worst regime in the world by far, the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world. Then and the National Counci- l, the NCRI, led by the president-elect, Madame Rajavi. Coalition of resistance organi- zations around the world. There are representatives of most of the major countries in the world here. They've got to know her. They've gotten to respect her. In my country, she's thoroughly respected.

We know there's a group of people who have been fighting for freedom all their lives, people who are dedicated to freedom, who are dedicated to freedom. People here at Ashraf, let's make it clear. I spent a lot of time with them. These are people who are dedicated to freedom. And if you think that's a cult, then there's something wrong with you. There's something missing in your soul.

But we know that there is a government in existence that negotiates with the Ayatollah, and it's written down plain as can be what it stands for. And it looks just like our Bill of Rights, just like the universal declarations of freedom and decency and human rights en-shrined in the great documents of the world. Free elections within six months is the promise, and I believe it will be fulfilled. They're for gender equality. They're for human rights. They're for a system of law. They're for we don't imprison someone un- less they have a fair trial. And because of their history, they oppose capital punish- ment, because there's been too much of it. And it isn't just capital punishment, it's murder in their country. This is a good organi- zation. And it's an organization that is ready, willing and able not to take over Iran but to guide Iran to elections as quickly as possible and hopefully they will be part of the coalition government that are part of the coalition that is trying to guide Iran to freedom. This is a group that we can support. It's a group that we should stop ma- ligning it and it's a group that should make us comfortable having regime change in the worst regime in the world.

Here's what you can do. You can be a wit- ness like in the Biblical sense of a witness. You know something that a lot of people don't know. You know really how bad it is in Iran. And you know about MEK. And you know about Madame Rajavi. And you know the truth, not the lies, “the cult, they don't have support in Iran.” Why has the Aya-tollah been murdering them for 40 years if they don't have support in Iran? The Aya-tollah, Rouhani, have said that this organi- zation is the only one that's really a danger to them.

You now have a responsibility because of your knowledge. Don't be euphemistic about it. Don't hide your eyes. You've got to get the leaders of your country to stand up so you can all be proud of your country and its heritage.

I get attacked and my colleagues who will be here in a moment get attacked all the time in America. Why we're doing this? We're doing it really very simply because we love freedom and we can't turn our back on people who are being treated this way and we can't turn our back on a situation that could be catastrophic for them and catastrophic for the world. You know what I say to them? Keep doing it. Keep doing it. I wear it as a badge of honor. I support freedom, you sup- port oppression. I support democracy, you support a dictatorship. I support decent peo- ple who share the values of decent govern- ments, and you support mass murderers. Who's right and who's wrong? But I know and I feel as I've told you, and I know why there's an optimism in this room. Because we're going to be in Tehran much sooner than all those cynics believe. You know why? Because we are Hazer, Hazer, Hazer. (We're ready).”
REMEMBERING HÉCTOR FIGUEROA
HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Héctor Figueroa, a champion for workers’ rights, an advocate for immigrants, a New Yorker, a passionate Puerto Rican and my dear friend. Above all, Héctor was a fighter for the vulnerable, the downtrodden and those who were treated unfairly. Sadly, Héctor passed last week. He will be honored at a public service on Wednesday in New York City.

Héctor Figueroa was known most notably for his leadership of 32BJ SEIU. Under his leadership, 32BJ SEIU grew by over 50,000 members and passed dozens of local and state-level policies. Héctor previously worked as SEIU’s Organizing Director for Puerto Rico, winning collective bargaining rights for teachers, airport security guards and others. As SEIU’s Justice for Janitors campaign and a researcher for Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (Workers United).

Most recently, Héctor was central to building support for relief in Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria. Héctor was critical to mobilizing support among New York’s Puerto Rican community, 32BJ members and non-members alike, to send aid and to build political momentum for Washington to do better in channeling assistance to our fellow citizens as they struggled through a humanitarian crisis.

Throughout his life, Héctor made waves as a progressive fighter for justice for all people. He was relentless in advocating for the rights of the doormen and doormen, custodial workers, airport security guards and others who constitute 32BJ’s membership. However, he was also on the frontlines helping taxi cab drivers, fast food workers and laborers in every sector achieve fair wages and improved conditions. To him, anyone who was oppressed was an ally and he was ready to join arms with them and march in common cause.

His belief that all workers were deserving of respect and kindness extended beyond his work as a labor leader; it infused his very demeanor. Héctor treated everyone, from the youngest organizers, to the most junior political aides, to the most powerful elected officials with the same kindness and warmth.

Whether it was fighting to expand health care for immigrant communities from ICE, strengthening voter rights or addressing the threats of climate change, Héctor was on the frontlines of every battle related to economic and social justice. Just last week, this House voted to raise the federal minimum wage, a milestone achievement, years in the making. I like to think when he’s there, that victory would bring a smile to Héctor’s face.

New York City and working people everywhere have lost a champion. I, personally, have lost a dear friend. From my earliest days in politics, I could always count on Héctor for wise advice and kind counsel. I’ll miss our days together and fighting alongside one another. While he was taken from us too young, we’ll honor his memory by continuing to advocate the causes that inspired him. As Héctor always said, “We’ll keep organizing.” Yes, my friend, we will.

RECOGNIZING THE DC GRAYS BASEBALL TEAM
HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the DC Grays for their commitment and contribution to increasing interest and youth participation in baseball and softball in the District of Columbia. In particular, I want to recognize the DC Grays 2019 summer college league baseball team and the annual Capitol Hill reenactment.

The DC Grays is a talented collegiate summer baseball team that, in addition to competing in the Cal Ripken Collegiate Baseball League, strives to engage inner-city youth and their families with baseball. Their mission is to be “ambassadors for baseball” in the District by running summer baseball camps and clinics for D.C. youth. Named for the champion Homestead Grays from the Negro Leagues, the DC Grays has reached out to African-American ballplayers who may have been overlooked by other teams.

The DC Grays partners with Major League Baseball (MLB) to further help its mission of providing disadvantaged youth an opportunity to learn and enjoy the game of baseball. The programs help motivate young players to stay in school and pursue secondary education. MLB’s RBI program helps teach youth not only the importance of success on the field but also in the classroom and the community. This year, the DC Grays RBI is sponsoring two summer baseball leagues and two travel softball teams for kids from Wards 6, 7, and 8 in D.C.—in addition to fall ball programs and winter training. There are 250 kids participating in DC Grays RBI programs this year.

Last year, the DC Grays participated in MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl. The programs help motivate young players to stay in school and pursue secondary education. MLB’s RBI program helps teach youth not only the importance of success on the field but also in the classroom and the community. This year, the DC Grays reaches out to African-American ballplayers who may have been overlooked by other teams.

The DC Grays participates in MLB’s unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben’s Chili Bowl, and their players attended an event to honor Jackie Robinson as part of MLB’s all-star festivities. They strive to honor the Negro Leagues and its role in Washington baseball history. Each year, the DC Grays hosts a salute to Negro League Baseball in collaboration with the Hubert Simons League Museum.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House to join me in commending the DC Grays for their important work it has done and continues to do in the community. We wish the DC Grays luck in their future endeavors. I thank each one of them for their dedication on July 23rd.

HONORING ARKANSAS’S KOREAN WAR VETERANS
HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Arkansas’s Korean War veteran commemorations. This summer, the Arkansas Department of Veterans Affairs is honoring the men and women who served our country and defended South Korea during the Cold War.

In an oft-forgotten chapter of history, Korean War soldiers from the United States provided vital assistance to the South Korean army. During a volatile time, their service prevented North Korean forces from taking over the entire Korean peninsula.

Arkansas has a rich history of bravery and patriotism, and I’m honored to recognize our Korean War veterans at these commemoration events. I thank each one of them for their service, and hope their legacies continue for generations to come.
HONORING THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MINNESOTA ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the International Institute of Minnesota on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. The Institute’s original mission is as vital today as it was after World War I when it welcomed refugees fleeing strife and instability in their homelands and helped them achieve self-sufficiency and full membership in American life.

In 1919, leaders of the Saint Paul YWCA came together to address an urgent need in the community to serve those who were arriving to Minnesota, displaced in the aftermath of the “War to End All Wars.” Out of this effort, the Institute became one of the first state resettlement voluntary agencies (VOLAGS).

The onset of World War II saw the need for the Institute’s services to expand. During this time, the organization partnered with the War Relocation Authority, helping to free Japanese-Americans from internment camps and working with the Iwo Jima and codebreakers at Fort Snelling. At the end of the Vietnam War, many refugees were displaced from Southeast Asia to Minnesota, particularly ethnic Hmong and others from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Since 1974, the Institute has resettled approximately 25,000 refugees from every region of the world, including recent arrivals from Somalia and Myanmar.

As economists point to increasingly tight labor markets and a growing scarcity of workers as two of our state’s most significant barriers to sustained economic growth, the Institute contributes to our economic vitality by opening the door for those pursuing the American dream. By partnering with new Americans on a path to citizenship, entrepreneurship and full membership in our community, state and country, the Institute has empowered hundreds of new Americans to become our trusted doctors, business leaders, teachers, engineers, scientists, policemen and soldiers.

Recognizing that new Americans enrich our state in many ways, the Institute honors and shares our state’s growing diversity and fosters cultural understanding. For nearly 90 years, the Institute’s Festival of Nations has drawn thousands of people together each May to celebrate the many traditions that are shared by Minnesotans. Through this festival, Minnesotans have come to appreciate how as a state and nation of Native Americans and immigrants, our strength is our diversity of backgrounds, viewpoints and religions.

The motto inscribed on the Great Seal of the United States: “E Pluribus Unum—Out of Many, One” underscores that the foundation of our nation has always been the collective power of many different people coming together. For 100 years, the International Institute of Minnesota has proudly supported our nation by welcoming and empowering new refugees and immigrants from different backgrounds to come together as new Americans.

Please join me to congratulate the staff, volunteers and donors to the International Institute of Minnesota for providing 100 years of hospitality, empowerment, hope and opportunity for new Americans.

CONGRATULATING JOHN F. MITTON FOR BEING VOTED INTO THE TEXAS RADIO HALL OF FAME

HON. PETE OLSON OF TEXAS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John F. Mitton from Missouri City, Texas for being voted into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame.

Mitton, president of a national advertising agency based in Sugar Land, is one of only twenty Texas broadcasters who will be inducted into the Hall of Fame. Inductions will be held on November 2, 2019, at the Texas Museum of Broadcasting and Communications.

Mitton has always had a strong suit for “listening to his clients . . . [and] helping develop and refine some of the best niche products ever featured in Texas radio.”

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to John Mitton for being elected into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. It is my pleasure to congratulate him on his contributions to radio. We are very proud of him and this incredible accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT J. FRIEND

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Lieutenant Colonel Robert Jones Friend, who died on June 21, 2019 in Long Beach, California, surrounded by his family. Lieutenant Colonel Friend was a member of the heroic unit known as the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II.

Robert J. Friend was born on February 29, 1920, in Columbia, South Carolina, to William A. Friend and Nella Mae Jones Liner. His father was an immigrant from Ecuador and a veteran of World War I. The oldest of four children, Robert was an aviation enthusiast from a young age, often building model airplanes and reading stories of World War I pilots during his childhood. While studying at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, he joined the Civilian Pilot Training Program where he earned his pilot’s license in 1939.

Despite his passion for aviation, he was denied entry into flight training by the Army Air Force because of his race. Instead he joined as an air-cadet in the all-black 99th Pursuit Squadron, nicknamed the Tuskegee Airmen. During World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Friend flew 142 missions for the 322nd Fighter Group. He began his tour in North Africa and was later sent to the European Theater to serve as a Combat Operations Officer where he was instrumental in orchestrating tactical air missions. He spent time flying the P-47 and P-51 Mustang aircraft. He experienced multiple death-defying disasters, including when he had to abandon his plane over the mountains of Italy and when a German oil barge explosion nearly grounded his aircraft.

He became the primary wingman to his commanding officer, Colonel Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., who would become the first black general in the Air Force. Robert and his fellow airmen were later awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for their service to our country.

After his service in World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Friend continued his education and received a degree in astrophysics from the Air Force Institute of Technology, later graduating from the University of California, Los Angeles Business School. Additionally, he continued his career in the military for 28 years by serving as an operations officer during the Korean and Vietnam wars, working on the Delta, Titan, and Atlas rocket programs, and operating as an executive of the aerospace companies, Stanford Mu and Fairchild Stratos. Following his retirement from military service, Robert started an aerospace company and conducted speaking engagements, remaining dedicated to sharing the legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen and keeping their history alive.

Robert J. Friend is survived by his children: Thelma Hoffman, Robert, Jr., Michael, Debra Carter, Karen Crumlish, Clara Ann Browning, 18 grandchildren, 32 great-grandchildren, and 14 great-great-grandchildren. The memory of his son, Darryl, who was killed while on active duty in 2002, continues to live on today. It was my great honor to have known Lieutenant Colonel Robert Jones Friend, an intelligent, hardworking, and spirited man who spent his life in service to our country. I ask all members to join with me in remembering Lieutenant Colonel Robert Jones Friend, a true American hero.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

SPEECH OF HON. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. HORN. Madam Speaker, the U.S. Government is entrusted by the American people with certain responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is managing our government’s finances and using taxpayer dollars wisely. In the last few decades, our government leaders have too often ignored this responsibility, opting rather to pay lip service to responsibly managing our budget but neglecting to do so in practice. This neglect has led to rampant spending, missed budgetary deadlines, and burdensome borrowing that have become mainstays of every Congress, regardless of which party holds the majority. The 116th Congress must take action to break this unwieldy cycle and restore the fiscal responsibility Americans have entrusted us with.

The 2019 GAO High-Risk List reveals that many federal government programs are over budget, over time, and beyond our capacity to deliver on the promise of providing quality services for the American public. This financial situation is specific to one government agency or program. It can be found across the federal government.

America must remain a world leader in many areas, such as scientific research, reliable infrastructure, and defense technology, and I understand that to do so requires large financial investments. However, it is also my responsibility as a Member of Congress to ensure the money our government spends is...
being used effectively and efficiently so Americans are getting the most out of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

I have made it a priority to support legislation that addresses our government’s spending habits. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I put forth a bipartisan amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) with fellow Oklahoman, Congressman Tom Cole, to allow the Department of Defense (DoD) to have better oversight of where and how government defense money is being spent. The amendment requires the office of the Inspector General to audit all sole-source contracts with depot maintenance centers. This audit, and other financial accounting tools, act as accountability measures to ensure the government is being a good steward of taxpayer money while keeping our country safe.

As a member of the Government Efficiency Caucus and the Blue Dog Coalition, I am constantly working with my colleagues to find ways to promote responsible government spending. The bipartisan Government Efficiency Caucus works to find pragmatic solutions to government spending that increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs. The Blue Dog Coalition’s Fiscal Responsibility Task Force analyzes ways to strengthen our fiscal responsibility and close the cycle of widespread government spending.

During the 116th Congress, the Government Efficiency Caucus has identified three priorities to improve the government’s fiscal efficiency. These priorities include focusing on ensuring government agencies adopt monetary best practices to increase efficiency and effectiveness; supporting reasonable policy proposals that will improve the on-time, on-budget delivery of federal infrastructure investments; and modernizing the federal government workforce to ensure government employees have the skills, knowledge, and technology, to be good stewards of taxpayer money.

The Blue Dog Coalition’s Fiscal Responsibility Task Force has released a set of policy proposals that include financial stability measures like creating a federal rainy-day fund so Congress is less reliant on massive, unplanned emergency spending when disasters strike. Another proposal emphasizes a return to the regular process of creating and passing the federal budget on time every year. This proposal outlines concepts like “No Budget, No Pay” and “No Budget, No Recess,” which would increase the consequences on Congress for not passing a federal budget. These and other proposals outlined by the Blue Dog Fiscal Responsibility Task Force should be given extensive consideration by Congress, so our government can correct the bad fiscal habits it has developed.

Future generations of Americans should not have to pay for our irresponsible spending. It is up to us to get America’s fiscal house in order so we can prove to the world that we are a nation that keeps its fiscal promises. Doing so will not only improve our government and its standing in the world, but also increase the faith that taxpayers have in the government to spend their money wisely.

**RECOGNIZING GERARDO BECERRA FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN’S ASSOCIATION**

**HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Tuesday, July 23, 2019**

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement as President of two local International Longshoremen’s Association (ILA) chapters, I rise today to commemorate the years of service my close friend, Mr. Gerardo Becerra, has given to the maritime industry and the thousands of members he passionately represented in South Florida. Gerry is a remarkable individual whose legacy in the port industry and the ILA will never be forgotten.

Born in 1941 in Havana, Cuba, Gerry escaped the Castro dictatorship in 1960 and had to build a new life for himself in South Florida. Shortly after arriving to the states, Gerry enlisted in the United States Army in 1962 and served our nation for a number of years. After being honorably discharged from the army, Gerry began working at the ports and in 1965 he was one of the original charter members for ILA’s Local 1922 chapter.

Gerry’s retirement closes his chapter of over forty-five years of service to the longshoremen industry and the ILA. From 1965 to 1983, Gerry worked as a checker and plan clerk and through his hard work and dedication, he was appointed Vice President in 1984 for Local 1922, Local 1922–1, and Local 2062. In this role, he represented checkers, mechanics, and truck drivers. In 2005, he became President of Local 1922 and Local 1922–1 and served in this position until his retirement. Additionally, he served as Vice President of the ILA from 2006 until 2018. During this time, Gerry was integral in negotiating contracts, mediating grievances, and representing the interests of his colleagues.

Having had the privilege of working with Gerry for many years, his determination and passion for bettering the longshoremen industry never wavered. Since his retirement marks the end of an era, I have no doubt that Gerry looks forward to spending more time with his wife of fifty-six years, Carmen, his two daughters, nine grandchildren, and extended family.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the impressive career of my dear friend, Mr. Gerry Becerra, and the strides he has made for our community.

**IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MOHAMMAD SIDDIQUE SHEIKH’S 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

**HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN OF VIRGINIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Tuesday, July 23, 2019**

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Mohammad Siddique Sheikh’s nearly five decades of service to our great Commonwealth of Virginia. Mr. Sheikh was born and raised in Gujranwala, Pakistan, before moving to the United States 50 years ago. He came with just $10 dollars in his pocket, and today he is a very successful businessman living the American dream. Since moving to this country, Mr. Sheikh has served our country as a successful entrepreneur and advocate for the Pakistani American community in the larger Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Mr. Sheikh has also been on several academic boards and business institutions, including George Mason University, one of Virginia’s largest public research institutions. He is also the Founder of the Pakistan American Business Association (PABA), a representative body of entrepreneurs of Pakistani-origin. In recognition of his service and commitment, he was appointed as the Chairman of the Council on Diversity formed by the Police Chief of Fairfax County. He served in this position for more than five years.

Mr. Sheikh is a selfless and dedicated leader in the Pakistani American community. He has been a torch-bearer in promoting Pakistan’s friendly image in the United States. Mr. Sheikh’s servant leadership can be witnessed in his work when he helped create the Muslim Community Center in the state of Maryland and being a leading voice in the creation of Islamic Circle of North America Sunday School for Muslim communities residing in the DC metropolitan area. In the education field, Mr. Sheikh has been a dominant force in promoting connections between higher institutions in Pakistan and the United States. As a member of the Board of Visitors at George Mason University and Pakistan’s National University of Science and Technology, he led an effort to create linkages for students at the University of Science and Technology faculty and students to study at George Mason University through various programs. He also played an active role in promoting cooperation between GMU and University of Karachi. Today, the two institutions are now working on various initiatives and programs.

Madam Speaker, I have had the privilege to know Mr. Sheikh for many years and count him as a dear friend.
hymn as a friend. I ask you to join me in rec-
ognition of Mr. Mohammad Siddique Sheikh
leadership, passion, and determination in serv-
vice to our great nation.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF OREGON RARE PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Uni-
versity of Oregon Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) program. This AmeriCorps program is administered through the University of Oregon’s Institute for Policy Research and Engagement and is dedicated to improving economic, social, and environ-
mental conditions in rural Oregon communi-

Since its inception in 1994, more than 600 RARE members have served all 36 counties and more than half of the cities in Oregon, providing much needed capacity and expertise to rural communities. In the past 25 years, RARE members have completed more than 2,000 assessments, plans, and reports for local communities, written more than 700 grants, raised over $6 million for communities, and recruited more than 10,000 community volunteers who served more than 8.6 million hours. In the last five years alone, commu-
nities in my congressional district have bene-

This year, 31 RARE members are working across the State of Oregon to develop and im-
plement community planning, community and
economic development, natural resource plan-
ing, and community food security/food sys-
tems projects. Current projects in my district include a RARE member working with the City of Florence Public Art Committee to select and install two large-scale public art pieces in the Urban Renewal District. There is also a two-

I am proud to note that RARE AmeriCorps Program partnerships include federal and state agencies and notable non-profit founda-
tions and organizations. The key partners are the Corporation for National & Community Service (AmeriCorps), the University of Or-
egon, the Ford Family Foundation, the Oregon Food Bank, Travel Oregon, Oregon Main Street, Energy Trust of Oregon, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Or-
egon Department of Transportation.

It is my pleasure to congratulate the RARE AmeriCorps Program on 25 years of service to rural communities in Oregon and to thank RARE for its many vital contributions. I have no doubt these first 25 years of success will serve as the inspiration for the next twenty-
five.

CONGRATULATING THE PEARLAND HIGH SCHOOL BAND FOR BEING SELECTED TO PERFORM IN THE ROSE PARADE

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pearland High School marching band, also known as “The Pride of Pearland,” for being chosen to perform in the 131st annual Rose Parade.

The band was chosen for a number of rea-
sons, most notably its member’s community service efforts, specifically towards hurricane, Harvey relief. The band was one of 16 chosen out of over 100 national and international ap-
plicants and the only Texas band selected this year.

In addition to community work, the bands are judged based on musicality and marching skills. The band also garnered commu-
nity support to help raise the money funds needed to pay for the trip to Pasadena, Cali-

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Conser-
vational District of Texas, congratulations again to the Pearland marching band for being chosen to represent Texas at the historical Rose Parade.

We are very proud of them and this incredible accomplishment.

CELEBRATING DR. EDNA REHBEIN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of Dr. Edna Rehbein, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Texas State University, as she retires after 21 years of incredible public service.

With her “can-do” spirit and high-
minded vision, she’s a model citizen and trusted community leader.

Renowned for her expertise in Spanish and Spanish-American Literature, Edna has distin-
guished herself as a gifted educator and nat-
ural-born leader who has made a lasting im-
 pact on both her beloved university and the greater Round Rock, TX community. She’s al-

Outside of teaching, Edna contributes her expertise to various civic organizations in Cen-
tral Texas. She represents Texas State Uni-

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND CAREER OF AMBASSADOR MARION H. SMOAK

HON. MICHAEL WALTZ
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and career of Ambas-
dador Marion H. Smoak as he celebrates his 103rd birthday. Ambassador Smoak has dedi-
cated many years to public service and em-
body the principles of a true servant leader.

Ambassador Smoak has held a wide range of positions in English and History from The Citadel in 1938. He went on to receive a law degree from the University of South Carolina Law School in 1941. After receiving his law degree Ambas-
dador Smoak served in the Army as a Judge Advocate and was stationed in Berlin, Ger-
many and New Caledonia, Japan with the 11th and 82nd Airborne Divisions. Following his tour abroad, he became a law professor at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Upon leaving his position at West Point, Ambassador Smoak continued to serve in the Army as a Legislative Liaison Officer right here in Washington, D.C. During his service, he assisted in drafting legislation and performed liaison duties both with Congress and
the Department of Justice, State, and Department of Defense. Ambassador Smoak then became Chief of the Legislative Drafting Division for the Judge Advocate General. He served as Chief until 1961 when he retired from the Army as a Lieutenant Colonel. Following his retirement, Ambassador Smoak continued to serve his community by pursing elected office in the South Carolina State Senate.

Upon completing his term in the Senate, Ambassador Smoak was appointed to serve at the State Department as the Deputy Chief of Protocol, then Chief of Protocol for President Nixon. During this time Smoak was witness to many historic events of diplomacy. When he retired from the State Department in 1974, he was given the title of Ambassador. His storied career continued when he was named Co-Chairman on the Committee of Finance for then Presidential candidate Ronald Reagan. Ambassador Smoak went on to practice international law until his retirement.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the career and lifelong servant leadership of Ambassador Smoak. It is with great pride that we thank him for his service and wish him continued health and happiness with his friends, family, and loved ones. Furthermore I hope that he may continue to enjoy his well-deserved daily martinis.

RECOGNIZING PRETRIAL, PROBATION AND PAROLE SUPERVISION WEEK OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the nation’s community corrections professionals and the vital role they play in enhancing public safety throughout the United States. In honor of the invaluable contributions of these dedicated public servants, the American Probation and Parole Association (AAPA) and associated members have designated the week of July 21 through 27 “Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019.”

I thank the thousands of men and women who perform these important public safety duties and urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in support of AAPPA’s week-long recognition efforts this year. Thousands of women and men in the nation’s capital and across the country serve as pretrial, probation and parole officers or administrators. As public servants, they, along with many other Americans, commit themselves on a daily basis to helping improve the lives of those involved in the criminal justice system. The work of these professionals ultimately results in stronger and safer communities for all.

Community corrections professionals are responsible for the supervision of adult and juvenile offenders in communities throughout our nation. These trained professionals go above and beyond the call of duty by connecting their clients to supportive services, community-based resources, employment opportunities, housing programs and other evidence-based practices that help individuals successfully complete supervision and reenter society.

Community corrections professionals strive to provide these services and support, while simultaneously providing client surveillance, crime prevention and restorative justice.

In honor of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019, I take the opportunity to recognize those who carry out community corrections and supervision services especially in the District of Columbia, including the officers and professionals of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA) and the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA) are dedicated to reducing recidivism and enhancing public safety in the nation’s capital. CSOSA and PSA are recognized as model community supervision entities because of their use of evidence-based practices and community partnerships. On any given day, CSOSA is responsible for supervising approximately 10,500 individuals on probation, parole or supervised release, while PSA supervises over 17,000 defendants over the course of a year. Charged with having to balance issues of public safety with social services and reentry support, the employees of CSOSA and PSA help to enhance the security of everyone who lives, works or visits the District.

Madam Speaker, again, I extend my gratitude to these public servants for their commitment, compassion and contributions to healthier and safer communities throughout the United States. I ask the House of Representatives to join me in acknowledging the impact community corrections professionals have on the quality of life of all Americans throughout our country by recognizing July 21 through 27 as Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019.

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I proudly honor the YMCA Youth and Government Program. Over the past 80 years, the YMCA Youth and Government Program has paved the way in creating the next generation of actively engaged leaders.

The national program invites young people from across the United States to participate in state-organized and model-government programs where they can participate in volunteering activities and get early exposure to practice governance and democracy. The program also provides the tools and resources to support all youth development through holistic programming. This program has played a crucial role in using the YMCA core values to cultivate a new generation of leaders.

My father, the late Donald M. Payne, was the first African American president of the National Council of YMCAs. He believed in the YMCA’s mission to support our country’s youth through mentorship opportunities. As someone who has participated in the YMCA Youth and Government Program, I actively support its mission of empowering young leaders to not only be active in their community, but also to have a global perspective.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the YMCA Youth and Government Program.

HON. MIKE THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today with Representative JARED HUFFMAN to honor Hank Schreeder for his service as the Santa Rosa Chief of Police and thank him for his commitment to our community upon his retirement.

Chief Schreeder earned a Bachelor of Science in Administration of Criminal Justice from California State University Long Beach and a Master of Criminal Justice Program from the American Military University. He is also a graduate of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, the Supervisory Leadership Institute, and the Command College. In addition, Chief Schreeder was a leader in the development of Sonoma County’s Family Justice Center and served as a member of the Chopp’s Teen Club Board.

During his time as Santa Rosa Chief of Police, Chief Schreeder increased transparency and worked to balance the needs of the community within budgetary limits. Chief Schreeder additionally bolstered community engagement by working with various community-based organizations to combat homelessness and develop long term solutions to the problem.

Under Chief Schreeder’s instrumental leadership, the Santa Rosa Police Department led a coordinated response to the October 2017 fires, drawing upon hundreds of officers from a mix of agencies to evacuate residents, find missing people, and patrol fire areas.

Madam Speaker, Chief Schreeder is an important member of our community and a true public servant. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Chief Schreeder here today.

EMMA SCHLOMANN EARNS GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emma Schlimmann of Katy, Texas for earning the Girl Scout Gold Award.

This is the highest award given to Girl Scouts and less than 5 percent achieve it. It is awarded to girls who develop and execute a project to make a lasting impact on an issue they are passionate about. Emma chose to do a Seizure Awareness campaign called “Project Caesar.” This project is deeply personal to her as she was diagnosed with seizures almost 10 years ago. As part of her project, Emma created a six-minute informative video, which was sent to several school campuses in Katy ISD for teachers to show to students in their classrooms. She also gave a presentation to a group of 40 people to help spread awareness for seizure disorder. Emma received this Girl Scout Gold Award for her passion and dedication to this project and her community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again...
to Emma Schloemann for earning the prestigious Girl Scout Gold Award.

HONORING WILLIAM MAY

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I pause to call attention to the upcoming retirement of a Missouri leader, advocate, legal scholar, and friend of small business.

For twenty years, Mr. William “Bill” May has served as executive director and general counsel at the Missouri Outdoor Advertising Association (MOAA). He will retire at the end of 2019.

An attorney, Bill May is considered an expert on regulation of out of home advertising in Missouri. His advice and counsel are sought by officeholders and staff, government officials, landowners, and billboard companies.

Bill began his career with Pioneer Outdoor Advertising in Springfield; he was promoted to general manager and general counsel. Soon after he assumed leadership of the Missouri Outdoor Advertising Association in 1999, voters faced an anti-billboard statewide ballot measure (“Proposition A”) which was defeated on November 7, 2000.

Recognized nationally for his trade association leadership, Bill is an effective advocate for property rights, new technology, and common-sense flexibility for our state to save time and money in carrying out its regulatory duties.

As a supporter of law enforcement, I commend Bill and his colleagues in the billboard industry for partnerships to help find fugitives and missing persons and also deliver emergency information.

Please join me in congratulating Bill May and his wife Gail for their long service to Missouri and the out of home media industry.

IN HONOR OF NAMPA’S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LANCE GOODEN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation:

 Whereas, the North American Mature Publishers Association, Inc (NAMPA) is celebrating its 25th anniversary on October 13, 2019; and

 Whereas, this prestigious association is holding its annual international convention and anniversary celebration in Memphis, Tennessee, where publishers, editors, staff, and guests of senior/burner publications from across the United States and Canada will gather for educational and networking sessions; and

 Whereas, NAMPA is a non-profit association of 96 member publications in 36 US States, and two Provinces in Canada with more than 4 million mature readers per month with its international headquarters located in Shreveport, Louisiana; and

 Whereas, NAMPA’s purpose and mission is to help magazines and newspapers that focus on the mature market to improve their quality in terms of design and content, while also increasing revenue; and

 Whereas, we wish to officially recognize and honor this outstanding association, its members, officers, and its current Executive Director, Gary L. Calligas, for their ongoing commitment to education and service to mature readers;

Now, therefore, we urge all citizens to support this milestone anniversary.

HONORING MR. ROBERT CLEMM
HON. SCOTT PERRY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert Clemm, who has served actively for 60 continuous years with the Camp Hill Fire Company. Mr. Clemm joined the company in June of 1959. During his college years, he volunteered as a dispatcher. While he served as Assistant Fire Chief for many years, he now serves with the Fire Police. He has consistently distinguished himself over these 60 years through quiet leadership, ability, dedication and kindness. His efforts have improved fire safety not only in Camp Hill, but across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Education has been a core part of Mr. Clemm’s mission. While volunteering with the Fire Company, he earned his Bachelor’s Degree in education from Millersville University of Pennsylvania and, in 1963, began a distinguished career as an award-winning industrial science teacher in the Big Springs School District.

Mr. Clemm used his skill as an educator to become a state-certified fire instructor for the Pennsylvania State Fire Academy. He taught advanced emergency response classes, with topics including vehicle rescue, aerial operations, and methods for use of rural water supplies. When the Fire Academy faced budget troubles, he volunteered his time to ensure that Pennsylvania’s firefighters would have the best training possible. He’s served as an instructor in the Fire Science program at the Harrisburg Area Community College, where he helped to prepare future generations of fire instructors.

Mr. Clemm believes in teaching and preparing for the future, which not only makes him an effective teacher, but effective leader and mentor. His support, guidance, and inspiration to fellow firefighters have spurred many to greater heights, strengthening the Company, ensuring its future, and improving the safety of the community.

After serving for decades as a firefighter, spending most of those years as Assistant Fire Chief, Mr. Clemm has moved on to support the Company’s fire police operation. He’s been instrumental in upgrading training for the fire police both locally and at the state level, and his insight has been invaluable as the Company acquired two fire police units.

On behalf of Pennsylvania’s Tenth Congressional District, I extend my heartfelt congratulations and sincere gratitude to Mr. Robert Clemm for his selfless and tireless service to our community and Country.

HON. ERIC SWALWELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, on June 28, I indicated how I would have voted on certain votes I missed that week. For three votes the wrong bill number is listed in the Record. To clarify, here is the correct information with respect to those votes:


RECOGNIZING HAVEN MEGED OF MILES CITY

HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Haven Megen of Miles City, for his outstanding success as a rookie on the rodeo circuit.

The Miles City native became involved in rodeo around the age of 11, and at 21, he is ranked in the top 10 in the world for tie-down roping. After his win at the College National Finals in June, he continues to take the American rodeo scene by storm.

With his mare named Beyoncé, Haven is working toward his goal “to be rookie of the year, qualify for the National Finals Rodeo, and win a gold buckle.”

At Custer County High, Haven won over 10 high school rodeo championships before going on to be a true freshman rider in college. After his first year, he transferred to a renowned rodeo school in Texas.

At Tarleton State University, his professors and rodeo coaches work with him to balance his books and his rodeo career. As busy and successful as Haven has been, he continues to focus on his studies and tie downs.

Rodeo is part of our Montana way of life. While the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association was founded in 1936, the roots of rodeo go back even further. During the summer, almost every city in Montana hosts a rodeo, either amateur or professional, making the cowboy sport a welcome sight. Hundreds of young men and women participate, carrying on the tradition of life on the cattle trail.

Madam Speaker, for his outstanding accomplishments as a young rodeo competitor, for his dedication to the Professional Rodeo Cowboy Association, and for preserving the American cowboy tradition, I recognize Haven Megen of Miles City for his spirit of Montana.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Haven Megen of Miles City, for his outstanding success as a rookie on the rodeo circuit.

The Miles City native became involved in rodeo around the age of 11, and at 21, he is ranked in the top 10 in the world for tie-down roping. After his win at the College National Finals in June, he continues to take the American rodeo scene by storm.

With his mare named Beyoncé, Haven is working toward his goal “to be rookie of the year, qualify for the National Finals Rodeo, and win a gold buckle.”

At Custer County High, Haven won over 10 high school rodeo championships before going on to be a true freshman rider in college. After his first year, he transferred to a renowned rodeo school in Texas.

At Tarleton State University, his professors and rodeo coaches work with him to balance his books and his rodeo career. As busy and successful as Haven has been, he continues to focus on his studies and tie downs.

Rodeo is part of our Montana way of life. While the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association was founded in 1936, the roots of rodeo go back even further. During the summer, almost every city in Montana hosts a rodeo, either amateur or professional, making the cowboy sport a welcome sight. Hundreds of young men and women participate, carrying on the tradition of life on the cattle trail.

Madam Speaker, for his outstanding accomplishments as a young rodeo competitor, for his dedication to the Professional Rodeo Cowboy Association, and for preserving the American cowboy tradition, I recognize Haven Megen of Miles City for his spirit of Montana.
HONORING CARMEL MANOR  
HON. THOMAS MASSIE  
OF KENTUCKY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, July 23, 2019  

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Carmel Manor in Fort Thomas, KY. Carmel Manor has been providing care for seniors in the northern Kentucky community for 70 years.

Carmel Manor served its first residents in 1949 after the Diocese of Covington asked the Carmelite Sisters to administer the home. The Carmelite Sisters are united in and motivated by the belief that life is valuable from conception to its natural end. They understand it is hard to leave a loved one in the care of another, but the staff of Carmel Manor have proven they know how to care for the whole person—not just physical needs but spiritual, emotional, and social needs as well.

Throughout its history, Carmel Manor has worked to honor its residents’ lives with compassion, dignity, and joy. They have achieved this by growing with the needs of their community.

Congratulations to Carmel Manor on their 70th anniversary. May they continue their mission to care in the years to come.

CHUCK BRAWNER RECEIVES LEADERSHIP AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AWARD  
HON. PETE OLSON  
OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, July 23, 2019  

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chuck Brawner for being named a recipient of the Stan C. Stanley “Eagle” Leadership and Economic Development Award.

The Stan Stanley awards recognize a volunteer and elected official who have done their part to inspire leadership and economic growth in the Katy area. Mr. Brawner, mayor of the city of Katy, received the award in the elected official category for his dedication to our Katy community. Prior to being elected mayor in 2017, Mr. Brawner served as chief of police for the Spring Branch Independent School District Police Department. Our community is grateful for the forty years that he has dedicated to public service and law enforcement.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Mr. Brawner for this honor.

RECOGNIZING HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY  
HON. KATHY CASTOR  
OF FLORIDA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, July 23, 2019  

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hillsborough Community College (HCC) for its 50th anniversary. Since 1968, Hillsborough Community College has provided the people of the Tampa Bay community with an affordable and quality education.

Ever since holding its first classes at Hillsborough High School in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, HCC has since grown to become an accredited institution serving over 44,000 students each year across 5 campuses and 3 training centers. HCC has expanded to offer 190 academic programs, ranging from Paralegal Studies to Engineering Technology. More than 84 percent of HCC graduates remain in Hillsborough County after graduation. Their contributions to our community are irreplaceable. HCC’s graduates make Hillsborough County a better place.

HCC is a vibrant and diverse community with students of many different backgrounds. HCC also has been recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution, meaning more than 25 percent of full-time HCC students are Hispanic or Latino. The 50th graduating class included students aged 16 to 72 years old. To celebrate the diversity of their campuses and encourage retention, in 2006 HCC hosted its first Annual Black, Brown & College Bound (BBCB) Summit. The Summit brings accomplished professionals and scholars together with Black and Latino male students to discuss barriers that affect persistence and completion among minority males. In its 13th year, BBCB has grown nationally to include more than 150 different colleges and universities from 40 states.

HCC has not just been an institution of higher learning, but part of the fabric of our community—hosting events such as a hearing of the United States Senate on small, premium cigar businesses in the college’s Cigar City campus, forums to address the persistence of sexual harassment in the workplace and enrollment events for the Affordable Care Act to expand health care coverage to our most vulnerable neighbors.

Hillsborough Community College plays a critical role in preparing young students for promising futures in the workforce. I applaud HCC’s success in preparing students for continued education and professional careers. I am eager to see where HCC’s next 50 years will lead students in the Tampa Bay community.

IN MEMORY OF THEODORE J. “TED” PLAMONDON, JR.  
HON. JOE COURTNEY  
OF CONNECTICUT  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, July 23, 2019  

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Theodore J. “Ted” Plamondon, Jr. Ted was a constituent of mine from Enfield, CT. He passed away last Tuesday at the age of 93.

Ted was born and raised in Enfield. He served as a police officer and served as Hartford County sheriff, state marshal, and town constable. Additionally, he served for 22 years in the U.S. Navy and Navy Reserve throughout World War II, the Korean War, and the war in Vietnam. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that Ted was the biggest advocate for veterans Enfield has ever seen. He organized both the Memorial Day and Veterans Day parades every year, was chairman of the Enfield Veterans Council, and was involved with AMVETS Post 18, VFW Post 1501, and the John Maciolek American Legion Post 154. He was also instrumental in securing a new World War II monument in town.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor lifelong Santa Ana resident and the WBA Super Bantamweight Champion of the World, Ronny Rios.

Ronny was born in Compton, California and his family moved to Santa Ana when he was just a toddler. Ronny grew up in Santa Ana and attended Monroe Elementary School, McFadden Intermediate School and graduated from Saddleback High School, where he was a proud Roadrunner.

Ronny was introduced to boxing at the age of 13, when he joined the local boxing club, TKO Boxing. Ronny immediately demonstrated talent in the sport and became one of the top prospects at TKO Boxing.

Ronny began to make a name for himself as an amateur boxer. He was a finalist in the Olympic Trials, narrowly missing a spot on the 2008 Olympic Team. He was a two-time U.S. Amateur National Champion and national Golden Gloves Champion. Ronny was one of the most decorated amateurs to hit the boxing scene in many years.

In 2009, Ronny made the step to become a professional boxer and signed with Golden Boy Promotions, the boxing promotion company run by legendary boxer Oscar De La Hoya. As a professional boxer, Ronny racked up an impressive list of wins, going 23–0 in his first 5 years as a professional with 12 knockouts. He scored NABF and WBA Silver Championships and sought a world championship title.

After a couple of losses, Ronny went into semi-retirement in early 2018, choosing to enter a career in real estate. A year later, Ronny returned to the sport to take one last shot at a title. The comeback began with a win over Daniel Olea on April 26.

Ronny’s next fight was for a title was against the undefeated Diego De La Hoya, cousin of Oscar De La Hoya, and a rising star in the sport of boxing. Ronny was considered the underdog.
Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Manufacturing USA Programs, the Manufacturing Institutes and their role in advancing U.S. Manufacturing.

These programs are the only ones of their kind in this country designed to bring business partners together in full collaboration, to foster communities of innovators and entrepreneurs, and to move specific new technologies into the manufacturing mainstream. We need these types of communities to propel advanced manufacturing out of the research labs and into the marketplace. The United States is a global leader in scientific and engineering research, but we are lagging in taking that research into the marketplace. The Manufacturing USA program has shown that the time to market can be greatly reduced in the right environment.

In the four short years of their existence, 14 Manufacturing Institutes have entered separate technology areas key to our future competitiveness. The partners in these institutes contribute matching funds equal to or greater than the government share. At the end of 2017, the matching funds were already being invested at $1.50 for every $1 investment from the federal government, speaking to the enthusiasm of the industry participation.

More importantly, 844 manufacturing firms and 297 educational institutions were participating in the collective institutes along with 150 other entities, such as state and local governments.

In the years since that report, the Manufacturing USA program has reached a spending match of $2 for every $1 of federal funding, with 140 organizations across the institutes, supporting 270 major collaborative industry-led R&D projects, and offered training opportunities for more than 200,000 people.

As a result, global competition in the manufacturing sector is growing tremendously. Several of our international competitors have focused government-supported efforts to develop their industrial sectors and commercialization strategies.

The European Union’s Horizon 2020 program invested 80 billion Euros in funding over 7 years and a follow-on program is in development.

Germany’s Fraunhofer Society, established in 1949, currently includes 72 institutes focused on applied research and development across various technology domains relevant to manufacturing. In 2017, the Fraunhofer Society budget totalled about $2.6 billion, with about $2.25 billion in contract research. 30 percent of this budget comes from government funds, and 70 percent from private.

China has set advancing manufacturing as one of their six top priorities and is on the path to opening 40 manufacturing institutes by 2025. The country is following the plan set by the Manufacturing USA program.

Korea (a country 1/6 the size of the U.S.) is spending $291M on the Korea Institute of Industrial Technology (KII), established in 1989 to strengthen their small and mid-sized manufacturing base.

The list goes on: Japan, Singapore, the UK, and others are all heavily investing in manufacturing.

This is why the Manufacturing USA program is so important—because it is our best effort to respond strategically as a nation to this mounting competition. The program allows the United States to focus its resources on high-value industries and ensure future leadership around the globe.

In December 2017, the White House published a National Security Strategy of the United States which states, “Economic security is national security” and calls out the need to lead in research, technology, invention, and innovation.

In response, the National Institute of Standards and Technology reached out to our country’s industries and women and men and reported on how we can better come together as a country and make use of our government investments. They reported 5 strategies to transfer the results of Federal research and development investments to the benefit of our country’s commercial, economic, and national security interests. This report is the most extensive of its kind to explore the value of Federal US research investments.

Furthermore, the Manufacturing USA program is uniquely positioned to address and is addressing the following 4 strategies: Private sector engagement, Entrepreneurial workforce, Tools and services for technology transfer, and Understanding of global science and technology trends and benchmarks.

The groundwork for this program has been laid. The strategy is to support our industrial base and securing our economic future has been thought through. We must continue our support for this program to safeguard our continued prosperity. I urge you all to support this bill to extend the term of federal funding for the Manufacturing USA program and to expand on the government-private partnerships operating under the program.

DICK PHILLIPS RECEIVES LEADERSHIP AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dick Phillips for being named a recipient of the Stan C. Stanley “Eagle” Leadership and Economic Development Award.

The Stan Stanley awards recognize a volunteer and elected official who have done their part to inspire leadership and economic growth in the Katy area. Mr. Phillips, University of Houston Vice President of Community Engagement, received the award in the volunteer category. He was crucial in recruiting the University of Houston Victoria and the University of Houston Katy campus to our community.

This accomplishment is creating jobs and opportunities for the hard-working individuals in our community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Mr. Phillips. We wish him the best of luck on his future endeavors and thank him for Katy, X.
End for-profit contractors from operating new Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) standard shelters or influx facilities. Such shelters or facilities must be state-licensed, meet Flores Settlement Agreement standards, and not used to house children indefinitely.

Expand authorities to detention and the successful Family Case Management Program (FCMP), which was a program that was designed to increase compliance with immigration obligations through a comprehensive case management strategy supported by community organizations. Remove roadblocks to placing unaccompanied children with sponsors by lowering the total number of cases a manager may take, mandating lower staffing ratios, and ending the information sharing agreement between ORR and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Ensure unaccompanied children have access to legal counsel and continue to be placed in a safe setting for their initial asylum case review.

Provide resources to non-profit centers that are helping provide humanitarian assistance.

Permit Members of Congress, accompanying staff, and credentialed press (without cameras) to visit any facility with 24-hour notice.

We need to ensure that our government funds must not be used to traumatize or harm asylum seekers. The Trump administration’s lack of empathy and compassion for migrant families and children at the U.S.-Mexico border is heartbreaking and demands action by Congress. Those who come to our nation should be treated with dignity and respect, and that is something the administration has failed to provide when treating migrant families. We have a crisis at the southern border, and we need to ensure our officials have the resources they need while respecting the dignity of those in the U.S. government’s care. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in the fight to protect children’s human rights.

---

HANNA TEERMAN EARNED STATE DEPARTMENT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hanna Teerman of Cinco Ranch High School in Katy, TX, who was selected for a scholarship from the U.S. Department of State’s National Security Language Initiative for Youth.

This highly competitive merit-based scholarship will give Hanna the opportunity to live overseas in language immersion program to acquire skills that are critical to U.S. national security. During this program, Hanna will develop her foreign language skills, increase her cross-cultural understanding, strengthening her leadership capacity and foster new academic insights and ambitions.

On behalf of the Two-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Hanna Teerman on earning this prestigious scholarship.

---

RAISE THE WAGE ACT SPEECH OF HON. ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters in support of H.R. 582, Raise the Wage Act: International Brotherhood of Teamsters; National Urban League; Disability Coalition; Health Care Groups; Interreligious Working Group on Domestic Workers; Human Need First; Focus Campaign for Children; Network Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Americans for Democratic Action; and National Employment Lawyers Association.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in the fight to protect children’s human rights.

John Farritor has lived an incredible and full life. He is a true inspiration for our community, and we cannot thank him enough for his service to his country and to Camp Pendleton. John Farritor celebrated his birthday on July 9 with friends and family in Vista, California. I am honored to pay tribute to John, and I wish him a very happy 100th birthday.

---

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This week, the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to vote for H.R. 582.

Income inequality is on an alarming trajectory and continues to rise unabated. Neither record-breaking corporate profits nor increased productivity have reversed or slowed this trend. This is not the kind of economy we should be building. The Raise the Wage Act is essential to bringing some measure or fairness and justice to workers who toil at the lower-end of the wage scale. It is an important step we can take to address growing pay inequality. An increase in the federal minimum wage, which has not increased since 2009, is long overdue.

H.R. 582 would raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15.00 per hour by 2024. It would increase the minimum wage to $5.55 this year, with increases over the subsequent six years. After 2024, the minimum wage would be indexed to median wage growth to ensure that its value does not erode.

Additionally, the bill would remedy an egregious situation that has gone on for far too long. The bill would phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a paltry $2.13 per hour for more than 20 years. And, it would end the subminimum wage for workers with disabilities employed in sheltered workshops and for workers under age 20.

No one who works hard and plays by the rules should live in poverty. Much is said about valuing work, but we are not expecting work. If we truly value work, if we truly respect work, the House will pass H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to vote for H.R. 582.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOPFA,
General President,
NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE
WASHINGTON, DC.
July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As President and CEO of the National Urban League, I am writing to express our support for immediate passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). Raising the minimum wage to $15/hour is a key provision of the National Urban League’s Main Street Plan, a bold and comprehensive plan for lifting urban communities out of poverty and stimulating their economic growth.

The National Urban League has been in every fight to raise the minimum wage. While the road from poverty to plenty is long, raising the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15/hour is an important and long overdue first step in lifting millions of families out of poverty and giving them a chance at a better life. No one—absolutely no one—who works full time should ever live in poverty. Much is said about valuing work, but we are not expecting work. If we truly value work, if we truly respect work, the House will pass H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019.
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Disabilities (“the Committee”) described in its report to Congress and the Labor Secretary:

There is an underlying need to amend Section 14(c) of the FLSA so that it reflects and aligns with modern federal disability policy and laws, which are based on the assumption that all individuals with disabilities are entitled to, [competitive integrated employment].

The current widespread practice of paying workers subminimum wages, based on assumptions that people with disabilities cannot work in typical jobs, or on assumptions about the unavailability of alternative work opportunities, is antithetical to the intent of modern federal law.

The National Council on Disability, an independent federal agency charged with advising the President, Congress, and other federal agencies regarding policies that impact people with disabilities, has repeatedly called for the elimination of sub-minimum wages under Section 14(c), including in its recent report, “National Disability Employment Policy, From the New Deal to the Real Deal: Joining the Industries of the Future.”

Unfortunately, in the Raise the Wage Act sends a clear message to the public that it is no longer acceptable to pay individuals with disabilities less than the minimum wage. The organizers stress again the necessity that the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 retain the phase out of the use of 14(c) certificates and bring an end to this blatantly discriminatory practice.


July 2, 2019.

Dear Representative Scott: The undersigned organizations are writing to express our support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). The Act would raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15.00 an hour over a six-year period, after which the minimum wage would be indexed to median wages. Our organizations believe that raising the federal minimum wage will significantly contribute to improving quality of care and quality of life for nursing home residents across the country.

According to the Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute (PHI), nursing assistants earn a median wage of $12.84 an hour and a median income of $21,200 a year. Nursing assistants’ inflation-adjusted wages have only increased six cents in the past 10 years, meaning that “while goods and services increased in price, the purchasing power of nursing assistant wages did not meaningfully increase in the past decade.” Since nursing assistants (37 percent) rely on some form of public assistance, federal and state governments subsidize the nursing home industry by compensating for their workers’ low wages. Unfortunately, the data suggest that putting the country’s most vulnerable individuals may lead to poverty.

Given the hardships involved with being a direct care worker, it is not surprising to learn that these positions cannot compete with less demanding and higher paying jobs, increasing the likelihood that those in the long-term care workforce will move to the more lucrative industries. This strain on the nursing home workforce is supported by a recently published study in The Gerontologist, which indicates that many individuals in long-term care facilities are underemployed, and one in three workers in the sector report that they are working at a second job.

The federal minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. A decade is more than enough time for our nation’s leaders to right this unjustifiable inequity. Let’s get this done now. It’s time for Congress to do the right—and smart—thing by working American’s hands.

The Raise the Wage Act sends a clear message to the public that it is no longer acceptable to pay individuals with disabilities less than the minimum wage. The organizers stress again the necessity that the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 retain the phase out of the use of 14(c) certificates and bring an end to this blatantly discriminatory practice.
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Dear Representative Scott: The undersigned organizations are writing to express our support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). The Act would raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15.00 an hour over a six-year period, after which the minimum wage would be indexed to median wages. Our organizations believe that raising the federal minimum wage will significantly contribute to improving quality of care and quality of life for nursing home residents across the country.
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our sisters and brothers who work hard but are still struggling to make ends meet. Inflation and rising prices have made the financial squeeze on low-wage workers unbearable. Now, a partial and minimal increase for those in most desperate need. Its urgency warrants full consideration by the chamber without further delay. It is time for members to recognize that the financial security of workers is a priority in the House.

We come from a variety of faith perspectives, but our principles and traditions all affirm the need to promote human dignity by prioritizing vulnerable communities and individuals in need. Our faith traditions and justice teachings require that every worker earn enough to provide a standard of living in accordance with their God-given dignity. The current federal minimum wage and $24 hourly four-year wage increase for tipped workers is woefully insufficient and has remained stagnant for the longest period in the history of our nation. This disregard is a shameful statement of neglect for those most in need in our society.

Passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would demonstrate to these workers relative to a life of poverty that they are, in fact, valued as individuals and as members of society. The provisions of the Raise the Wage Act take substantive steps to ensure that people earn wages that are enough to support themselves. Moving towards a universal wage floor of $15 an hour is on-par with historical wage rates and responsive to the real cost of living everywhere in the nation. Phasing out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, workers under the age of 20, and those with disabilities is just and is long overdue. Moreover, an annually adjusted minimum wage based on the nation’s median hourly wages would curtail the growing gap between the lowest-paid workers and the middle-class.

Our families and our economy have been increasingly burdened by wage stagnation and income inequality. The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would immediately lighten this burden by gradually raising the wage floor to broadly impact those at the bottom of the workforce. According to policy experts, more than 1 in 4 workers would be impacted by this legislation, 90 percent of whom are over the age of 20. Estimates project that low-income families would make an additional $3,000 a year, on average, for those working year-round. The difference that makes for a preschool teacher, bank teller, or fast-food worker to get by or to try and break even at $20,000 per year would be remarkable. The Raise the Wage Act will particularly benefit women and people of color, who are disproportionately represented among low-wage workers. Additionally, this legislation corrects the harmful and exploitive practice of under-paying individuals with disabilities by requiring employers to pay them accordingly.

The time for the Raise the Wage Act is long overdue. This month, we marked the shameful milestone of the longest period in U.S. history without a federal minimum wage increase. Justice cannot wait; and neither can Americans who labor every day to barely make ends meet. The faith community calls on Leadership to schedule a floor vote on this important piece of legislation immediately. We urge all members of the House to vote yes in support of this legislation.

As an organization committed to ensuring the economic security of children and families in the United States, we applaud efforts to raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2024. Nationwide, 17.5 percent of children are living in families with incomes below the poverty line. At its current rate, a parent making minimum wage and working full-time cannot earn enough to pay market rent for a two-bedroom home. Children in the U.S. are disproportionately affected by these low wages, and are 62 percent more likely to live in poverty than adults.

A recent landmark study from the National Academy of Sciences confirms that raising the federal minimum wage decreases child poverty. Written by a nonpartisan commission of experts on child poverty, A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty finds that income poverty directly causes negative outcomes to child well-being, yet 62 percent of children in a household that receives additional income, such as from an increase to the minimum wage, parents and guardians are enabled to provide resources that have long-term impacts on a child’s health and economic contributions.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the new wage proposal would give higher pay to 41 million workers, 28 percent of which have children to support. This would mean the parents of over 11 million children would be empowered to support the child’s healthy development with critical resources such as nutritious food, health care, adequate shelter, warm clothing, and educational materials.

Parents who live in a constant state of financial instability and struggle to provide

enough resources for their children often suffer from stress, anxiety, and depression, making it more difficult to respond to their children’s emotional needs. Increased income thereby creates financially stable families, improves the physical and mental health of children and families and in turn, reduces child maltreatment rates.

The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 is both an important step toward improving economic stability for 11 million children and a vital step away from the current federal minimum wage of $7.25 an hour anywhere in the country is a bitter, harsh reality; supporting dependents or a family on this wage is impossible. Workers who are one work accident, job loss, or family illness away from economic disaster are so vulnerable—and they are the backbone of our nation. There is a covenant between lay people and God that is an essential part of our nation’s history of progress: full time work should be enough to keep families out of poverty. Today we find low wage earners working 2 or even 3 jobs to make ends meet. It is morally reprehensible that millions of people work full time, yet are a paycheck away from acute poverty and homelessness. In the spirit of the Gospel, we promote a just society which ensures that all people are able to live dignified lives. Catholic Social Justice teachings tell us that a stable and central indicator and “the most concrete means of verifying justice” within a fair, functioning economy is on-par with his-historical minimum wage rates and responds to long-term trends of under-paying individuals with disabilities who are disproportionately women and people of color, who are disproportionately.

We are grateful for your leadership in making children and families a legislative priority, and we look forward to working with you on this and other proposals to improve the well-being of children and youth.

Sincerely,

Bruce Lesley, President

NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice

July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice urges a yes vote on HR 582, Long as the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. In the spirit of the Gospel, we promote a just society which ensures that all people are able to live dignified lives. Catholic Social Justice teachings tell us that a stable and central indicator and “the most concrete means of verifying justice” within a fair, function-
new sense of urgency to change must be instilled.

The Raise the Wage Act Would:
Lift pay for tens of millions of workers and reverse decades of growing pay inequality;
Favor all low wage workers, only 10 percent of which being teenagers and restaurant workers;
Be particularly significant for workers of color, as 38 percent of African Americans and 33 percent of Latinos would see a wage increase;
Divert reliance on safety-net programs, which reduces burden on the taxpayer;
Raise wages for jobs considered to be middle class, including nearly one third of manufacturing workers, one fifth of construction workers, one sixth of educators, and one forth of health care workers.

It is critical that you vote in favor of the Raise the Wage Act as it comes to the floor this week and reject any Motions to Recommit. This legislation would provide numerous benefits to the working people of America, which underscores the importance of passing the bill as written. With wage stagnation surpassing record levels, voting yes on the Raise the Wage Act will provide long overdue relief to those who work but struggle to make ends meet. Please vote yes to raise the wage and improve the lives of millions of Americans.

Sincerely,

DON KUSLER,
National Director,
Americans for Democratic Action.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS
ASSOCIATION
July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA), I am writing to express our strong support for, and to urge you to vote in favor of, passage of the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582). In order to gain passage of the strongest bill possible, we ask that you oppose any motion to recommit and any amendment that would weaken this bill when the bill is brought to a vote on the House floor.

NELA advances workers’ rights and serves lawyers who advocate for equality and justice in the American workplace. With members in every state, NELA is the country’s largest professional organization exclusively comprised of lawyers who represent individual employees in employment discrimination cases and other employment-related matters. NELA and our 69 state and local affiliates have more than 4,000 members across our nation. Our members are private civil rights lawyers whose clients suffer the practical realities of an insufficient, inconsistent minimum wage.

The Raise the Wage Act is long-overdue. If passed, it will address the reality of stagnated wages and income inequality brought about, in part, by an outdated federal minimum wage that has not been raised in ten years. The current federal minimum wage of $7.25/hr is worth 17% less than it was ten years ago. For a full-time, year-round minimum wage worker, this represents a loss of over $3,000 in annual earnings. If passed, this much-needed bill would raise the federal minimum wage to $8.55 this year and increase it over the next five years until it reaches $15 an hour in 2024. The Raise the Wage Act also includes common sense language to adjust the minimum wage each year after 2024. It would phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager $2.13 since 1991, and sunset the ability of employers to pay a subminimum wage to people with disabilities and workers under the age of twenty.

According to a recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Report, gradually raising the federal minimum wage will lift pay for nearly 27.3 million workers by 2024 and reduce the number of people living in poverty by 1.3 million. Nearly half of the 1.3 million people who would be raised out of poverty are children under the age of eighteen. The CBO study concurs that the benefits of this legislation outweigh its costs, and that passage of the bill will leave low-wage workers and their families far better off than they are now. This bill will bolster the middle class all across the country. Many workers in sectors that are considered skilled, such as early childhood education and health care, struggle to survive on $15 per hour. Passage of a clean bill will lift those across the bottom of the workforce.

Tens of millions of workers in America currently cannot afford basic living expenses for themselves and the families they support. These same workers stock our grocery stores, fulfill our online purchases, clean offices and homes, and perform thousands of other jobs that make every aspect of the lives of higher wage earners function. These workers are your constituents, and they deserve a raise. We urge you to pass the Raise the Wage Act now.

Sincerely,

TERRY O’NEILL,
Executive Director.

RECOGNIZING LYNETTE LACKEY

HON. VAN TAYLOR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Lynette Lackey for her thirty-five years of dedicated service to the federal government and to the North Texas veterans community.

Mrs. Lackey began her career with the United States Army Corps of Engineers at Lake Texoma prior to transferring to the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center in Bonham, Texas, where she worked in various administrative positions. Eventually, Lynette would be assigned as the Congressional Liaison for the VA North Texas Health Care System, the second largest VA health care system in the country. As the assigned Congressional Liaison for the fourteen Congressional offices in the system, Lynette was responsible for responding to inquiries from a served population of over 134,000 veterans, over thirty-eight Texas counties and two counties in southern Oklahoma.

Lynette is often lauded throughout the region for her efforts to assist veterans, their families, and Congressional staff in navigating the often-complicated VA healthcare system. Mrs. Lackey consistently strives to solve the most complex veteran issues, always with the focus of providing the best possible outcomes for those she serves. Lynette has justifiably earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues in the community.

Now as Mrs. Lackey prepares to enjoy her well-deserved retirement, she looks forward to spending more time with her husband of thirty-eight years, Dean, and her children, Jack and Aubrun, and Cole and Leslie. Lynette anticipates welcoming her first grandchild this fall, taking on the title of “Lolly” and becoming part of the “Lolly and Pop” duo of love and support surely to surround their newest addition.

The North Texas veteran’s community and all those who have had the honor of working with her over the past twenty-two years, thank Mrs. Lynette Lackey for her steadfast service and wish her the best in her retirement.
Senate confirmed the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.


**Chamber Action**

**Routine Proceedings, pages S4983–S5025**

**Measures Introduced:** Forty bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2203–2242, and S. Res. 280–282.

**Measures Reported:**

- Report to accompany S. 349, to require the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for, and make determinations regarding, roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program. (S. Rept. No. 116–61)
- Report to accompany S. 1689, to permit States to transfer certain funds from the clean water revolving fund of a State to the drinking water revolving fund of the State in certain circumstances. (S. Rept. No. 116–63)
- Report to accompany S. 1833, to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority. (S. Rept. No. 116–64)
- S. 1883, to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

**Measures Passed:**

- **Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act:** By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 224), Senate passed H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

  - Rejected:
  - By 32 yeas to 66 nays (Vote No. 222), Lee Amendment No. 928, to limit the amount available for the Victims Compensation Fund. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 18, 2019, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.)
  - By 22 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 223), Paul Amendment No. 929, to require a sequestration of certain direct spending. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 18, 2019, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.)

- **Honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 282, honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States.

- **National Day of the American Cowboy:** Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 265, designating July 27, 2019, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

- **National Whistleblower Appreciation Day:** Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 194, designating July 30, 2019, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

- **Dickson Nomination—Agreement:** Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.
During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 221), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, July 24, 2019; that following disposition of the nomination, Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska; and that if cloture is invoked, Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed at 3 p.m.

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 90 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. EX. 220), Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Messages from the House:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—224)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:51 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 24, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5019.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CHALLENGES FOR CANNABIS AND BANKING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine challenges for cannabis and banking, focusing on outside perspectives, after receiving testimony from Senators Gardner and Merkley; Rachel Pross, Maps Credit Union, Salem, Oregon, on behalf of the Credit Union National Association; Garth Van Meter, Smart Approaches to Marijuana, Alexandria, Virginia; and Joanne Sherwood, American Bankers Association, and John Lord, LivWell Enlightened Health, both of Denver, Colorado.

WORKING WATERFRONTS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather concluded a hearing to examine America’s waterfronts, focusing on addressing economic, recreational, and environmental challenges, after receiving testimony from Mayor Eric Genrich, Green Bay, Wisconsin; Michael J. Friis, Wisconsin Department of Administration Coastal Management Program, Madison; Lynn Clark, Historic Arkansas Riverwalk of Pueblo, Pueblo, Colorado; and Monty Graham, University of Southern Mississippi, Long Beach.

FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the United States’ interests in the Freely Associated States, after receiving testimony from Douglas Domenech, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Insular and International Affairs; Randall G. Schriver, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Indo-Pacific Security Affairs; Sandra Oudkirk, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Australia, New Zealand, and Pacific Islands, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs; and David Gootnick, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office.

ELDER JUSTICE REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine promoting elder justice, focusing on a call for reform, after receiving testimony from Megan H. Tinker, Senior Advisor for Legal Affairs, Office of Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; John E. Dicken, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Robert B. Blancato, Elder Justice Coalition, Mark Parkinson, American Health Care Association, and Lori Smetanka, National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care, all of Washington, D.C.

FBI OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after receiving testimony from Christopher Wray, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.
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.

BUSINESS MEETING
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.
Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 51 public bills, H.R. 3876–3926; and 7 resolutions, H. Res. 507–508, 510–514 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2942, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–166, Part 1);
H.R. 1307, to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–167, Part 1);
H.R. 549, to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–168);
H.R. 2938, to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense (H. Rept. 116–169);
H.R. 3304, to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days (H. Rept. 116–170);
H.R. 3311, to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–171);
H.R. 3409, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–172);
H.R. 3375, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–173);
H.R. 2507, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–174);
H.R. 2035, to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–175);
H.R. 776, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program (H. Rept. 116–176);
H.R. 1058, to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–177); and
H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–178).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Dean to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 12:23 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:
Building Blocks of STEM Act: H.R. 1665, to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood; Pages H7166–68

American Manufacturing Leadership Act: H.R. 2397, amended, to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes”;

Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act: H.R. 3153, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction;

Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019: H.R. 36, amended, to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment;

Vera Rubin Survey Telescope Designation Act: H.R. 3196, amended, to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope”;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the ‘Vera C. Rubin Observatory’”;

Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019: H.R. 34, amended, to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy’s energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources;

Department of Energy Veterans’ Health Initiative Act: H.R. 617, amended, to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States;

Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel: H. Res. 246, amended, opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 398 yea to 17 nays with five answering “present”, Roll No. 497;

United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act: H.R. 1837, amended, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize assistance for Israel;

Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019: H.R. 1850, amended, to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism;

Calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions: H. Res. 358, calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions;

Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act: H.R. 2943, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog’’;

Directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020: H.R. 2942, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020;

Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019: H.R. 3504, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Honoring American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019: H.R. 2938, amended, to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense;
National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019: H.R. 3304, amended, to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 499; Pages H7216–17, H7223–24

Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019: H.R. 3311, amended, to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses; and
Let Everyone Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service Act: S. 504, to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion.
Suspensions: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:
Venezuela TPS Act of 2019: H.R. 549, amended, to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nay vote of 268 yeas to 154 nays, Roll No. 498.
Announcement by the Chair: The Chair informed the House that, pursuant to H. Res. 497, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of William P. Barr and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., to produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Senate Referral: S. 1199 was held at the desk.
Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H7181 and H7202–03.
Quorum Calls Votes: Three yeas-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7222, H7222–23 and H7223–24. There were no quorum calls.
Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings
RESTORING THE PARTNERSHIP: THE FUTURE OF FEDERALISM IN AMERICA
Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Restoring the Partnership: The Future of Federalism in America”. Testimony was heard from Representative Bishop of Utah; and public witnesses.

REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEmployer PENSIONS ACT OF 2019; HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT
Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019”; and H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act”, and H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act”, under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–24 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order the further amendment printed in Part A of the report, if offered by the member designated in the report, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”, under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–24 modified by the amendment printed in Part B of the report, and provides that it
shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part C of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part C of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides that House Resolution 507 is hereby adopted. The rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 25, 2019, or July 26, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section. Section 5 of the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. The rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of the resolution. Finally, the rule provides that each day during the period addressed by section 5 of the resolution: shall not constitute a calendar day for the purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution; shall not constitute a legislative day for the purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII; and shall not constitute a legislative day for the purposes of clause 7 of rule XV. Testimony was heard from Chairman Neal, Chairman Scott of Virginia, Chairman Lofgren, and Representatives Brady of Texas, Foxx of North Carolina, Grothman, Estes, and Collins of Georgia.

LEARNING FROM WHISTLEBLOWERS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations concluded a hearing entitled “Learning from Whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs”. Testimony was heard from Tamara Bonzanto, Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, Department of Veterans Affairs; Michael Missal, Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; Henry Kerner, Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel; Tristan Leavitt, General Counsel/Acting Chief Executive and Administrative Officer, Merit Systems Protection Board; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

ENERGY AND POWER IN EUROPE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission received a briefing on pipeline politics, focusing on energy and power in Europe from Colin Cleary, Director for Energy Diplomacy for Europe, Western Hemisphere and Africa, Department of State; Ed Chow, Center for Strategic and International Studies, and David Koranyi, Atlantic Council, both of Washington, D.C.; and Efgan Nifti, Caspian Policy Center, Arlington, Virginia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of David L. Norquist to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 496, to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, S. 893, to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, S. 1148, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists, S. 1341, to adopt a certain California flammability standard as a Federal flammability standard to protect against the risk of upholstered furniture flammability, S. 1349, to expand enrollment in TSA PreCheck to expedite commercial travel screening and improve airport security, S. 1625, to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, S. 1858, to ensure the Chief Information Office of the Consumer Product Safety Commission has a significant role in decisions related to information technology, proposed legislation entitled, “Regional Ocean Partnership
Act”, S. 2035, to require the Transportation Security Ad-
ministration to develop a strategic plan to expand eli-
gibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with
Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Haz-
arous Materials Endorsements, S. 2134, to extend the
transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees
from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for
Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027,
and a promotion list in the Coast Guard; to be imme-
diately followed by hearings to examine the nominations
of Theodore Rokita, of Indiana, to be a Director of the
Amtrak Board of Directors, Jennifer L. Homeny, of Vir-
ergia, and Michael Graham, of Kansas, both to be a
Member of the National Transportation Safety Board,
Carl Whitney Bentzel, of Maryland, to be a Federal Mar-
time Commissioner, Michael J.K. Kratsios, of South
Carolina, to be an Associate Director of the Office of
Science and Technology Policy, and Ian Paul Steff, of In-
diana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Direc-
tor General of the United States and Foreign Commercial
Service, 10:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hear-
ings to examine the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize, fo-
cusing on innovative solutions to reduce human-predator
conflict, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the
nominations of Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be
an Under Secretary, Brian Callanan, of New Jersey, to be
General Counsel, and Brian McGuire, of New York, to be
a Deputy Under Secretary, all of the Department of the
Treasury, and Travis Greaves, of the District of Co-
lumbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for
a term of fifteen years, 10:15 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to exam-
ine authorities for the use of military force, 10:15 a.m.,
SD–419.

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy, to hold
hearings to examine confronting Ebola, focusing on
addressing a 21st century global health crisis, 2:30 p.m.,
SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:
business meeting to consider S. 2162, to require the
Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to
annually hire at least 600 new Border Patrol agents, to
report quarterly to Congress on the status of the Border
Patrol workforce, and to conduct a comprehensive staffing
analysis, S. 1976, to amend the FAST Act to improve the
Federal permitting process, S. 2065, to require the Sec-
retary of Homeland Security to publish an annual report
on the use of deepfake technology, S. 2183, to require the
Comptroller General of the United States to analyze cer-
tain legislation in order prevent duplication of and over-
lap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initia-
tives, S. 2177, to provide taxpayers with an improved un-
derstanding of Government programs through the disclo-
sure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among
them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Fed-
eral program inventory, S. 2169, to amend section 3116
of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability
of the appointment limitations for students appointed
under the expedited hiring authority for post-secondary
students, S. 2107, to increase the number of CBP Agricul-
ture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field
Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, S.
2193, to require the Administrator of General Services to
issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by
charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor ve-
hicles, S. 764, to provide for congressional approval of na-
tional emergency declarations, S. 439, to allow Members
of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retire-
ment System, and allow Members who opt out of the
Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to par-
ticipate in the Thrift Savings Plan, S. 2119, to amend
title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the au-
thority to award bonuses to Federal employees, H.R.
2590, to require a Department of Homeland Security
overseas personnel enhancement plan, H.R. 3305, to des-
ignate the facility of the United States Postal Service lo-
cated at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach,
Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”,
and the nominations of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be
Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and Wil-
liam Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science
and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland
Security, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Gov-
ernor of the United States Postal Service, Ann C. Fisher,
of the District of Columbia, and Ashley Jay Elizabeth
Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of
the Postal Regulatory Commission, Catherine Bird, of
Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Rela-
tions Authority, and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost
Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior
Court of the District of Columbia, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to con-
sider S. 2159, to repeal the Act entitled “An Act to con-
fier jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses
committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake In-
dian Reservation”; to be immediately followed by a hear-
ing to examine the nomination of E. Sequoyah
Simermeyer, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National
Indian Gaming Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold an over-
sight hearing to examine the Government Publishing Of-
cc, Office of the Inspector General, 11 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: business
meeting to markup an original bill entitled, “Small Busi-
ness Administration Reauthorization Act”, 2:30 p.m.,
S–115, Capitol.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the De-
partments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Oversight
of the Unaccompanied Children Program: Ensuring the
Safety of Children in HHS Care”, 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Re-
lated Agencies, budget and oversight hearing on the
White House Office of Science and Technology Policy,
10:15 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Secu-
rity, oversight hearing on the U.S. Customs and Border
Protection—Border Patrol, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Costs of Climate Change: From Coasts to Heartland, Health to Security”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled “Building America’s Clean Future: Pathways to Decarbonize the Economy”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.


Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Next Megabank? Examining the Proposed Merger of SunTrust and BB&T”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, hearing entitled “The FY20 Budget: State Department Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism Bureau”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 934, the “Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2019”; and H.R. 935, the “Miners Pension Protection Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Status of the Reclamation Fund and the Bureau of Reclamation’s Future Infrastructure Funding Needs”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled “Examining JUUL’s Role in the Youth Nicotine Epidemic: Part I”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “Beyond the Citizenship Question: Repairing the Damage and Preparing to Count ‘We the People’”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “The Devil They Knew—PFAS Contamination and the Need for Corporate Accountability”, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2203, the “Homeland Security Improvement Act”; and H.R. 3877, the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3597, the “Solar Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3607, the “Fossil Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3609, the “Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 335, the “South Florida Clean Coastal Waters Act of 2019”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act a Help or Hinderance to Main Street?”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.


Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Former Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election”, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 24

**Senate Chamber**

**Program for Wednesday:** Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 11 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, Senate will vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska. If cloture is invoked, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations at 3 p.m.

---

**Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
10 a.m., Wednesday, July 24

**House Chamber**

**Program for Wednesday:** Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

---
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