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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, September 25, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Joyce Beatty to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, September 25, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Joyce Beatty to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING CYRUS G. WILEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ninth President of Savannah State University, Mr. Cyrus G. Wiley.

At the time called the Georgia State Industrial College for Colored Youths, Mr. Wiley made tremendous strides forward for the oldest public historically Black college in the State of Georgia.

He started his term in 1921 and was the first alumnus to become president of the school. In that same year, he allowed women to attend for the first time and he transitioned the college out of its role providing high school programs and into a 4 year, degree-granting institution.

Nearly 100 years later, the school remains a vital part of the Savannah community. They have earned patents in battling Alzheimer’s and ALS, built new science and technology buildings, and purchased new property for a new marine lab.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank everyone at Savannah State University, especially President Kimberly Ballard-Washington, for following in Mr. Wiley’s footsteps to continue breaking barriers, their commitment to the Savannah community, and for providing a great education for the students.

WORLD PHARMACISTS’ DAY 2019

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Pharmacists’ Day 2019 being celebrated today. I am proud that we have a day like this for people all over the world to remember the important role that pharmacists play in keeping all of us and our loved ones healthy.

There are currently over 2 million practicing pharmacists around the world, but in each nation, pharmacists are combating unique problems. For some countries pharmacists are at a severe shortage.

In the United States, pharmacists have been thrown into the front lines of a critical issue: the opioid epidemic. Currently, more than 115 people die every day from opioid addictions, and pharmacists will play an integral role in bringing this number all the way down to zero.

Madam Speaker, I encourage everyone to get to know their pharmacists and to thank them for the work that they do.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I thank all our pharmacists around the world.

EMD’s success is a great example of why the State of Georgia was named as the top State to do business for the sixth year in a row. And Savannah itself has a strategic location with its connection to a major seaport and interstates.

Madam Speaker, I thank EMD for their work in our area, and I congratulate them on their anniversary. I hope that we will have another 40 years of working together.

RECOGNIZING GEORGIA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Georgia Army National Guard, whose last unit is coming home this month from Afghanistan.

Stationed at Fort Stewart in the First Congressional District of Georgia, the 177th Brigade Engineer Battalion is the only unmanned aerial vehicle unit in the entire Georgia National Guard.

Because of that expertise, they remained in Afghanistan longer than other units, and their high quality of work has not gone unnoticed.

Upon returning home, they will be working in a brand-new facility at Fort Stewart for the first time. I am proud
to have this group located in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I thank them for their service to our country, and I welcome them home.

WE HAVE BEEN VINDICATED

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

Mr. GREEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today, just as I rise, because I love my country.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, to thank the Speaker of the House for standing up for the cause of justice, and taking on the challenge to protect our Nation, when it is obvious that national security is of great concern.

I rise because there were persons who made yesterday possible. There are some who say that yesterday was a tipping point, others say that things happened that were the equivalent of a straw that broke the camel’s back as it relates to impeachment, but I say that yesterday was a seminal moment in time that has the potential to impact the rest of our time.

I say that yesterday was a moment of truth, and I say that there were people who made yesterday possible. I would like to read a statement into the Record that will address many of the people, not all, but many of the people who made yesterday possible.

My statement reads: ‘On behalf of the American people, I thank the 218 who voted to move Articles of Impeachment on November 6, 2017, the historic 66 who voted to move Articles on January 19, 2018, and the noble 95 who voted to move Articles on July 17, 2019.

For their tireless and progressive efforts, I would also like to thank The People; Center for Popular Democracy; Citizens Impeachment Coalition; Common Cause; Courage Campaign; CREDO; MoveOn; Revolving Door Project; Social Security Works; Stand Up America; and Women’s March.

With nearly 200 Members of the House of Representatives favoring impeachment inquiry, we have been vindicated. However, our approach is not one that has ended as of yesterday. We need 218 to vote for impeachment. There is more to be done.

PARKRIDGE PREGNANCY CENTER

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the good people at Parkridge Pregnancy Medical Clinic in Lubbock, Texas.

Parkridge, a nonprofit pregnancy center, is celebrating 26 years of providing compassionate care to mothers throughout their pregnancies, and often in the most difficult of circumstances.

By providing ultrasounds, medical services, material assistance, and even ministering to mothers’ deeper emotional and spiritual needs, the people at Parkridge are truly and literally saving lives.

You see, Madam Speaker, they believe, like I do, that all life is a gift from God. They believe in the words etched into our Declaration of Independence, our founding principle and fundamental belief that all of us are created equally by God and endowed by our creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For nearly 50 years now, we have fallen short of that national ethic. Ever since the Supreme Court erred in Roe v. Wade, we have failed to protect the sacred right for the most vulnerable among us, rejecting the notion that life at every stage is equally valuable, equally precious, not only in light of the Constitution, but also in the eyes of God.

Since then, over 60 million lives have been terminated through the practice of abortion in these United States. And yet even in the shadow of this darkness, we can see rays of hope shining through.

Because of places like Parkridge, I believe the tide is finally turning, and in the direction of life. All across our country, the growing momentum for a culture of life is palpable.

Last week, we learned that the abortion rate in America has dropped to its lowest level at any point since 1973 and Roe v. Wade.

We have seen States throughout the country taking bold action to defend the inherent dignity of every human life, especially those who can’t speak up for themselves.

I am proud to have supported every single pro-life measure considered in this Chamber, from the Heartbeat Protection Act, to the pain-capable protections, to defunding Planned Parenthood, to the recent born-alive protection legislation.

I stand behind our President 100 percent in his efforts to reframe the courts so that judges adhere to the Constitution and to the independent and interpretive role that they are supposed to play, rather than legislating from the bench and imposing their policy preferences on the American people.

This is one of the most important and certainly the loudest voices of this President, and I am proud to say and excited to say the Senate has recently confirmed President Trump’s 150th judicial nominee.

But I also recognize that in order to build a lasting culture of life, we are going to need to do more than just change laws. We are going to have to change hearts.

In the debate over abortion, the late Pennsylvania Governor Bob Casey said: ‘The real question is not when life begins, but when love begins.’

For 26 years now, the people of Parkridge Pregnancy Center have been coming alongside these young mothers not in judgment, but in joy, not in condemnation, but to comfort, praying with them, loving them, and ministering to them and meeting their deepest needs in their darkest hours.

Thanks to the good and godly work that they are doing, along with countless organizations across America, I hope, pray, and I believe that we will soon see a day in our country when every child is loved and every life, born or unborn, is celebrated, cherished, and protected.

Madam Speaker, may God bless the Parkridge family, may He bless their mission to protect life and promote love, all to the praise of God, the author of both life and love.

Go west Texas.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 1/4 minutes remaining.

WE SHOULD BE MORE RESPONSIBLE IN CARRYING OUT OUR CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I feel like it is incredibly irresponsible and premature and careless for this body, led by our Speaker and the Democratic Party, to rush to this conclusion and allege that our President has committed high crimes.

I don’t believe this is under the auspices of pursuit of justice and truth. I think it is placating a certain group in the Democratic Party.

I think this is more of the bloodlust for impeaching our President, not because of high crimes, but because they hate him, they hate his personality, they hate his policies, but that is no justification.

We are better than that as a country. We should be more responsible in how we faithfully carry out our constitutional duties.

So I look forward to reading the transcript. I look forward to getting the facts.

Republican or Democrat. Madam Speaker, we ought to look at the facts and we ought to be very judicious and careful and certainly responsible when wielding our constitutional oversight, and certainly that provision of impeachment.

So that is what I am going to do on behalf of the good people of west Texas and my beloved countrymen across the United States.
Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the remarkable life and legacy of Mrs. Juanita Abernathy, a selfless leader in the struggle for civil rights whose direction and tireless engagement was an integral part in the movement of civil rights throughout our nation and around the globe.

She worked closely with the King family to integrate Atlanta’s public schools. At this same time, understanding the link between race and economic inequality in this country, Mrs. Abernathy fought to establish a national food stamp program for low-income families and a national free meal program for public schoolchildren.

A true servant leader, Mrs. Abernathy’s brilliant mind, full heart, and resilient spirit should remind all of us of what constitutes a full and wonderful life.

On a personal note, I was honored to get to know Mrs. Abernathy during her many pilgrimages to my hometown of Selma, Alabama, for the annual commemoration of Bloody Sunday and the Selma to Montgomery marches.

She was a powerful voice for change and a proud product of Alabama’s Black Belt who passionately protected the legacy of her husband and their lifework together to advance civil rights.

Mrs. Abernathy graciously encouraged me to run for Congress and honored me with her presence in my hometown of Selma on election night when I won in November 2010. I saw in her face that night the pride she felt witnessing the election of Alabama’s first Black Congresswoman. I prevailed because of her personal courage and sacrifice that paved the way for future generations of Black children like me to succeed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute and honor to Alabama native Mrs. Juanita Jones Abernathy on the passing of this civil rights icon and true American heroine, whose tremendous efforts helped propel our Nation toward a more perfect Union.

Early on in the conversation between President Trump and President Zelensky, President Zelensky says: We, here in Ukraine, are trying to drain the swamp much in the way you are working to drain the swamp in the United States.

This wasn’t a call about leverage. This wasn’t a call about threats. This was a mutually appreciative and mutually laudatory call between two leaders who are trying to clean up some of the mess in their respective countries that has polluted politics.

Now, the President does ask for a favor from President Zelensky, but the favor is on behalf of our Nation. The favor we seek is cooperation between the Zelensky government and Attorney General Bill Barr as we work to determine what activities in Ukraine may have been in any way involved in the 2016—not 2020, but 2016—efforts to interfere with the United States elections.

The President even references CrowdStrike, attempting to get to the bottom of these improper actions, which, again, may have emanated from Ukraine. John Solomon with The Hill has a great deal of reporting on that very question.

Zelensky ran against corruption. Thus, it would be only appropriate that in the conversation about that election victory, they would discuss and reference what are, obviously, mutual goals between the United States and Ukraine to have the world safer for democracy.

The President also mentions Mayor Rudy Giuliani. Let me be clear about this: Mayor Giuliani has every right to go to Ukraine to try to ascertain whether or not activities in that country were harming his client as a result of the corrupt connections that may have existed between the DNC and some elements in Ukraine.

I feel like we have been here before. House Democrats told us it was all just collusion. We asked for the Mueller report. Well, when the Mueller report falls flat on collusion, then it is all about obstruction of justice. Until Robert Mueller testifies and that falls flat, then it is all about abuse of power. Until the Democrats go to court and cannot make the case in court that there has been an abuse of power, it is all about Ukraine.

Then, I want to ask you: Do you know what? I saw this movie as related to Russia, I didn’t like it very much, and I doubt I am going to enjoy the cheap Ukrainian knockoff.

The Speaker has embraced these concerns. I fear that her embrace of impeachment does great damage to the United States and herself as a representative.

President Zelensky, in this call, indicates that he will conduct an investigation into corruption. It is a promise
not only that he made to President Trump but that he made to his own citizens. In that promise, President Zelensky says that any investigation will be both open and candid, open and candid investigations of corruption of election meddling. I sure would like to see the model of candidness and openness in our House of Representatives.

Certainly, my greatest hope is that the Attorney General’s investigation into the corrupt origins of the efforts to smear the President of the United States will proceed and those responsible will go to jail.

That is how we restore honor to this House. That is how we solve and heal some of the great wounds that were inflicted on this body by the Speaker yesterday. Maybe the next time the radical left will wait for the facts before engaging in a reflexive, fact-free impeachment.

SUPPORT UKRAINIAN PEOPLE BY ROOTING OUT CORRUPTION

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

Ms. KAPITUR. Madam Speaker, I include in the record a statement from the floor of the House prior to my remarks.

Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPITUR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to provide some background on why the conversations between President Donald Trump and the newly elected President of Ukraine, President Volodymyr Zelensky, are so vitally important to liberty and our Nation’s national security.

There is no more important strategic alliance for liberty and with our military than America’s membership with European allies in NATO, our dependable transatlantic allies who stood at our side through so many battles for the values we share. The blood lands of Europe directly influence the very security of our side through so many battles for freedom for its defense on the line for liberty for our day to defend our liberty.

Today, stands ready every hour of every day to fight a two-front war: one against Russia and one against enemies from within, the scourge of corruption aided by Kremlin allies every minute of every day.

While Ukraine has sought to shake off the vestiges of Soviet repression, Ukraine itself has converted over $1.2 billion, Ihor Kolomoisky is one of the richest oligarchs in Ukraine. But he travels between Ukraine, Cyprus, Israel, and here. His own son was on the basketball team at Cleveland State University.

But the man who ran the show, servant of the people, who propelled President Zelensky to stardom. And so the question for history is: Will President Zelensky be his own man, or will he beholden to oligarchs? Will he stand for liberty, and will the people of the world see the benefit from those oligarchs who'd opened accounts with PrivatBank, the oligarchs Ihor Kolomoisky and Gennadiy Bogolyubov doled out corporate loans to beneficial owners to create companies that were shell companies. They used PrivatBank “as their personal piggy bank,” in the words of the complaint. Those loans were then laundered in multiple digital transactions and dozens of other shell companies that had been created exclusively for the purpose of laundering those accounts to manage by co-conspirators at PrivatBank’s branch in Cyprus.

The true origin of the money thus concealed funds were traced to LLCs in the United States, according to the complaint, were a Miami-based trio: Mordechai “Motti” Korf, his brother-in-law Chaim Schochet, and Ukrainian oligarch Ihor Kolomoisky. Those three men managed the “Optima” companies: Optima International, Optima Ventures and Optima Acquisitions, all of which were created and ultimately controlled by Kolomoisky.

“Optima Ventures” should be a familiar name. It was the company, launched in 2007, used to acquire properties in the U.S. for Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov. The majority of those properties were in Cleveland. Chaim Schochet was Optima’s “front man” in Sophialand Ohio. He told a Dealer in 2012 that his local goals were twofold: “making money for investors betting on the upside of a Midwestern city, and contributing to the betterment of a downtown that more high-profile buyers had passed by.”

But his investors’ funds were ill-gotten, according to the complaint, proceeds from massive, systematic and fraudulent loan misappropriation and recycling schemes. In the 2012 PD piece referenced above, Schochet was reportedly circumstantial about discussing how (Optima) was structured or who the major investors are.

The loan recycling schemes were functionally identical to a ponz scheme, except in this case, paying purgation investors with funds from more recent investors. The Ukrainian oligarchs and their cronies within PrivatBank paid off early fraudulent corporate loans with money from new fraudulent corporate loans.

On paper, this appeared to be a repay. But in reality, it was a fraud, as PrivatBank was repaying itself and increasing its outstanding liabilities in the process. This process was carried out over and over again, over a period of years.

In December 2016, the Ukrainian state was forced to nationalize PrivatBank as a result of the oligarchs’ conduct. The state injected more than $5.5 billion into the bank to prevent its collapse, and “preserve the stability of the (Ukrainian) financial system.” In 2018, the bank reverted to private ownership.

The complaint alleges that Korf, Schochet and Laber were in on the racket, aware of the systematic corruption because they were working directly as supervisory officers of PrivatBank and Bogolyubov (or their trusted lieutenant inside PrivatBank, Timur Novikov), and because they were enriched in the process. Korf, Schochet, and Bogolyubov “demanded substantial financial remuneration,” according to the complaint, which they used to acquire
A sale was in the works with K&D development last year, but K&D pulled out, calling the project “unworkable.” Though Optima had purchased it for $34 million in 2008, it was only 57-percent occupied and was in need of significant renovations. The Plain Dealer reported that the building was “in dire need of a makeover” and that “only a smattering” of businesses occupied the 2nd through 11th floors of the 22-story structure. The John Q Steakhouse space on the ground floor has been vacant for years.

Optima retains a management stake in what is now the downtown Westin Hotel (formerly the Crowne Plaza) and owns One Cleveland Center, which it refinanced in 2010. Optima Management and Development company affiliated with Optima Ventures, also works out of One Cleveland Center.

Scene spoke with a representative there by phone, who asked that questions for Chaim Schochet about the so-called “Optima Schemes” be submitted via email. Schochet provided the following via Optima Management Group late Tuesday afternoon:

‘The allegations in this lawsuit—part of an orchestrated political attack by a Ukrainian oligarch against his American business— are false, defamatory and utterly without merit. We intend not only to contest but to disprove these reckless allegations, and to demonstrate that they are part of a smear campaign driven by a Ukrainian political agenda that we have nothing to do with. We are immensely proud of our extensive track record building a vibrant real estate portfolio in Cleveland, and we will not let a frivolous lawsuit tarnish our hard-earned reputation or distract us from our mission to continue to serve the interests of the Cleveland community.

Filed on behalf of the current PrivatBank shareholders, the Delaware complaint seeks damages on behalf of all of Optima’s U.S. assets. Those include properties in Dallas and Louisville and metallurgical assets in addition to the Cleveland portfolio. Among the metallurgical assets that Optima Acquisitions acquired was a steelmaking plant in Warren, Ohio, called Warren Steel Holdings LLC. Warren Steel shuttered permanently in 2011 and laid off 162 workers due to “unforeseeable business circumstances.”

Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov are now back under FBI investigation and laundering in forty-two other sources linked to Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov. But when Rugby acquired it last year, it had dropped to only 57-percent occupancy and was in need of significant renovations.

“They’ll fully renovate the lobby so it fits the 21st century and doesn’t look like the 1980s,” Rugby principal Robert Ades said at the time of purchase. Rugby’s plans also included updating the elevators, the mechanical components of which reportedly dated back to 1972.

The Huntington Building (The 925 Building) was sold to Frank Sinito’s Millennia Companies last year for $34 million. A full overhaul of the building was projected to cost $300 million. The property was characterized by the FD at the time of sale as a “gap in the hole in the heart of a revitalizing downtown.”

A situation of disrepair and vacancy can also be found at 55 Public Square, the only building other than One Cleveland Center that remains in Optima’s local ownership portfolio.
PRAYER

Dr. J.D. Greear, The Summit Church, Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we ask You for Your help in guiding the affairs of this great Nation. We acknowledge that you have appointed governments for the promotion of peace, for the preservation of justice, and the protection of liberty. We recognize that the wisdom to accomplish these things comes only from You.

May You grant that this body rule in a way that directs the men, women, and children of this country towards Your goodness, and enables them to respond in thankfulness to You, knowing that each of us must give an account for our decisions and our actions to You.

May we perceive the love that You have for us, and may that translate into love for one another, especially the most vulnerable.

Finally, may we recognize that all of this comes as a gift from You, embodied in Jesus Christ, who was punished for our sin and raised to life so that we could find new life in Him.

It is in His name that I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces that we could find new life in Him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. J.D. GREEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, you have just heard from a man, J.D. Greear, that I have the distinct privilege of calling my friend.

Pastor J.D. Greear leads The Summit Church in Durham, North Carolina. Under Pastor J.D.’s leadership, The Summit Church has gone from 300 members to over 10,000, making it one of the fastest growing churches in our country.

His vision is to plant 1,000 new churches around the world by the year 2050.

He believes the deeper we dive into the extravagant love of Christ, the more our lives will be filled with unquenchable joy, reckless generosity, and audacious faith.

Pastor J.D. is the author of several life-transforming books and is the current president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

One of his most important accomplishments is his dedication to his wife, Veronica, and their four children.

It is an honor to have him here today in Washington, D.C., today. He is also the mentor of my pastor, Andrew Hopper.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to his continued work as a father, as a pastor, and as a leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY IS NECESSARY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, we see an erosion of this country’s ideals by a President who freely sidesteps Congress, profits off his position, obstructs justice, and places personal petty politics before national security.

The validity of these violations is not in question. They are happening before us.

The Intelligence inspector general, who was appointed by President Trump, said that the whistleblower complaint is of both urgent concern and credible, and its public release is the National Intelligence director’s obligation to the American people.

An impeachment inquiry is necessary to protect the values included in our Constitution and to deliver the truth Americans deserve.

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

SANDHILL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, each August, I participate in a bus tour of South Carolina’s Second Congressional District with my wife, Roxanne, and dedicated staff from the Washington and district offices.

This year, the tour took us to the Clemson University Sandhill Research and Education Center in Columbia. The Sandhill Research and Education Center plays a vital role in the growth of statewide agriculture.

We were welcomed by long-time friend, Director Kathy Coleman.

During the visit, we heard updates from faculty members Cory Heaton, Adam Kantrovich, and Nathan Smith on their research in agribusiness programming, which promotes President Donald Trump’s policies of farm exports.

We learned from farm manager Cody Bishop of the incubator program, which provides small plots for startup farmers to begin growing their business.

The visit was jointly hosted with the South Carolina Farm Bureau. We were welcomed by David Wilson, Gary Skees, and Charles Wingard.

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

INVESTIGATE FORMER VICE PRESIDENT JOE BIDEN AND HIS SON, HUNTER BIDEN

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for an investigation into former Vice President Joe Biden and his son, Hunter Biden, for their unethical and potentially criminal actions in Ukraine.

In 2014, after being discharged from the Navy for cocaine use, Hunter Biden was named a board member of Burisma Holdings. Burisma is a natural gas company that was being investigated by the Ukrainian Government for corruption.

This strange hire for a million dollars a year was around the same period that Vice President Joe Biden was the primary American liaison to Ukraine, supposedly assisting their new government in combating corruption.

Just last year, Joe Biden bragged to the Council on Foreign Relations that he threatened the Ukrainian Government while vice president with the loss of a billion dollars unless they fired the prosecutor general leading the ethics probe into Hunter Biden, or America would cut off that foreign aid.

Talk about quid pro quo.

It is clear: Democrats would rather smear President Trump than investigate Biden’s corrupt bullying of the Ukrainian Government.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE OPTIONS

Mr. BUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.
Mr. BUDDE. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, President Obama made a famous promise: that the American people would be able to keep the plans they liked while paying less for health insurance. But, Mr. Speaker, that famous promise, and Obamacare’s consequences are still being felt to this day.

Over the preceding decade, premiums for individual coverage have more than doubled, patient choice has declined, and State exchanges have collapsed. This upheaval is a direct result of the law’s rigid and costly regulations that predated the Trump administration.

In order to bring down costs and increase choice, today I introduced the Flexibility Through Lower Expenses Healthcare Act, or the FLEX Act.

The FLEX Act codifies into law the Trump administration’s rules on short term, limited duration, and association healthcare plans. This will allow small businesses to band together to purchase affordable plans and give consumers the freedom to purchase lower-cost, short-term plans if they need to.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to follow the Trump administration’s lead and make these rules permanent. All citizens of our great country deserve affordable health insurance options that are free from Obamacare’s crippling regulatory regime.

TYSON UPWARD ACADEMY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the launch of the 50th Upward Academy at the Tyson Foods plant in my hometown of Zeeland, Michigan.

This unique in-plant educational program offers empowering resources and courses to all workers at no cost.

By partnering with local community organizations, Upward Academy provides team members the opportunity to access important courses, such as English as a second language, general education development, and citizenship courses.

The academy also includes multiple components focused on workplace skills and professional training to develop a workforce, especially in rural and marginalized areas.

Through programs such as drivers’ education, computer technology, and financial literacy, Upward Academy brings knowledgeable experts directly to workers so they can move beyond entry-level, and receive valuable qualifications so that they can perform at even higher levels.

The 50th launch of the Upward Academy will open the door for all team members to strive beyond their current situation.

Tyson Foods and Upward Academy’s commitment to cultivating a modern workforce that is prepared for the 21st century helps our community grow stronger and make west Michigan a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,


Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

The Speaker, House of Representatives,

Washington, DC.

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 25, 2019, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1596.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1596.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 577, providing for consideration of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act of 2019, the U.S. Border Patrol Medical Screening Standards Act; and H. Res. 576, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, under closed rules.

For H.R. 2203 and H.R. 3525, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security for each bill. The rule provides H. Res. 576 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The rule also provides blanket suspension authority for the legislative day of Thursday, September 26, 2019, and standard recess instructions for the district work period from September 30 to October 4, 2019.

At the end of this debate, I will be offering an amendment to the rule to replace the text of H. Res. 576 with the text of S. Res. 325, a bipartisan resolution that passed the Senate unanimously yesterday. Both of these resolutions urge that the complaint be transmitted immediately to the Intelligence Committees, as required by law.

In our Rules Committee meeting last night, several of my Republican colleagues suggested that they would prefer that we take up the Senate-passed language. To ensure that this Congress speaks with one voice clearly and unequivocally on this urgent matter, we will be amending the rule to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislative business, which I will address serially: H. Res. 576, with the text of S. Res. 325; H.R. 3525; and H.R. 2203.

By now, every Member of this body is well aware of the whistleblower complaint that was filed to the intelligence community inspector general following a call President Trump had with the President of Ukraine. These types of complaints are far from unheard of, and the law states that the complaint must be transmitted to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. However, the inspector general has testified that the Acting Director of National Intelligence blocked the complaint, after consulting with the Department of Justice, from being turned over to Congress, detailing the requirements for being turned over under the law.

The way this complaint was handled by the Trump administration was a stark violation of that whistleblower law, which states that the Director of National Intelligence shall provide Congress with the full whistleblower complaint. In addition to breaking the law, this corruption sends a strong and chilling message to would-be whistleblowers that there is no sacrifice in speaking out against impropriety and corruption will not be valued if it is not politically expedient.

Yesterday, the Senate voted by unanimous consent to pass a nonbinding resolution demanding the administration to hand over the whistleblower report filed against President Trump, reportedly, to House and Senate Intelligence Committees. The fact that Senator MCCONNELL allowed this resolution to go to the floor should show House Republicans that there is a point where you must stop turning a blind eye to this administration’s betrayal of our Constitution, our country, and our national security.

It is a sad day when Congress needs to pass a resolution to obtain documents that we have an absolute right to see, but this type of conduct is part of a pattern of obstruction by this administration that we have seen time and time again.

Allowing the Intelligence Committees to see the complaints and interview the whistleblower is essential to our national security. Furthermore, this resolution serves as a shoo-up of support and solidarity with whistleblowers. If we allow partisanship to deter whistleblowers from acting, we risk undermining a necessary check on an unrestrained administration. It is imperative that these brave Americans are protected and that their concerns are heard.

It is also worth noting that these whistleblower protections were negotiated and implemented with bipartisan support over multiple administrations.

Protecting the integrity of our national security is vitally important. I urge my Republican colleagues to follow the lead of their Senate counterparts and join us in passing this resolution so that Congress can properly oversee its constitutional oversight duties.

Also subject to this rule are two homeland security measures.

First, H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act, is a timely and necessary bill to address our Nation’s immigration and security challenges at the southern border in a responsible and humane way. This legislation will ensure accountability, transparency, and oversight in the agency responsible for monitoring and securing our Nation’s borders.

Further, the bill establishes an ombudsman for border- and immigration-related concerns within the Department of Homeland Security. This additional oversight in the Department of Homeland Security will bring a much-needed level of independent accountability to DHS and ensure that the agents and employees working at our border are performing their duties to the highest possible standard.

There is no doubt that these border security jobs are demanding and intense, and the creation of an independent, neutral, and confidential process to address complaints will help both the agents and employees working at the border, as well as the individuals they process.

This bill also creates a border communities liaison, appointed by the ombudsman in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at DHS, to operate in each Border Patrol sector along the northern and southern borders. The liaison will be charged with fostering cooperation between ICE, CBP, and surrounding border communities, relationships that have become increasingly strained and distrustful in recent months.

In addition, the omnibus bill will be required to conduct annual evaluations of all training given to ICE and CBP agents and officers.

One of the many concerns that I heard from ICE and CBP agents during my trips to the border is that they are not given adequate training and resources to properly do their jobs under current conditions. It is clear that this situation is critical at the southern border by instituting policies that prioritize political fear-mongering over addressing the humanitarian crisis in Central America. This is unacceptable given the complex challenges our border agents face every day, and an annual assessment of their training will serve to better equip these men and women for their very difficult jobs.

Another area where DHS is lacking is utilizing advancements in technology that could improve outcomes for both border agents and migrants. This bill mandates that the ombudsman, in coordination with the CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and ORR, develop recommendations for an electronic tracking number system to keep track of children in U.S. custody. The wholly inhumane practice of separating children from their parents is preventable, and tracking the location of a child who has been separated from his or her parents or guardians will help ensure that no child is ever again in custody alone and unaccounted for at our southern border.
Finally, this bill requires the ombudsman to submit to Congress a plan for requiring the use of body-worn cameras by U.S. Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when they are engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities. This is a long-overdue step. Body cameras are already used by State and local police departments around the country and have served to improve justice outcomes for the individuals who come into contact with the police and provide a level of oversight that is greatly needed at the border.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats are committed to passing legislation that will improve conditions at the border and better ensure the safety of agents and employees who work there, as well as the safety of migrants they come into contact with. Increased accountability is necessary to improving the situation at the border, a situation, I might add, that my Republican counterparts repeatedly say needs addressing. This bill is the chance for that added accountability.

I commend my colleague Representative Escobar from El Paso for her hard work and dedication on this issue and Chair Thompson and the Homeland Security Committee for their thoughtful consideration of H.R. 2203.

The second Homeland Security bill in today’s rule is H.R. 3525, the U.S. Border Patrol Medical Screening Standards Act.

In December 2018, Jakelin, aged 7, and Felipe, aged 8, both passed away in the custody of the U.S. Border Patrol. Following their deaths, CBP announced new medical screening procedures for children. Despite this, four more children have since passed away in Federal custody.

Let us be clear that we are addressing an issue that has emerged with the implementation of the Trump administration’s border policies. No child died in CBP custody for the entire decade preceding 2018, but we have seen six in the last 10 months.

CBP facilities must be better equipped to provide medical attention for individuals in U.S. custody, particularly children.

One critical component of addressing the new reality is an initial health screening to identify acute or pressing medical issues that need immediate or follow-on care. H.R. 3525 builds upon legislation passed by the House in July of this year by directing DHS to research innovative approaches to address capability gaps for providing medical screening at the border and mandates the implementation of an electronic health record system that can be accessed by all DHS components operating on our borders. ICE already has its own electronic health record system in place, and it is time CBP upgraded its capabilities, as well.

The deaths that have occurred on our borders are a stain on our Nation, and current medical screening processes are clearly not enough.

An inspector general report, released a few weeks ago, highlighted the challenges current medical screening processes are having in addressing the mental health needs of those children released by CBP to ORR. Though this bill deals with CBP, many of the issues transfer from agency to agency with the children. The trauma for these children begins when they are forced to flee their birth countries and is exacerbated by the journey to the U.S., which, for many, is marked by violence, sexual abuse, hunger, and sleep deprivation.

On the day finally arrive in the U.S., they then may be separated from their parents, if that didn’t happen along the original journey, causing further trauma. Medical professionals are clear that these children are going to have lifelong trauma. They need a detailed medical record of the care they receive or do not receive while in U.S. custody so that they can receive adequate follow-up care.

The IG report noted, as well, that the facilities where we house these children have not provided sufficient numbers of essential mental health clinicians. This results in higher case-loads for staff and worse outcomes for these afflicted children.

The electronic health record system required by this bill will ensure that medical information does not get lost, help track when follow-up appointments are necessary, and prevent duplication of medical services due to lost or incomplete records once children are transferred to ORR custody.

This bill is the result of Representative UNDERWOOD’s leadership and engagement with the treatment of migrants at our border, and I commend her for her efforts.

These two Homeland Security bills provided for in this rule will modernize the Department of Homeland Security and support better outcomes for border agents, employees, and migrants who come into U.S. custody.

House Democrats understand the need to provide the Department of Homeland Security with the resources it needs to effectively do its job, and I urge my Republican colleagues to vote for this legislation to support all those who work and live by the border.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCANLON for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we consider today highlight how far the priorities of my colleagues across the aisle have diverged from the priorities of the American people.

We consider two bills purportedly related to border security but which do nothing to solve the humanitarian crisis at our border and, like the rest of their previous so-called solutions, make the problem even worse.

Instead of addressing the issues that impact American citizens and legal residents, the Democrats continue to cave to radical, leftwing activists, cater to illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens and legal residents, and malign the President for his attempts to secure our border.

Then, late yesterday afternoon, a mere 1 hour and 45 minutes before the Rules Committee met, my Democratic colleagues added another item to the schedule for this rule to further their witch hunt against President Trump.

The Democrats ran on kitchen table issues like healthcare, but it is becoming increasingly clear that their obsession with attacking this President and prioritizing illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens and legal residents, and malign the President for his attempts to secure our border.

This is a special ombudsman just for illegal immigrants to file complaints against law enforcement, even though there are current avenues to file complaints. It requires that bureaucrat to establish even more bureaucrats in each U.S. Border Patrol sector. On top of those bureaucrats, it creates even more to sit on a border oversight panel. The legislation gives the ombudsman no real authority to resolve any issues.

This bill does nothing to address the root causes of the current humanitarian crisis on the southern border. In fact, I have introduced six bills to get to the root of the problem. None of them have been heard in the Judiciary Committee, but, instead, their bill is made up of policy provisions that cater to illegal immigrants and undermine our law enforcement at the border, thus weakening our national security.

Put simply, my Democratic colleagues’ answer to our border crisis is to create a taxpayer-funded complaint
box for illegal immigrants, and it gives no power to the ombudsman.

The second bill, H.R. 3525, throws even more taxpayer money at programs that will do nothing for the border security Americans demand. It even jeopardizes national security by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to reprogram funding used for combating terrorist and criminal organizations and for responding to manmade and national disasters to an IT system to track illegal immigrant health records.

The bill states that this new electronic health records program has to be completed in a record 90 days. Once again, my Democratic colleagues are prioritizing illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens. Our own veterans don’t even have a system like this.

In fact, we in Congress have been trying to get an electronic health record system in the VA for years, and we found that it would cost millions of dollars to develop. This is no funding in this bill for this electronic program, so we would have to divert money from our national security priorities.

This bill does divert money from protecting American citizens to enhancing the eligibility of illegal immigrants. I have been to a border facility in Eloy, Arizona, a detention center, and I have also been to an HHS facility in Virginia that houses unaccompanied minors. I saw that both facilities were clean and that the occupants were treated well. I even ate with detainees, sat at the table with them at the Eloy Detention Center, and the food was good.

Prioritizing where DSHS should allocate its limited resources, my firsthand experience leads me to believe that hurricane response and thwarting terrorists are of greater concern than prioritizing illegal immigrants.

Finally, the resolution, H. Res. 576, is still premature.

Second, the Director of National Intelligence: Turn that whistleblower’s complaint over immediately to Congress. The 7 days came and went. This is too profuse. There is too much language, and the gentlewoman said, we think that it may disparage the conduct of the President.

So what we did is we took them at their word. We purged all of that language and we made it an exact replica of the Senate resolution that they were praising last night. They loved it last night. They said: That is exactly what this should be. So we have conformed it precisely to what they are asking for, and they still oppose it.

What we need is an emphatic, unanimous, bipartisan statement that the Federal laws of the United States must be respected by this administration. The lawlessness must stop.

A whistleblower is someone acting in the highest, most noble traditions of the American people. He is not some traitor, as some have implied. A whistleblower is not someone who has gone over to the other side of the country. A whistleblower is someone working for the American people.

I believe my colleagues should use their power to understand that, not just Democrats, but Republicans used to understand that. Apparently, the Senate Republicans do understand it, and yet, now, we have a situation where we are saying: We have got a resolution, an exact replica of the Senate resolution where we are asking the administration just to comply with the law. Come forward and give us the complaint as you are required to do by law.

The statute uses the phrase, “shall turn over to Congress.” “Shall,” that means must—not may, not maybe do it. You must do it. Every other President, every other administration, every other Director of National Intelligence has understood that.

We asked our colleagues to stand by what they told us in committee last night, which was they liked the Senate version, and they urged us to use the Senate version. We are using the Senate version, and we hope that we will have an emphatic, bipartisan statement to the executive branch of government they must turn over this material according to law.

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

Mr. Speaker, if you grant the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for immediate consideration of S. 820, the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, which authorizes funding to process the rape kit backlog.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.
Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, this program was reauthorized with broad bipartisan support in both 2008 and 2014. The Senate passed the Debbie Smith Act by unanimous consent in May, over 4 months ago; yet the House has yet to take this important bill meant to end the rape kit backlog, even though it expires in just 5 days.

As a survivor of domestic violence and co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I am deeply concerned that some are using this program as leverage to get the Senate to pass other things that have nothing to do with DNA testing of rape kits.

My amendment makes the vote on the previous question simple. Vote "no" if you believe survivors of rape and domestic abuse are one step closer to justice. Vote "no" so we can immediately consider the Debbie Smith Act. Vote "no" on the previous question if you stand with survivors of rape and sexual assault.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), who is my good friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I, like many people growing up thought murder was the worst crime you could have in this country. However, my career as a criminal defense attorney and as a legal guardian ad litem for victims of sexual assault has taught me that is not true. Violent sexual assault is the most terrifying crime that can be committed, and, as opposed to other things, victims of this crime have to relive it when they are interviewed by law enforcement, they have to relive it when they are interviewed by doctors and nurses, they have to relive it when they are interviewed by prosecutors, and they oftentimes have to relive it as they navigate through the criminal justice system.

We have all heard stories about light sentences in different areas, especially when it comes under these cases. One of the main reasons for that is because of the nature of the crime and the unwillingness of victims to continue to go through this process as they move through the courtroom. I have done this in a court of law. I have helped victims navigate this.

The single biggest predicate for getting a conviction without a jury trial is DNA evidence. This puts really bad people in jail, it protects victims, it protects future victims, and, more importantly, it protects the very victims who are there from having to deal with this and navigate it.

In layman's terms, the FBI has said that 475,000 matches have happened through this DNA testing; of that 42 percent of those are directly related to the Debbie Smith law. This should be the only thing we are talking about in this town, because I cannot imagine why do not have broader bipartisan agreement, and it should be the previous question on every single bill until we get it passed.

I understand how we work, and I understand how things move around, but there is absolutely no reason this should be used as a bargaining chip for anything else. This is simple, this is commonsense, this is good law enforcement, and this program is of the most dangerous and despicable crime that can be committed on them.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I thank our floor manager, my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Representative SCANLON, for so ably guiding this argument. On September 12, Assistant Speaker Mr. Speaker so eloquently stated yesterday, this is a dangerous time for our democracy. Our Founding Fathers understood the importance of whistleblowers as an integral part of the fabric of our democracy and ensuring the rule of law is upheld.

The first United States whistleblower law which unanimously passed on July 30, 1778, by the Continental Congress states: "That it is the duty of all persons, officers or persons in the service of these states, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge."

The Founding Fathers understood this simple principle—that it is the duty of all patriotic Americans to not only come forward with allegations of wrongdoing but to ensure that there is a path that these allegations be brought to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what have we learned? That these principles that our Founding Fathers fought so hard to enshrine in our democracy are in jeopardy. It is our responsibility, and it is our duty to restore the faith of the public in our elections and oversight of all elected officials including and especially our President.

We know that the memorandum that was released today is only a memorandum of the conversation between the President and the President of Ukraine, and it undermines the integrity of his office. The President has betrayed his oath of office and his fidelity to that oath by putting himself and his personal and political gain over national security and the rule of law.

He must provide with details of the whistleblower information to Congress. He must provide a full transcript or tape of that conversation with the Ukrainian President. The public deserves it, our election security relies upon it, and the integrity of the office demands it.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President. Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), who is my friend.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I served as a magisterial district judge. I was on the front line of the criminal justice system, and I handled preliminary hearings for sexual assault and rape cases. Tell me, these crimes are incredibly heinous stories of the victims are absolutely heart-breaking.

Many of these victims went through a grueling evidence collection process in the hopes they would help catch their rapist. Unfortunately, this evidence often sits untested on shelves for months to years while sexual assault victims wait for justice and their rapists roam the streets. This is especially dangerous because those who commit sexual assault are likely to do it again. They are typically habitual offenders. So when we delay the testing of these kits, we do so at the expense and the risk of others being sexually assaulted.

So that is where the Debbie Smith Act comes in. The Debbie Smith Act provides funding for DNA testing and training to eliminate the backlog of untested DNA and rape kit evidence. Since 2004 nearly 200,000 DNA matches have been made thanks to the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program. Again, that is over 200,000 DNA matches since 2004. But without congressional action, this legislation is set to expire on Monday.

The Senate recognized this critical need to reauthorize this bill. They passed this bill back in May and sent it to the House for consideration, but, unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues refuse to bring this bill to the floor. They would rather play politics than put criminals in jail.

This is absolutely despicable. Sexual assault victims have been through enough. We should not hold this up for funding so that Democrats can score cheap political points with their radical, far-left base. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reexamine their priorities and help us get justice for these crime victims. This issue is too important for partisan games.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the Representative from Arizona has more speakers.

Mrs. LESKO. I have three speakers at least, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I request a balance of time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), who is my good friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the House immediately bring the Debbie Smith Act up for consideration before the program expires later this month. As a former prosecutor in Virginia, I know all too well how critical the Debbie Smith Act is for achieving justice for victims of sexual violence.

Debbie Smith's courage to share her story with the world has changed the
lives of millions, and no person should ever have to experience her trauma firsthand. Thanks to this program, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlogs, and we cannot take a step backward by allowing it to lapse. The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and convictions is unquestionable. In my home State of Virginia, the FBI’s National DNA Index contains more than 447,000 offender profiles and has aided in over 11,000 criminal investigations.

This program has been reauthorized previously with bipartisan support, and there is no excuse for it to be politicized now. S. 820 has been languishing in the Judiciary Committee for months. This failure to act enables violent criminals to remain at large and in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor and put it up for a vote so we can protect people from violent sexual predators and allow them to be served through our legal system.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will address the underlying bills on this rule.

I have been at the border three times this year, and while I have been to a lot of workplaces, a lot of work environments, there is nobody I have more respect for than the professional job that the U.S. Border Patrol does of protecting this country, and they do it under the most difficult of circumstances.

Last time I was down there, they had 2,000 vacant positions. They were, in May, staffed at a level that was maybe a third of what it should have been, given the huge number of people coming across.

In addition to just apprehending people, they had to do mounds of paperwork. They had to, in essence, act as a day care for all the young people who are sneaking in this country, but they did it without complaining, with the utmost professionalism.

I find it hard to believe, after watching these professional Border Patrol agents, that other people went down to the border and felt the problem is we have to tie their hands still more with another ombudsman, more paperwork, inviting people to file false complaints, particularly since we already have an inspector general and an Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Department of Homeland Security. So in addition to the watchmen on the Border Patrol, we had all sorts of new people, they are out there in the middle of the night, maybe they catch a caravan of 30 or 50 people sneaking into this country, and one Border Patrol agent is supposed to bring all these people in. What sacrifice for our country.

And what do they get from this body? Do they get filling out the empty positions? They don’t get that. What they get is a kick in the teeth, saying: We have something wrong with you.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we vote against the rule, and I hope we vote against the acts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before my closing statements, I want to put on the RECORD that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) had said earlier that, in Rules Committee last night, Republicans gushed over the Senate resolution, and that is actually not accurate. What we did is, after Mr. SCHIFF made some disparaging remarks about House Republicans, if they didn’t vote for the House resolution like the Senate Republicans did, that we didn’t care about the issue, then I merely pointed out the differences between the Senate version and the House version, and so that is how that came about.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will just summarize the bills before us today:

One, creates government bureaucrats with no real authority:
Two, diverts money meant to protect Americans from terrorism, gangs, and natural disasters;
Three, continues the obsession by my Democratic colleagues to bash the President and others and is a political tool.

The Democrats ran on kitchen table issues. Instead, week after week, they put forward the demands of radical leftwing activists over the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the whistleblower resolution we will vote on later this week is critical to the constitutional oversight responsibilities given to us by the Constitution. Congress has a right to view this whistleblower complaint, and it is important that we join our Senate colleagues in a bipartisan statement to
the administration that Congress will not abdicate its responsibilities.

Again, I urge my Republican colleagues in the House to join House Democrats and a unanimous Senate to support the final resolution affirming to the administration that we will perform our duty and to reassure whistleblowers that their courageous acts will be welcomed and rewarded by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the two strong bills to protect children and families from appalling conditions and treatment at our southwest border have been sent to us by the Committee on Homeland Security and are representative of the types of constructive and measured legislation that comes from going through regular order.

These bills seek to address emergent conditions at our southern border in a way that is thoughtful and practical and, if enacted, will have a tangible impact on the day-to-day working lives of the men and women who work at the border and the migrants and children who come into U.S. custody.

Conditions at the border are unacceptable. I think both sides of the aisle should agree on that. But what we would agree upon is not simply throwing money at this situation will not help. We talk about the need for meaningful solutions a lot around here, and today we present two of them.

The situation at the border is complicated and requires ongoing attention, but we cannot let conditions at the border continue to deteriorate. These two bills will provide meaningful and much-needed reforms to our border detention system and help pave the way for larger scale immigration legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the resolution, as amended. The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 577

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SNC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed on the consideration in the House of the bill (S. 829) to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2009. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SNC. 12. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 829.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, on that I would also likely agree upon is that we should agree on that. But what we would agree on is not simply throwing money at this situation.

[The text of the amendment is as follows:]

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution shall be considered as ordered on the floor of the House for the purpose of adding the following:

(a) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

(b) The resolution, as amended, to adoption of the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on the amendment to the resolution, if ordered, and adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[The voting results are as follows:]

Amendments offered and agreed to:}

[The text of the amendment is as follows:]

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution shall be considered as ordered on the floor of the House for the purpose of adding the following:

(a) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

(b) Strike the preamble.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the bill to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution was agreed to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution shall be considered as ordered on the floor of the House for the purpose of adding the following:

(a) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

(b) Strike the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on the amendment to the resolution, if ordered, and adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

So the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the votes on September 25 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall No. 543.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during the votes on September 25 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall No. 543, and nay on rollcall No. 543.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because I was held up chairing a hearing on the assault weapons ban, I missed the motion on ordering the previous question to the rule, House Resolution 577, regarding the Homeland Security bill and the whistleblower bill. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea."
EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT MADE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 577, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the amendments to the text and preamble specified in section 11 of that resolution are adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

Resolved, That—

(1) the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee of the House of Representatives should be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the amended resolution, which demands provision to the congressional intelligence committees of a whistleblower complaint, which the Acting Director of National Intelligence has withheld. The law, however, required the Acting DNI to submit it to the committees.

This is a serious matter, Madam Speaker. I urge that the Acting Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Inspector General and the Select Committees of Congress, transmit the whistleblower complaint to the Select Committees of Congress immediately and in strict accordance with proper whistleblower procedures. These permit classified disclosures to be made to the intelligence committees while protecting national security.

That mechanism, in August, the whistleblower made a complaint to the inspector general with respect to the Intelligence Community. According to the Justice Department's legal opinion regarding the complaint, which it today released to the public, the whistleblower's allegations concerned the content of a telephone call between President Trump and a foreign leader.

The inspector general determined the complaint to be urgent, meaning that the matter met important statutory criteria, and that its allegations appeared to be credible.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

In strict accordance with the statutory rules, the inspector general passed the complaint and his determination to the Acting Director of National Intelligence. The Acting Director was obligated to forward this material to the congressional intelligence committees within 7 days of receipt. In understandable fashion, the inspector general determined the complaint potentially concerned matters not only falling "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today. That is protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell "within the DNI's jurisdiction," but also they "relate to one of the most important and significant threats that the American people face today," to wit, protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.
which strains to minimize or ignore the functions and responsibilities that the DNI carries out—or at least I hope—routinely.

I am also stunned that the ODNI would acquiesce in advice that, if permitted to stand, would do enormous damage. By conferring on the DNI the discretion to opt out of what is plainly mandatory, the Department of Justice neutered a statute governing intelligence community whistleblowing; overturned years of consistent practice; and, most damaging of all, called into doubt important protections from reprisal on which this whistleblower relied and other lawful whistleblowers in the IC have relied.

I can only imagine the chilling effect that the Department of Justice’s approach will have on lawful IC whistleblowing and thus on the intelligence committees’ ability to conduct oversight of intelligence activities.

Madam Speaker, let me end with a note about the art of play, which is fluid, to say the least. I understand that the executive branch may make some of the whistleblower’s materials available to the committee this afternoon, but the details remain sketchy, and they may not yet receive in complete and unredacted form, all the information that the acting DNI is obligated to furnish by law, and that we have sought by subpoena. The committee will settle for nothing less.

However, the situation is resolved, Madam Speaker, the House has no choice but to denounce the extraordinary lengths to which the White House and Justice Department have gone to cover up and obstruct.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the resolution, as amended. I urge my colleagues to join me, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP)? I ask unanimous consent that he have the balance of his time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, this is a sobering moment in our Nation’s history, when the rule of law and constitutional duty requires Congress to move swiftly to protect our national security and the integrity of our democracy.

In my time on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been amazed and grateful for the work our intelligence community performs every day. We hold these men and women accountable to the rule of law and expect them to adhere to the principles of our Constitution.

In return, those great Americans expect their elected leaders to be held accountable to the same standard—above all, their Commander in Chief, President Trump’s refusal to adhere to the whistleblower statute and his unwarranted attacks against one of these professionals files in the face of that compact.

The statute is clear, Madam Speaker. The Director of National Intelligence shall provide the intelligence committee with all whistleblower complaints, especially those that the inspector general finds credible and of urgent concern.

It should not take this resolution or the threat of impeachment to convince the President to uphold the law he swore to obey.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 576, honor our oaths, and do the right thing.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 576, as amended.

This resolution, which mirrors a resolution passed by the Senate yesterday, expresses the sense of the House that the whistleblower complaint received by the intelligence community inspector general should be immediately transmitted to the congressional intelligence committees.

Madam Speaker, this complaint has given rise to fevered speculation and frenzied media reporting, much of which is based on a transcript of the President’s phone call released today. It appears to be exaggerated, misleading, or outright false. It is also serving as a linchpin of a longstanding attempt by the Democrats to impeach President Trump and finally achieve their ambition to determine the result of the 2016 election. The media coverage and the Democrats’ hysterical and politicized response to it is reminiscent of countless episodes during the course of the Russia collusion hoax. Thus, Republicans look forward to actually reading the material on which the Democrats, from a position of ignorance, are basing their unstrained accusations.

I should make the House aware that it is roughly 3 o’clock in the afternoon here in Washington, D.C., and at 4 o’clock this afternoon, in fact, the DNI is going to transmit the complaint to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence spaces where all the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members will have an opportunity to read it.

So, therefore, we have to ask ourselves: Why are we voting on a resolution that is asking for the very documents that are being sent over? They are probably on their way right now, if they are not already here.

So, with that, I guess it gives an opportunity for the Democrats to come down and bash the President, which I know they enjoy doing, but in the meantime, we have no problem with this H. Res. 576, as amended. We appreciate the majority’s accepting our amendment so that it mirrors exactly what the Senate passed last night.

Madam Speaker, in the meantime, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIME of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, this is a sobering moment in our Nation’s history, when the rule of law and constitutional duty requires Congress to move swiftly to protect our national security and the integrity of our democracy.

In my time on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been amazed and grateful for the work our intelligence community performs every day. We hold these men and women accountable to the rule of law and expect them to adhere to the principles of our Constitution.

In return, those great Americans expect their elected leaders to be held accountable to the same standard—above all, their Commander in Chief. President Trump’s refusal to adhere to the whistleblower statute and his unwarranted attacks against one of these professionals files in the face of that compact.

The statute is clear, Madam Speaker. The Director of National Intelligence shall provide the intelligence committee with all whistleblower complaints, especially those that the inspector general finds credible and of urgent concern.

It should not take this resolution or the threat of impeachment to convince the President to uphold the law he swore to obey.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 576, honor our oaths, and do the right thing.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this, and I am glad we are having the opportunity to bring this resolution to the floor.

At this time I am pleased that we are going to be able to get to the documents that are being requested in this resolution. I am pleased that if there is going to be a resolution that it is the one that the Senate put forward in a bipartisan fashion. This is what we asked for in the Rules Committee last night, and I am glad that it has come forward today.

The question in hand—and we have heard lots of comments, some of it rehashing old history, some of it rehashing history that was disproven by the Mueller Report—but at the same time we are questioning what the DNI’s authority is in this situation, according to statute. I think it should be discussed.

In this situation where the DNI determined that this should not be sent to Congress, but also did not, in review of the complaint—because the complaint was given to DOJ for appropriate review, DOJ officials reviewed the complaint in light of legal issues identified by the IC IG in his cover letter and determined that no further action was warranted.

Tomorrow we are going to hear from the DNI in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which I think is appropriate.

As I pointed out last night in the Rules Committee, I don’t think that the other side would be happy if we only heard from the DNI and not the IG. So it is appropriate that we do that.

He talked about the timely fashion of it. I think it is appropriate that you go through the Department of Justice and make sure you are doing everything right, and we need to hear from the DNI tomorrow.

We also have received the transcripts of the conversation between the President and Zelensky in Ukraine and the President of the United States. The President made supposedly, and is being accused of making, a mysterious promise to Zelensky in return for Ukraine reviving an investigation against Joe Biden and his son. In fact, there was no such conversation. The President wanted allegations of corruption potentially involving an American official to be investigated.
What I see in this transcript is the President of one country speaking to a President of another country about trying to eliminate corruption within their government.

The other comment that had been made is the President offered a quid pro quo related to military aid for Ukraine. There is no quid pro quo in that conversation. There is no mention of an aid package to Ukraine at all. It is not in there at all. So while one might want to keep saying that, it is not in there.

Another myth, the President urged President Zelensky to work with Rudy Giuliani to investigate Biden’s involvement in securing the firing of a Ukrainian prosecutor eight times.

Fact: The President mentioned Rudy Giuliani in that conversation only after Zelensky mentioned him first and referred to Biden in only one exchange.

I, myself, have some confusion on what the rules are within the intelligence community and involving the executive branch. A couple of years ago in an open hearing, when we were discussing with John Brennan—this was in an open hearing—the former CIA director, an expert in intelligence, when I asked him about the conversation between President Obama and President Medvedev where it was caught on tape where he said:

I'll have more flexibility after my election.

Medvedev said:

I stand with you, and I will let President Putin know.

I asked him if that was a red flag. His answer was:

I am not going to comment on a private conversation between two heads of state.

Since that time, I have wondered what the rules are within the intelligence community and involving conversations between two heads of state completely off-limits within the IC? I don’t know. I have asked that question time and time again. I have asked some high-ranking officials who should know the answer to that, and I have gotten no answer.

What I have heard in the testimony here today, I heard someone say, “favor,” “favor,” in response to the potential of this President asking for a favor. I don’t see that. And I don’t know who made the quote. I would like some clarification on that.

Where we stand right now is kind of where we stand right now is kind of a recurring playbook. It is always moving the goalpost, right?

We want to see these documents.

Okay. The President has given you the documents.

Okay. We are going to see what the whistleblower had to say.

And now, what do we hear? Well, I am concerned that there may be more out there that we are not getting. It is always moving the goalpost.

Listen, I speak in favor of this resolution. You should get to it. Move on with the business of the country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
try to work to impeach the President. Many of them talked about it. They didn’t even have the gavel in their hands yet, and they were talking about impeaching the President.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary said he wants to bring Articles of Impeachment to the House floor by the end of the year. Keep in mind, there is not a single Article of Impeachment that they have listed because there have been no crimes. They thought the Mueller report was going to be the crimes. It turned out it showed there was no collusion. Instead of wrapping it up, they move on to look for something else.

It is not the job of a prosecutor, by the way, to go and get somebody to point of crimes. They are supposed to follow facts. If the facts lead them there, that is where they go. That is not happening here.

When you saw the Speaker of the House yesterday saying that the President committed crimes, please, one crime that has been listed.

We have seen the report now, the transcript of a conversation between President Trump and President Zelensky of Ukraine. There is a lot of niceties here, the President congratulating him on winning an election. There is not a single quid pro quo, which we were told there would be. There is not an exertion of pressure, which we were told there would be.

Now, they bring up Joe Biden. Joe Biden, himself, has said that he exerted pressure on the Ukrainians, bragged about the fact that he withheld $1 billion in aid from the Ukrainians.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Again, when we talk about something as serious as impeachment, and obviously, that is where they have said they would go, the Speaker said she wants to get the committee working toward an impeachment inquiry.

Why? Why? Why, Madam Speaker, haven’t they brought a vote here on this House floor to start an impeachment inquiry? They are scared to death of having a vote on this House floor on impeachment. They are trying to keep moving down that train track.

It is a reckless track, when they say that they are going to bring impeachment. Even the people who have read this, not one of them has pointed out a high crime or misdemeanor that is in here.

The quid pro quo that they promised doesn’t exist. These are the same people who promised that there was collusion, with the Mueller report, and there was no collusion.

Instead of moving on, they keep going down the impeachment path. People are sick and tired of the constant harassment of the President.

Go read the transcript, and you will see, again, a President congratulating another President who was elected on a platform to root out corruption, and he is working to root out corruption. We ought to watch that.

Instead of doing this, we ought to be focused on things like USMCA, lowering drug prices, solving real problems. Let’s move on.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, with respect to my colleague, the only corruption the President seems to be concerned with is the corruption of his impeachment. He is not involved with, and that seems to be an increasingly narrow category.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution demanding that the administration release the whistleblower complaint to Congress.

Every American ought to be extremely concerned by circumstances surrounding this urgent complaint and outraged that this President and members of his administration are hiding it. Congress has a constitutional duty, Madam Speaker, to obtain this information. Any law required by the administration is blocking our ability to gather the information necessary to respond to the public’s needs. In this case, these needs are inseparable from our security, our safety, and the well-being of our Nation.

Congress is entitled to the full complaint, not only for the sake of national security, Madam Speaker, but to ensure that our ability to hold public servants accountable remains.

This isn’t about partisan politics. This is about protecting our democracy and its people.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment at what the House is devoting its time to this afternoon. It certainly not the issues that my constituents elected me to come to Washington to advocate for on their behalf.

We are not on the floor today talking about how we can improve care and services for veterans. We are not talking about strengthening our infrastructure, how to fix the broken immigration system. We are not talking about how to modernize and personally tailor healthcare. We are not on the floor talking about how we can continue to improve policies to further strengthen our economy.

Instead, we again find ourselves on the House floor talking about President Trump and his administration.

Sound familiar? This morning, in the interest of full transparency, the Trump administration released the complete memorandum outlining the telephone conversation between the President and the Ukrainian President, just as the President promised he would do yesterday. But before reading the transcript, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle prejudged the memo and called for impeachment.

Did the Speaker wait to see and review this information? No. Instead, she went before an American people to announce that the House would begin the formal impeachment inquiry into President Trump.

Well, I read the transcript, and I don’t see the bombshell that the Democrats promised. There is no quid pro quo, no this for that. Nowhere does the President say that he will withhold military aid unless the Ukrainian investigation continues. It is simply not there.

Rushing to judgment and overpromising, if it sounds familiar, that is because it is. We waited nearly 2 years for Special Counsel Mueller to finish his report on the 2016 election. Over and over, we heard Democrats promise that his report would lead to President Trump’s impeachment. After a disappointing report and an even more disappointing appearance by the special counsel before Congress, they went fishing for new reasons to attack the President.

What happened to the standard of innocent until proven guilty in this country? I learned that in law school. How have we strayed so far from this fundamental principle?

The Democrats are operating under the presumptive belief that the President is guilty. They believe if they look long enough and hard enough, maybe, just maybe, they will uncover something, anything, that they can impeach him for.

This is wrong, and I will not support their efforts. I will not stand by silently while it happens. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly believe that this warrants impeachment, and if they are not willing to take 1 day to read the transcript, then why are they sending us back to our districts for the next 2 weeks?

The majority leader said this morning there are no plans to cancel the recess because it is important Members go home to their constituents and explain what we are doing. In other words, they still need to convince the American people that today’s revelations, which didn’t live up to their promises, should lead to President Trump’s removal from office.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I call on the Democrat leadership to keep us in session the first 2 weeks of October, if this is an urgent and as serious as the presumptive belief the American people.

I will not support the political impeachment that Democrats are incessantly pursuing. I implore this House.
We have been through a lot. And its leadership to put this behind us once and for all and get to work, get to work and do the important work that the American people sent us here to do. Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, a point of clarification: Quid pro quo exists on its face in what we reviewed just today. But, for the record, criminal conduct does not have to be quid pro quo.

The President asked a foreign government to investigate his political rival and interfere in our election.

The response by my friends across the aisle has also confirmed something else I have had a suspicion about: They have an extraordinary sense of humor. They imagine that this administration would have released whatever it is this morning relating to a transcript, the complaint, and allowed the DNI to formally testify and the complaining witness to testify just because the President thought we should know, not because there was a complaining witness.

Without the complaining witness, no one knows about this—without their courage, it makes the point of how important complaining witnesses are, because, without their courage, we don’t know about wrongdoing or there are further leaks, both of which put our country at risk.

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

Let me make a few comments, if I can.

This was reviewed by the criminal division of DOJ today that found no violation whatsoever.

Let me make another point, because I have heard accusations along the way that certain entities here in Congress don’t care about whistleblower protections.

We do care. We care about the whistleblower process. We care about their protections. Let’s be perfectly clear on that. As Republicans, and sitting on the intelligence committee, we recognize the value of this process. We are for it.

We have heard a lot of comments, yesterday especially, that were made that would imply guilty until proven innocent when we haven’t even seen the whistleblower claim. We just got the transcripts of the President with the President of Ukraine today, and we don’t even know the circumstances of the claim.

I don’t know if anyone on the other side has had contact with the whistleblower, but I don’t know anything about the whistleblower except that there is a whistleblower. And I have not seen the complaint, and I look forward to seeing it.

We have been through a lot as a country. Time and time again, our country gets challenged—challenged from outside, challenged from within. We have been through a lot.

As Mr. Spano alluded, we are about ready to go home. Yet we have got an urgent matter on our hands, we have been told; yet leadership is saying: But just go home.

Well, if this is such an urgent matter, why are we waiting?

And I also will bring up the point again that tomorrow we are scheduled to hear from the DNI. Let’s give that process its due, and let’s know facts before we speak and before we pass judgment. That is all we are asking to do. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair of the committee for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is a powder keg. This is not as my colleagues on the other side are trying to suggest it is, but they are dealing with alternative facts.

As co-chair of the Whistleblower Caucus, I can point to the fact that $54 billion has been returned to the taxpayers of this country because men and women had the courage to stand up and point out tax evasion, fraud, abuse, and waste.

Now, we have a whistleblower here who was defined as not being a whistleblower by the Attorney General, and now we are all saying he is a whistleblower. He doesn’t even have the protections of a whistleblower based on the analysis by the Attorney General.

One thing is very clear here, Members: But for the fact that this whistleblower came forward, but for the fact that the inspector general found that it was both credible and urgent, and but for the fact, after the DNI did not deem it to be sent to the committee, it was the inspector general who had the courage to contact the chair of this committee to inform him that there was a whistleblower pending that brought this all to the fore.

So let’s be very clear: There was a concerted effort by the administration to shut down this whistleblower, to restrict the money that was supposed to go to Ukraine on June 18—or July 18.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the Speaker.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I commend him for his great patriotism, for the equanimity that he brings to all that he does with great wisdom and judgment.

Madam Speaker, just over a week ago, when our Nation observed the anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution, on that very day, news broke of great allegations which were a threat to our Constitution.

On that day, the intelligence community inspector general formally notified Congress that the administration was forbidding him from turning over a whistleblower complaint that he found to be of “urgent concern” and “credible.”

The administration’s refusal to turn over the full complaint is a violation of the law, which is unequivocal, stating that the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide Congress with the full complaint.

I repeat, that obligation is mandatory.

Shortly thereafter, the American people learned of a phone call from the White House calling upon a foreign power to intervene in the upcoming election. Today’s release of the notes of the call by the White House confirms this behavior, which undermines the integrity of our elections, the dignity of any Presidency, and our national security.

Let us repeat the facts:

The intelligence community inspector general, who was appointed by President Trump, determined that the complaint was both of “urgent concern and credible,” and its disclosure “relates to one of the most significant and important of the Director of National Intelligence’s responsibilities to the American people.”

I want to talk a moment, Madam Speaker, if I may, about whistleblowers.

First, let me say what an asset the intelligence community is to the security of our country. We talk about our men and women in uniform, and we praise them. We could never thank them enough. Our intelligence community personnel are a significant part of the national security of our country.

Whistleblowers, in any part of the government, are important, but whistleblowers can be defined as an act of reporting waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption in a lawful manner to those who can correct the wrongdoing.

The intelligence community has publicly recognized the importance of whistleblowing. It is important and necessary for our security.

I repeat, that obligation is mandatory.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the Speaker.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair of the committee for yielding, and I commend him for his great patriotism, for the equanimity that he brings to all that he does with great wisdom and judgment.

Madam Speaker, just over a week ago, when our Nation observed the anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution, on that very day, news broke of great allegations which were a threat to our Constitution.

On that day, the intelligence community inspector general formally notified Congress that the administration was forbidding him from turning over a whistleblower complaint that he found to be of “urgent concern” and “credible.”

The administration’s refusal to turn over the full complaint is a violation of the law, which is unequivocal, stating that the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide Congress with the full complaint.

I repeat, that obligation is mandatory.

Shortly thereafter, the American people learned of a phone call from the White House calling upon a foreign power to intervene in the upcoming election. Today’s release of the notes of the call by the White House confirms this behavior, which undermines the integrity of our elections, the dignity of any Presidency, and our national security.

Let us repeat the facts:

The intelligence community inspector general, who was appointed by President Trump, determined that the complaint was both of “urgent concern and credible,” and its disclosure “relates to one of the most significant and important of the Director of National Intelligence’s responsibilities to the American people.”

I want to talk a moment, Madam Speaker, if I may, about whistleblowers.

First, let me say what an asset the intelligence community is to the security of our country. We talk about our men and women in uniform, and we praise them. We could never thank them enough. Our intelligence community personnel are a significant part of the national security of our country.

Whistleblowers, in any part of the government, are important, but whistleblowers can be defined as an act of reporting waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption in a lawful manner to those who can correct the wrongdoing.

The intelligence community has publicly recognized the importance of whistleblowing. It is important and necessary for our security.

I repeat, that obligation is mandatory.
the inspector general of the intelligence community, and then the congressional intelligence committees, House and Senate, which can act upon it.

The statute does not permit the DNI to second-guess the inspector general’s determination of any complaint he finds to be “credible.” At no point in the history of this law has a DNI ever refused to turn over a whistleblower’s complaint that has been found by the IG as credible. The only way to do this is a violation of the law.

Our national security depends on this framework. This vote today is about more than just any one President. This resolution is about the preservation of our American system of government.

Once we pass this resolution—and I acknowledge that we are joining the Senate, which passed it without objection yesterday, unanimously—the DNI will be faced with a choice: to honor his responsibility to help preserve our Republic or to break the law.

This resolution passed by unanimous consent—I repeat—in the Senate. Every Member, Democratic and Republican, who joined us in passing this in the House.

While we await the release of the full complaint, we reiterate our call for the release of the full transcript of the call between President Trump and the Ukrainian President and reiterate our call to protect whistleblowers from retaliation.

Madam Speaker, I urge a bipartisan vote to defend our national security and to protect our democracy.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio had asked earlier: Where does it say in the President’s notes—and these are notes; this is not a transcript—the word “favor”? Page 3, I would direct the gentleman: “I would like you to do us a favor.”

And the problem with this mob-like tactic is that, when you ask someone to do a favor, you owe that person something in return. And, when that person is a foreign leader, that means, as President of the United States, one day you will have to put a foreign leader’s interests ahead of America’s interests.

This is only the tip of the iceberg, this note that the President has released, and that is why it is important that we hear from the whistleblower.

It is important to note that Ukraine depends on the U.S. economically, militarily, and the credibility we afford to them when we support them. So, you don’t need to be explicit with them when you tell them that you need a favor and you are withholding military funds.

In this case, the whistleblower did everything right; so now it is time for the Acting Director of National Intelligence to do the same.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I, too, look forward to reviewing the whistleblower’s complaint, shortly.

I want to start by saying thank you to the whistleblower. We don’t know if it is a man or a woman, the person’s identity, yet, but I want to say thank you for having the courage and bravery to come forward and reveal—at least in terms of what we have seen from the transcript—abuse of power by the President of the United States.

We must protect a whistleblower who comes forward and puts himself or herself and their career on the line. I hope that this Congress will be committed to doing that.

These are very serious charges, an abuse of power that includes coercing a foreign leader into digging up dirt against a political rival for the President’s political gain, to win reelection; asking a personal lawyer, his personal lawyer, to go along with this.

It appears as though the State Department and, perhaps, the Secretary of State may also be implicated in this scandal.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to passing this resolution. I hope all will support it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I look forward to Articles of Impeachment today. If folks want to get on to Articles of Impeachment, get on with it.

I want to associate myself with my friend from Vermont, who said this is an Article I, Article II question. And I want to ask my colleagues, again, if you are ready to get going with impeachment articles, bring them, and let’s have that debate on the floor.

This is a nonbinding House Resolution today. It sounds as if we are working on Articles of Impeachment today. If folks want to get on to Articles of Impeachment, get on with it.

I want to ask my colleagues how we are advantaged as an institution by turning this into an us against them.
Again, when you get ready to go down the Articles of Impeachment, it
is going to be an us against them. I have
seen no crimes and lots of hear-
ing. I have heard lots of promises and
absolutely no there, there.
But I have an opportunity. I dare
say, an obligation, to conduct our-
seves in a way that, forbid the
thought, should one day our Nation
have to go down that path, we have the
credibility to lead that discussion.
You have an hour of debate here that
we can use, and the Speaker can
continue to admonish Members not
to engage in personalities with the
President. We can absolutely conduct
ourselves in that way if that is what we
would like.
Or we could follow the pathway of
the United States; do this in a bipo-
tarian way to say we have got a coequal
branch of government that has a right
to see these documents and be done
with it.
I will remind my colleagues who are
raising their constitutional ire today
that this institution held President
Obama’s Attorney General in both civil
and criminal contempt, and we got no
support, save 17 Members, to make
that happen.
Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, may I
inquire as to the time remaining for
the majority.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman from Connecticut has 6½ min-
utes remaining.
Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I yield
2 minutes to the gentlewoman from
Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).
Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, Re-
publican President Teddy Roosevelt
said that “patriotism means to stand
by the country.” It does not mean to
stand by the President at any cost.
The whistleblower is a patriot who
stood up for their country. It is time
for Americans of good conscience,
starting with every member of this
committee, to follow in that patriot’s
footsteps and unite behind the belief
that no one is above the law.
The President has abused the powers
of his office. Perhaps he is afraid of los-
ing the next election. Perhaps it is just
who he is.
When the President of Ukraine
brought up a request to buy military
equipment from the United States, the
President said—and yes, it is quite
clear—"I would like you to do us a
favor."
But even worse, press reports indi-
cate that the whistleblower’s com-
plaint was far more extensive than any
one call.
This ongoing cover-up by this White
House has prevented us from imme-
diately reviewing the report that is
required by law.
Further, the administration must
immediately move to ensure that the
whistleblower is fully protected as re-
quired by law.
To my colleagues, history is about to
be written at this moment. I ask you
to think about your place in that his-
tory. Decide whether you want to de-
defend and stand up for corruption or
abuse of power or stand up for the
country we all swore to protect.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mem-
bers are reminded to refrain from en-
gaging in personalities toward the
President.
Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I
reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I yield
myself the balance of my time.
It may turn out that this resolution
is unnecessary. I understand proce-
dures are being made to provide the
complaint, I hope, the full whistle-
blower complaint, to the Congress and,
specifically, to the Intelligence Com-
mittee. If that is true, that is a good
first step. It is a step, of course, that
is remedying the blatant violation of law
that this administration engaged in
when they chose to stop the trans-
mittal of that complaint to the Con-
gress.
But I do want to take this oppor-
tunity to just clear up some things
that were said, because these are seri-
ous matters, and it is important that
the American people understand the
truth.
Mr. SCALISE came before this body
and ridiculed the majority, saying that
we had promised a quid pro quo, a
statement that is, of course, absurd on
the face of it. We made no such prom-
ise. In fact, we have spent the day ex-
plaining that a quid pro quo is not ne-
cessary for the kind of extortion that is
evident in the so-called transcript that
we received today.
Bribery requires a quid pro quo; if
you do this, I will pay you that. Extor-
tion is simply saying you better do
a favor, or else.
So there was no promise of a quid pro
quo. Neither is it necessary for this be-
havior to be well beyond the pale.
And I would remind my friends in the
minority that our job did not bring this
moment upon the Congress. The in-
spector general came to this Congress
of his own volition and, I would add, at
significant personal risk, because of his
concern over the actions of the admin-
istration.
It emerges today that the Acting DNI
perhaps threatened to resign his posi-
tion unless the Department of Justice
gave a legal justification for his
stance.
So we are not here because we want
to be here. The Speaker of the House,
as every Member of this Chamber
knows, has resisted, until yesterday,
even using the word impeachment be-
cause she is that focused on the senti-
ment of the American people and the
consequences of that draconian step.
Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I
yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker,
I rise to support H. Res. 576—Expressing
the sense of the House of Representatives with
respect to the whistleblower complaint of Au-
gust 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General
of the Intelligence Community.
Allegations that the President of the United
States sought to enlist a foreign government
to interfere in our democratic process by in-
vestigating one of his political rivals, and may
have used the withholding of Congressionally
appropriated military aid, days earlier as intimi-
dation, is a clear problem. We must have all
raised their hand and said something is not right.
So this resolution and its contents
may be remedied later this afternoon; I
certainly hope so. But let’s be clear
about what really happened and how
close we are to the truth.
I certainly hope so. But let’s be clear
about what really happened and how
close we are to the truth.
I certainly hope so. But let’s be clear
about what really happened and how
close we are to the truth.
of the facts so that we can do what is required under law and get to the bottom of what actually took place. This is not a partisan matter. It is an American matter that must be investigated so that we can continue to protect our democracy against outside attacks.

The resolution expresses the sense of the House that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Our Constitution demands respect for the rule of law. As a Member of Congress, I will continue to uphold our American principles and values. I urge passage of this resolution.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 577, I call up the bill (H.R. 2203) to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within the Department of Homeland Security, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and make recommendations to the Secretary to ensure the Ombudsman's office is sufficiently staffed and resourced to carry out its duties effectively and efficiently.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). Pursuant to House Resolution 577, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–27, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116–217, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2203

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR BORDER AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT RELATED CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within the Department there shall be a position of Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Enforcement Related Concerns (in this section referred to as the ‘Ombudsman’), who—

(1) be independent of Department agencies and officers;

(2) report directly to the Secretary; and

(3) have a description of allegations identified in section 5101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) in resolving complaints with respect to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a subcontractor, or a cooperating entity, which process shall include a publicly accessible website through which a complainant can check on the status of such a complaint.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—It shall be the function of the Ombudsman to—

(1) in consultation with the Inspector General of the Department, establish an independent, neutral, accessible, confidential, and standardized process to assist individuals (including aliens who submit a complaint as defined in section 5101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)) in resolving complaints with respect to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a subcontractor, or a cooperating entity, which process shall include a publicly accessible website through which a complainant can check on the status of such a complaint;

(2) establish a Border Oversight Panel in accordance with subsection (f); and

(4) review compliance with departmental policies and standards of care for custody of aliens by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including any violations of applicable policy or standards of care involving force-feeding.

(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The existence of a complaint, including the identity of any Department employee implicated in a complaint, shall be kept confidential by the Ombudsman and, in the absence of the written consent of an individual who submits a complaint, the Ombudsman shall keep confidential the identity of and any identifying information relating to such individual. Such confidentiality requirement may not be considered as a factor of whether or not information under this subsection may be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act).

(d) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Not later than June 30 of each year beginning in the year after the date of enactment of this section, the Ombudsman shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that includes, for the previous year, the following:

(1) The number and types of complaints received under this section and for each complaint—

(A) the component or subcomponent, subcontractor, or cooperating entity identified;

(B) the demographics of the complainant; and

(C) a description of the resolution of the complaint or the status of the resolution process.

(2) Any complaint pattern that could be prevented or reduced by policy training or practice changes.

(3) A description of any pattern of violations of any applicable policy or standards.

(4) A description of each complaint received under this section with respect to which U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a subcontractor, or a cooperating entity, as applicable, has taken action to resolve, and the time between receipt and resolution of such complaint.

(5) A description of complaints received under this section for which action has not been taken after one year, and the period during which each complaint has been open.

(6) Recommendations the Ombudsman has made under subsection (b)(2).

(7) Other information as determined appropriate by the Ombudsman.

(8) APPOINTMENT OF BORDER COMMUNITIES LIASION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Ombudsman, in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall appoint a Community Liaison (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Liaison’) in each U.S. Border Patrol sector on the northern and southern borders. Each Liaison shall report to the Ombudsman.

(2) PURPOSES.—Each Liaison appointed under this subsection shall—

(A) foster cooperation between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and border communities;

(B) consult with border communities on the design, implementation, and operation of programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

(C) receive feedback from border communities on the performance of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

(D) submit to the Ombudsman an annual report detailing their findings, feedback received from border communities, and recommendations to increase cooperation between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and border communities.

(3) BORDER OVERSIGHT PANEL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Ombudsman shall establish a Border Oversight Panel (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Panel’).

(B) COMPOSITION.—

(1) In general.—The Panel shall be composed of 30 members selected by the Ombudsman.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The Ombudsman shall be the chair of the Panel.

(C) EXPERTISE.—Members of the Panel shall have expertise in immigration, local crime indicators, community relations, cross-border trade and commerce, quality of life indicators, or other experience the Ombudsman determines is appropriate, and shall include individuals who reside in or near border counties.

(D) DUTIES.—The Panel shall evaluate and make recommendations regarding the border enforcement policies, programs, and programs of the Department operating along the northern and southern borders of the United States.

(E) STAFFING.—The Secretary shall take appropriate action to ensure the Ombudsman’s office is sufficiently staffed and resourced to carry out its duties effectively and efficiently.

(F) TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Ombudsman shall conduct a yearly evaluation of all training given to agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(G) REPORTS.—Each evaluation under paragraph (1) shall include whether the training referred to in such paragraph adequately addresses the following:

(1) Best practices in community policing, cultural awareness, and carrying out enforcement actions near sensitive locations, such as...
places of worship or religious ceremony, school or education-related places or events, courthouses or other civic buildings providing services accessible to the public, hospitals, medical treatment facilities, correctional facilities, public demonstrations, and attorney’s offices (including a public defender or legal aid offices).

(B) Policies for operating in locations where there are limitations on cooperation by local law enforcement.

(C) Interaction with vulnerable populations, including those that are在我看来,identifying, and responding to vulnerable populations, such as children, victims of human trafficking, and the elderly.

(D) Standards of professional and ethical conduct, including the following:

(1) Lawful use of force, de-escalation tactics, and alternatives to the use of force.

(2) Training with chain of command and lawful orders.

(3) Conduct and ethical behavior toward the public in a civil and professional manner.

(iv) Civil rights and legal protections for nationals of the United States and aliens.

(v) Non-biased questioning.

(vi) Sensitive and secure-gender, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals.

(vii) Permissible and impermissible social media use.

(viii) Sexual and other harassment and assault, including an assessment of whether adequate policies exist to resolve complaints.

(E) Policies for operating in locations where there are limitations on cooperation by local law enforcement, including chain of evidence practices and documentation of use of force policies available to agents and officers.

(F) Maintaining and updated understanding of Federal, court decisions, and Department policies and procedures.

(G) The scope of agents’ and officers’ authority to conduct immigration enforcement activities, including seizures, interrogations, stops, searches, arrests, and detentions, in addition to identifying and detecting fraudulent documents.

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after conducting each evaluation under paragraph (1), the Ombudsman shall develop, and submit to the Secretary, recommendations regarding:

(A) Appropriate training, gap analysis, and recommendations for needed improvements.

(B) Principles regarding body-worn cameras by agents and officers of U.S. Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including training modules for the appropriate use of such cameras and adverse actions for non-compliance.

(C) Mechanisms to ensure compliance with body-worn camera policies and procedures.

(5) CONSIDERATION.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall be informed by—

(A) Existing State and local policies requiring the use of body-worn cameras; and

(B) Principles regarding body-worn cameras published by major civil and human rights organizations.

(6) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to the customs and border protection enforcement activities the following new item:

‘‘Sec. 711. Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Enforcement Related Concerns.’’.

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

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the record be extended for 15 minutes.

The Clerk will be allowed to extend the record, if necessary, for 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act, as amended, seeks to enhance accountability for how the Department of Homeland Security carries out its border security and immigration enforcement activities.

For years, the complaints process at DHS has been fragmented. While the inspector general of DHS reviews allegations of unlawful activity by Department personnel, other complaints must go through Customs and Border Protection, or Immigration and Customs Enforcement first.

Further, the process for filing a complaint can be complicated and confusing. Additionally, there is no central mechanism for residents of border communities to speak out about how DHS’ operations affect their day-to-day lives or the environment around them.

H.R. 2203, as we are considering it today, would establish a new ombudsman to carry out an independent, neutral, and confidential role to help resolve complaints with respect to the Department’s border and immigration enforcement activities.

The communities most directly impacted by DHS’ border and immigration enforcement activities are those that are on our borders with Mexico and Canada.

H.R. 2203, the ombudsman would appoint border community liaison officers to serve in sectors along the northern and southern borders to foster better communication and meaningful engagement with these communities.

The ombudsman is also required to stand up a border oversight panel to make recommendations on border and immigration policies and programs with attention to DHS activities that affect due process, property rights, and the safety of migrants and officers training, particularly on standards for professional and ethical conduct, and make recommendations on any needed improvements.

Additionally, the bill directs the ombudsman to develop an implementation plan to require the use of body-worn cameras by Border Patrol agents and ICE officers while engaged in border security or immigration enforcement activities.

While the current administration’s activities in this area warrant heightened scrutiny, several issues, such as conditions in ICE detention or insufficient consultation with property owners by U.S. Border Patrol, have persisted for years.

H.R. 2203 represents a step in the right direction to bring greater transparency and accountability to DHS. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

House of Representatives,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2019.

Hon. Bennie G. Thompson,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 2203, the ‘‘Homeland Security Improvement Act’’ that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee appreciates your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor. I commend that cooperation that considers whether to include in the measure the House floor. Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2203, the ‘‘Homeland Security Improvement Act.’’ The Committee appreciates your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I concur with you that it is important to consider the House- Senate conference involving this legislation, and I appreciate your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I would appreciate your response to this letter. The Committee has no objection to your including in the bill the authority given to the Ombudsman in Title II of the bill is not intended to include authority regarding trade law enforcement complaints. Should you choose to include an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation, I would support that effort.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2203 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. I look forward to working with you on the matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Neal,
Chairman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Homeland Security,

Hon. Richard Neal,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2203. Over the current fiscal year, law enforcement has encountered nearly a million migrants illegally crossing the southwest border.

For months, records of migrant families have overwhelmed the Customs and Border Protection facilities, creating an unprecedented humanitarian crisis. And for months, Democrats did nothing. They said the crisis wasn’t real. Then they said the President manufactured it.

Then, after months of ignoring pictures of children and families living in overcrowded conditions, Democrats finally agreed to the President’s request for emergency funding. Now, thanks to that funding and the administration’s efforts to reach agreements with Mexico and some Northern Triangle countries, the crisis has finally abated.

Congress should use this opportunity to address the causes of the border crisis and prevent another one from happening. Unfortunately, Democrats have chosen to squander the opportunity. Instead, they decided to move yet another partisan agenda item that stands no chance of becoming law.

All this bill does is waste taxpayers’ dollars on a duplicative new office designed to demonize law enforcement and serve the demands of illegal immigrants. It should really be called the illegal immigrant customer service act.

The bill creates a new ombudsman at the Department of Homeland Security to collect and review complaints made by illegal immigrants against Federal law enforcement officers.

The Department already has an Office of Inspector General and an Office for Civil Rights and Liberties required by law to collect and investigate complaints against DHS personnel, as well as recommended relief for the complainant. Both offices maintain tip lines for anonymous complaints and websites to collect complaints, and both regularly report to Congress on their caseload.

It is unclear how creating another bureaucrat with a duplicative mission will improve the current process. It is clear, however, that this new bureaucrat will further demoralize the men and women of law enforcement.

The bill empowers the ombudsman to scrutinize the training and conduct of ICE and CBP officers on an ongoing basis.

The bill also includes a bogus oversight panel comprised of so-called experts to make recommendations on how ICE and CBP officers should carry out their law enforcement mission.

Every day, the men and women of ICE and CBP put their lives in danger to keep our families and communities safe. They faithfully and skillfully carry out their duty to enforce Federal immigration law. Congress should be moving legislation to thank them, not second-guess and criticize them.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation started out as an attempt by Democrats to appease radical leftwing open border activists. The original bill was chock-full of absurd provisions that the Senate was forced to pull it from floor consideration in July. The bill has been rewritten six times to get it to this point where just enough Democrats will vote for it to pass.

But it didn’t have to be such a partisan exercise. We could have worked together to move comprehensive legislation to truly prevent another crisis at our border.

Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats on serious proposals that reform our laws to reduce the pull factors for illegal immigration, to protect vulnerable families and children from exploitation by human smugglers, to expand migrant processing and long-term housing facilities to eliminate dangerous overcrowding, and to hire additional immigration lawyers and judges to reduce the unprecedented backlog in asylum cases.

When this partisan bill fails to move in the Senate, I hope Democrats will finally embrace bipartisanship over politics and will agree to work with Republicans on solutions to our border security problems.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

I would first like to thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman THOMPSON for their steadfast leadership and for helping get this bill to the floor. Mr. Speaker, this moment never would have been possible without Mr. THOMPSON’s perseverance and hard work.

H.R. 2203 started at our southern border as a community-driven effort to boost accountability and transparency within DHS. To that end, I would like to especially thank the Border Network for Human Rights, an El Paso-based organization that works tirelessly to ensure migrants and border communities are treated with dignity and respect that we all deserve.

Those of us who live within the 100-mile border enforcement zone have often had our civil rights impeded because some basic constitutional principles don’t fully apply to us.

Since the creation of DHS in 2003, our government has spent over $300 billion, including two supplemental bills passed this year, on the agencies that carry out immigration enforcement, largely within that 100-mile zone. This enormous taxpayer investment has created a situation where the American taxpayer spends more money on immigration enforcement than on all other Federal law enforcement agencies combined.

Unfortunately, especially for those of us who live within that 100-mile border enforcement zone, this spending has not included corresponding oversight or accountability measures. This bill seeks to change that with the creation of an ombudsman, for border and immigration-related concerns.

The ombudsman, in conjunction with the inspector general at DHS, will be charged with establishing an independent, neutral, and confidential process to assist individuals, including personnel, with complaints against Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

The ombudsman is also responsible for reviewing CBP and ICE compliance with all departmental policies and standards related to the treatment of migrants in custody.

This function was a priority for me after learning about child deaths in Federal custody; after having witnessed severe overcrowding in Border Patrol facilities; after hearing in my community, in El Paso, Texas, concerns from agents over and over again about leadership not listening to them and about policies. Mr. Speaker, forced to enforce and after interviewing ICE detainees in my hometown who were subjected to force-feeding, an inhumane practice that is tantamount to torture.

I have heard countless times from my constituents and other border residents that they need to have a voice in crafting border policies because we are the ones most impacted. H.R. 2203 will allow them this opportunity through the establishment of both a border community liaison and a border oversight panel. Both seek to foster communication and cooperation between DHS and the community by giving border residents an opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations regarding border policies.

This panel will also help improve conditions for agents and officers. For example, one responsibility of the border oversight panel is to evaluate policies to enhance their safety.

The bill also requires the ombudsman to conduct annual evaluations of all training provided and will examine whether key areas are covered, including community policing, which builds trust; enforcement near sensitive locations; government program populations; and professional and ethical conduct, such as lawful use of force, LGBTQ sensitivity, and sexual harassment.

El Paso has been at the epicenter of much of the humanitarian crisis our Nation has seen, like being the testing ground for the cruel family separation policy that continues to this day. To help speed up reunifications of these families, H.R. 2203 requires the ombudsman, in conjunction with the CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement, to develop recommendations for the establishment of an electronic tracking number system on a single, interoperable interface.

Finally, the ombudsman is responsible for developing a plan for outlining the use of body-worn cameras by Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities, something local police forces have embraced.

The plan must be crafted in conjunction with the CBP Commissioner, the ICE Director, and relevant labor organizations that represent these officers and agents. It must also consider existing State and local body-worn camera policies.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) an additional 1 minute.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, it must also consider existing State and local body-worn camera policies and principles developed by major civil and human rights organizations, so that DHS can build upon best practices for each establishment of both a border community liaison and a border oversight panel. Both seek to foster communication and cooperation between DHS and the community by giving border residents an opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations regarding border policies.

This plan further ensures that safety needs are met, and trust is built.

All of these features will be invaluable tools to make sure that we address our Nation’s immigration challenges in a common sense and humane way.

Today, we have the opportunity to come together and begin to make a powerful and well-funded Federal agency more accountable to the Congress and the people that they serve. The ombudsman’s role will fill much needed gaps in transparency, oversight, training, and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of this legislation. It comes right from the communities that are impacted the most. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2203, yet another one of the majority’s messaging bills that would do nothing to address the crisis on our southern border.

At home in Pennsylvania’s 13th Congressional District, nearly 2,000 miles away from the southern border, this crisis is taking a tangible toll on our communities. As illicit drugs continue to pour across the southern border and infiltrate into my district, addiction and death are occurring.

If we continue to kick the solutions down the road, we are choosing simply not to act.

Today, we could be voting to stop the human trafficking, to stop the drug trafficking, to stop the cartels and the violent criminals who permeate into our country. H.R. 2203 does not address the real problems.

In the interest of passing this do-nothing bill, I ask that we return to the Homeland Security Committee and work on a bipartisan basis to secure our border, to end the asylum loopholes, and to protect this great country.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2203, a bill introduced by my dear friend from Texas, Congresswoman VERONICA ESCOBAR.

There is a humanitarian crisis at the southern border and within the American immigration system. The Homeland Security Improvement Act is a critical bill, not a do-nothing bill. It is a critical bill that addresses our Nation’s immigration challenges at the border in a responsible and humane manner by ensuring accountability and oversight through the creation of an ombudsman.
Our American values, moral conscience, and Constitution require that we treat all individuals on American soil humanely and respectfully. This bill helps ensure that that happens.

Congress must continue working to finally fix the humanitarian crisis at the southern border. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2203.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis at the border. Finally, our colleagues across the aisle have recognized that this is not a game.

Just this month, over 800,000 illegal aliens have now crossed our southern border in 2019. That is two times more than crossed in all of 2018.

The numbers are at historic highs in large part due to our broken immigration system that incentivizes illegal crossings, and H.R. 2203 does nothing to fix it.

This bill does nothing to stop children from being used as pawns by traffickers to cross our border. This bill does nothing to support law enforcement officers, which as a lifelong enforcement officer myself, I take particular issue with. This bill does nothing to help agents of our immigration judges, which are desperately needed in order to decrease the growing and historic backlog of cases that we have now seen. This bill does nothing to alleviate the pressure on our detention facilities.

In fact, this bill will make these problems worse; worse, Mr. Speaker.

Requiring the release of all migrants after 72 hours in detention will incentivize even more people to cross our southern border, because they are guaranteed to be released into the interior of our country.

This bill negates the positive steps that President Trump has taken to secure our southern border.

A bipartisan majority in the House and Senate did not support these ideas before we passed the border supplemental in June, and they will not support them now.

Instead of giving law enforcement the resources they need to keep our communities safe, House Democrats are tiptoeing around real solutions, and are more interested in obstructing our President than solving problems for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 2203.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON Lee).

Ms. JACKSON Lee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and certainly the ranking member for his position on this bill, but I rise with great enthusiasm to support H.R. 2203 by the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, and as well to indicate to her that I had wished that the joy of doing this would not be passing productivity legislation, but the sadness is that it is based upon the history and the evidence of what is going on at the southern border where she lives.

So I hope those who are waiting for this bill will realize that it is going to pass this House and that we are going to move this bill to the United States Senate and ask the Senate whether, in fact, they believe in the humanity of all people.

Let me share with you what this bill is about from my perspective. First of all, I take no backseat to dealing with the border patrol agents, the CBP, and any others.

In 2004, Senator Kerry and I, he in the Senate and I in the House, helped to prevent the militarization of the border patrol, because when I went down to the border, they didn’t have the tools that they needed. We gave them the night goggles, we gave them the kinds of equipment that they needed, the heavy terrain vehicles. We gave them the fast boats that they needed.

We gave them their equipment, recognizing that we had been organized just a few years as the Homeland Security Committee wanted our border to be safe and secure, but at the same time, we wanted to make sure that we had comprehensive immigration reform. That was imploded when we could not pass a major bill that came to the House.

So I am curious why anyone would not want to have a bill that says it is the Homeland Security Improvement Act. So I stand here in the name of Roger, 9 months old, who was separated from his parents by the Trump administration’s heinous policies of family separation.

This bill deals with eliminating family separation.

I stand here for the mother who had had a baby, and 45 days after having that baby, she had not been to a hospital, but she was in a detention center.

I think it is fair that there be a policy for border patrol agents to wear those cameras, like any other law enforcement, to protect them and others; the limitation on the separation of families; the prohibition of exceeding 72 hours in short-term detention; the ombudsman, which is so important so that we have a fair investment.

To my friend that was on the floor dealing with human trafficking: Any day of the week, I will join him in a bill that deals with human trafficking. I held the first hearing by Homeland Security on human trafficking in the field almost 8 years ago, because Houston is a known epicenter for human trafficking.

But right now, we are dealing with the improvement of this Department, and I believe this commission is going to be important and crucial for migrant families and children that have been separated and abused by the Trump administration.

Do we want to see human beings in cages? Or do we want to have a fair system that protects the United States and the border from the intrusion of those who would do us harm?

Regular immigration system would allow these desperate families to come and be processed.

I would have wanted the Mexican program to be out. I would have wanted to have my amendment that deals with making sure that the FOIA amendment covers every detention center, private and nonprivate, that would have ensured that they had to report about what was going on inside these detention centers.

Those amendments were not allowed at this time, but we will work with the gentlewoman and work with Homeland Security to make sure that we do not give Members of Congress blocked from coming to these private detention centers that women and children are in.

But this is a good start. This gives tools to those who are in need of those particular tools.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON Lee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to focus on this: We know in the past year, under this administration, seven-plus children have died. How many adults have also passed? It is as important to report the deaths of individuals in our own prison systems as it is to report migrant deaths. They are human beings.

It is important to be able to use and to understand the use of force. To every law enforcement officer, I say to their families, I want them to go home to their families. But to every human being who comes desperate for the hope and the blessings of America who has not come to do us harm, I want to be able to have the oversight that is in this bill, the accountability and transparency in that border area.

I all know that El Paso has been touted as the safest city in the Nation. It was not an immigrant that killed 22 people. It was not an immigrant whose violence and victimization and utilization of an automatic weapon caused injuries to the people whom I had to visit in the hospitals of El Paso. It was not an immigrant.

Mr. Speaker, this is a worthy bill that will, in fact, provide the right direction for the Homeland Security Department. I rise to support H.R. 2203.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.
I thank my colleague, Congresswoman ESCOBAR for her leadership in drafting this important piece of legislation.

As a member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I am well aware of the many problems associated with this Administration’s immigration policy.

Independent Ombudsman:
Establishes an independent Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Related Concerns within DHS.

The functions of the Ombudsman include establishing an independent, neutral, and confidential process to assist individuals with complaints against Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

Provides for annual reporting on the complaints filed, including the number and types of complaints received to identify trends and solve systemic problems.

Reviews compliance by CBP and ICE with all departmental policies and standards related to treatment of migrants in custody, including with respect to force-feeding.

Makes the complaint resolution process easy to follow by establishing a publicly available website.

Border Communities Liaison:
Directs the Ombudsman, in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at DHS, to appoint a Border Community Liaison in each Border Patrol sector along the northern and southern border to:
- foster cooperation between ICE, CBP, and border communities;
- consult with border communities on CBP and ICE policies, directives, and programs;
- receive feedback from border communities about CBP and ICE activities in the region; and
- report annually to the Ombudsman.

Border Oversight Panel:
Directs the Ombudsman to establish a Border Oversight Panel to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the border enforcement policies, strategies, and programs that directly affect border communities.

Specifically directs the Panel to pay special attention to how DHS policies impact due process, property rights, legal obligations, and migrant and officer safety.

Training Evaluations:
Requires the Ombudsman to conduct annual evaluations of all training given to the agents and officers at CBP and ICE.

The Ombudsman must examine whether there is training in specific key areas including community policing, enforcement near sensitive locations, interacting with vulnerable populations, and professional and ethical conduct (including use of force, LGBTQ sensitivity, and sexual harassment).

Mandates that the Ombudsman provide recommendations to the Secretary on additional training needs. The Secretary must respond to these recommendations publicly within 180 days with an action plan to implement such recommendations and a justification for why any of such recommendations have been rejected.

Body-Worn Cameras:
Directs the Ombudsman, in coordination with CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and labor organization representing agents and officers, to submit to Congress a plan for requiring the use of body-worn cameras by U.S. Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities.

Provides that the plan must consider existing state and local body-worn camera policies and principles developed by major civil and human rights organizations.

I offered an amendment to H.R. 2203, that was not included in this final bill.

This Jackson Lee Amendment, listed as No. 6 on the Rules Committee Roster, makes a good bill better by creating an affirmative obligation on the part of Customs and Border Protection to provide access to records of entities that contract with the agency to provide services related to detention or removal of persons, including children.

The Jackson Lee Amendment states simply: ‘In the case of a contractor including a State licensed, vetted, and qualified contractor, and a nonprofit entity, which has a contract with U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the provision of direct or support services associated with providing care for individuals, including unaccompanied alien children, apprehended at the southern border of the United States, that contractor held by U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall be considered an agency record for purposes of section 552 on title 5, United States Code.’

Since 1967, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) has provided the public the right to request access to records from any federal agency.

It is often described as the law that keeps citizens in the know about their government.

Federal agencies are required to disclose any information requested under the FOIA unless it falls under one of nine exemptions which protect interests such as personal privacy, national security, and law enforcement.

The FOIA also requires agencies to proactively post online certain categories of information, including frequently requested records.

As Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court have all recognized, the FOIA is a vital part of our democracy.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on gaining greater transparency and oversight of CBP.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST), a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and a former prosecutor, I rise today to express my concerns regarding H.R. 2203.

While the bill is referred to as the Homeland Security Improvement Act, the legislation does not make improvements to our homeland security, and, in fact, would have no positive impact on resolving the crisis at our southwest border or preventing any future homeland security crisis.

It is the responsibility of Congress to fix gaps in our immigration system that benefit criminals such as human traffickers and drug smugglers.

Instead of addressing these needs, this bill would create even more loopholes.

H.R. 2203 would establish a new and unnecessary position at the Department of Homeland Security that would serve as an additional barrier for law enforcement officers charged with protecting our communities. This new position would overlap with existing positions at DHS, and appointees or bureaucrats with no prior experience in law enforcement would oversee the border and immigration enforcement process.

Democrats must recognize the efforts, dedication, and sacrifices made each day by members of our law enforcement community to uphold the rule of law. Rather than undermining their roles and duties, we should be focusing on how we can assist these brave men and women who work to maintain our Nation’s security.

I recently introduced H.R. 3990, the Operation Stonegarden Authorization Act. This bill would establish a grant program for States bordering Mexico or Canada or those with a maritime border. These grants would provide much-needed resources to help Customs and Border Protection, law enforcement officers efficiently carry out their mission on behalf of the American people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in promoting respect for our law enforcement community and providing a sense of gratitude for the work they do to keep us, our families, and our communities safe.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I voted against this bill when it was considered in committee. Now, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in voting against this partisan measure and to, instead, work across the aisle to find real solutions, bipartisan solutions, to make America a safer place to live, to work, and to raise a family.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank Chairman THOMPSON for yielding and for his tremendous leadership not only on issues of security but on so many issues that affect our country.

Also, I thank Congresswoman VERONICA ESCOBAR, who I call my Congresswoman because she represents the wonderful people of my hometown of El Paso, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

I have visited McAllen and Brownsville, Texas, and Homestead. I have witnessed children in cages, sleeping on concrete floors. I had a chance to talk to mothers and fathers who had no idea where their children were.

I served on the conference committee on Operation Stonegarden because she represents the wonderful people of my hometown of El Paso, Texas.
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration’s cruel and inhumane approach to border and immigration enforcement has harmed DHS’s frontline personnel and border communities to chaotic conditions. It has also hurt families and children.

From the Remain in Mexico policy that puts children and families in harm’s way to separation from a parent, legal guardian, or other relative.

We will not stand by while the Trump administration separates children from their families, so this bill takes an important step in the right direction.

By passing this bill today, we are putting critical protocols and protections in place for migrants, making sure that their well-being and health is upheld.

We cannot allow migrants to be abused by CBP and ICE any longer. It is past time to protect migrants who are seeking a chance to start a new life in America. It is past time we recognize people fleeing violence are human beings who deserve a chance to address and be part of a just immigration system.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this vital bill.

I thank Chairman THOMPSON and Congresswoman ESCOBAR for finally getting this bill to the floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill demonstrates just how disingenuous Democrats are about securing our borders and fixing our broken immigration system. Their Caucus is in such disarray on this issue that it took them 10 weeks and a hatchet just to find a compromise among themselves. Now, they are going to send another partisan messaging bill to the Senate, where it will promptly die.

Congratulations on the press release.

Mr. Speaker, we watched an unprecedented humanitarian crisis unfold on our Southwest border this year. It used to be that when this country faced a crisis, Democrats and Republicans came together to solve it and ensure it didn’t happen again. Unfortunately, that is no longer the practice under Democratic control.

When Democrats are ready to legislate with real solutions to problems this country faces, Republicans stand ready to work with them. In the meantime, I urge all Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution relating to a concurrent resolution to extend the expiration date of the seal of the United States Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2203 is postponed.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 10 weeks, the President’s press conference was honest.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this vital bill.

I thank Chairman THOMPSON and Congresswoman ESCOBAR for finally getting this bill to the floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill demonstrates just how disingenuous Democrats are about securing our borders and fixing our broken immigration system. Their Caucus is in such disarray on this issue that it took them 10 weeks and a hatchet just to find a compromise among themselves. Now, they are going to send another partisan messaging bill to the Senate, where it will promptly die.

Congratulations on the press release.

Mr. Speaker, we watched an unprecedented humanitarian crisis unfold on our Southwest border this year. It used to be that when this country faced a crisis, Democrats and Republicans came together to solve it and ensure it didn’t happen again. Unfortunately, that is no longer the practice under Democratic control.

When Democrats are ready to legislate with real solutions to problems this country faces, Republicans stand ready to work with them. In the meantime, I urge all Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.
apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease extension of up to 5 years for approximately 204,607 rentable square feet (RSF) for five components of the Department of Transportation (DOT) and for the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration (VA-VHA), currently located at 901 Locust Street, Kansas City, Missouri. DOT and VA-VHA have occupied space in the building since 2009 under a lease that expires on October 14, 2019.

Extension of the current lease will enable DOT and VA-VHA to provide continued housing for personnel and meet their mission requirements while planning for the future replacement lease. The office and overall utilization will be maintained at 162 and 311 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupant:</th>
<th>Departments of Transportation and Veterans Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSF:</td>
<td>204,607 (Current RSF/USF = 1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF:</td>
<td>204,607 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion/Reduction RSF:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current USF/Person:</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated/Proposed USF/Person:</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):</td>
<td>10/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delineated Area:</td>
<td>North: I-70/I-35; East: 1-70/Campbell Street; South: 31st Street; West: Summit Street/I-35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Official Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring:</td>
<td>Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Total Annual Cost:</td>
<td>$4,238,269 (leases effective 10/15/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Rental Rate¹:</td>
<td>$24.35/RSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Annual Cost²:</td>
<td>$4,982,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This estimate is for fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent per year to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced, including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

² New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.
PROSPECTUS – LEASE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
KANSAS CITY, MO

Prospectus Number: PMO-02-KC20
Congressional District: 05

Background

In addition to VA-VHA, this location houses the administrative offices of the following five DOT operating administrations within the Kansas City, Missouri, area:

- The Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) mission is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world;
- The Federal Railroad Administration’s mission is to enable the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of people and goods for a strong America, now and in the future;
- The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration’s mission is to save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce economic costs due to road traffic crashes, through education, research, safety standards, and enforcement activity;
- The Federal Transit Administration’s mission is to provide financial and technical assistance to local public transit systems, including buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, trolleys, and ferries; and
- The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration’s mission is to protect people and the environment by advancing the safe transportation of energy and other hazardous materials that are essential to our daily lives.

VA-VHA’s mission is to honor America’s veterans by providing exceptional healthcare that improves their health and well-being. VA-VHA is the largest integrated healthcare system in the United States, providing care to over 9 million veterans enrolled in the VA healthcare program.

Justification

The current lease at 901 Locust Street expires on October 14, 2019, and the agencies require continued housing to carry out their missions until the long-term plan can be executed for a replacement lease. This FAA location houses the Regional Office and the functions of oversight of airport planning, development, and certification, as well as administration of regulations for airmen, air carriers, and air agencies. The remaining DOT components execute mission functions necessary to perform vital operations. The VA-VHA office is responsible for administrative operations to support the VA Heartland Network of medical centers and healthcare systems.

Continued housing is critical to these agencies meeting their mission requirements, and a 5-year lease extension will provide sufficient time to formulate and execute lease replacement plans, as well as budget for move and replication costs accordingly.
Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, D.C., on September 6, 2019

Recommended: [Signature]
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: [Signature]
Administrator, General Services Administration
Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 140,000 rentable square feet of space, including 208 official parking spaces, for the Department of Homeland Security—Customs and Border Protection currently located at Building 77 at the JFK Airport in Queens, NY at a proposed total annual cost of $11,060,000 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agency(ies) agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 212 square feet or less per person, except that, if the Administrator determines that the overall utilization rate cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 212 square feet or higher per person.

Provided further, the Administrator shall require the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
GSA

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease of approximately 140,000 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), currently located at Building 77 at the JFK Airport in Queens, NY.

The lease will provide continued housing for CBP and will improve the office and overall space utilization from 142 to 84 and 241 to 212 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

Occupant: CBP
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF): 145,912 (Current RSF/USF = 1.15)
Estimated Maximum RSF: 140,000 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.15)
Reduction RSF: 5,912
Current USF/Person: 241
Estimated USF/Person: 212
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s): 06/30/2021
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority: 20 years
Delineated Area:
North: Intersection of Lefferts Blvd. and S. Conduit Rd. heading east to Rockaway Blvd. then heading east to Brookville Blvd; West: Lefferts Blvd; East: Head of Bay; South: Jamaica Bay

Number of Official Parking Spaces: 208
Scoring: Operating
Current Total Annual Cost: $8,244,028 (leases effective 06/19/1992)
Estimated Rental Rate¹: $79.00 / RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost²: $11,060,000

¹ This estimate is for fiscal year 2021 and may be escalated by 2% percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.
² New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.
GSA

PROSPECTUS — LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Background

CBP currently occupies approximately 145,912 RSF of space in Building 77 at JFK Airport in Queens, NY. CBP at JFK Airport covers the diverse operational demands of 5 international passenger terminals, 1 International Mail Facility (IMF), 24 air cargo facilities, 80 containerized freight stations, 2 general order warehouses, 14 bonded warehouses, 3 foreign trade zones, and 5 general aviation facilities. This facility functions much more like a port of entry than an office location.

The CBP operation at JFK Airport monitors half the cargo imported into the United States as well as over 10 million passengers a year. CBP’s ability to effectively and safely manage this extensive operation is facilitated by close physical proximity to the airport. Transporting narcotics, currency, and inadmissible aliens and criminals to off-airport locations for processing would pose security risks, decrease effectiveness, and unnecessarily reduce the time dedicated to CBP’s enforcement mission. The proposed delineated area maintains the agency’s proximity to the airport.

Justification

This replacement lease will provide CBP with the opportunity to increase space utilization efficiency to accommodate additional personnel in field operations, internal affairs, and the international trade office.

The current lease expires on June 30, 2021, and CBP requires continued housing to perform its mission.

Summary of Energy Compliance

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.
PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on April 29, 2019.

Recommended: [Signature]
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: [Signature]
Administrator, General Services Administration
Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 215,000 rentable square feet of space, including 1,050 official parking spaces, for the Veterans Health Administration currently located at 244 Clearfield Avenue in Virginia Beach, VA at a proposed total annual cost of $9,030,000 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or if it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes an outpatient clinic lease of approximately 215,000 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration (VHA). The lease will house a new Health Care Center and will serve as a complement to the existing Community Based Health Care Center (CBOC) currently located at 244 Clearfield Avenue in Virginia Beach, VA.

This project would allow VHA to expand its current primary care, mental health, and eye clinic services, as well as provide much needed new specialty care and advanced imaging services to veterans in a right-sized, state-of-the-art, and energy-efficient healthcare facility.

Description

Occupant: Veterans Health Administration
Current RSF: 0
Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF: 215,000 (Proposed RSF/Usable SF = 1.15)
Expansion/Reduction RSF: 215,000 (Expansion)
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s): N/A
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority: 20 years
Delineated Area:

North: start at the intersection of Tidewater Drive (Route 168) and E Virginia Beach Blvd. (Route 58) to Virginia Beach Blvd.; East: S. Independence Blvd. (Route 225) to Holland Road, south onto Dam Neck Road, continue onto Elbow Road, continue on Indian River Road; South: at the intersection of Indian River Road and Elbow Road, head south on Elbow Road, west on Butts Station Road, west on Clearfield Ave., west on Kempsville Road (Route 190); West: north on Battlefield Blvd. N (Business 168), onto Oak Grove Connector (Chesapeake Expressway - Route 168), onto Hampton Roads Beltway (Route 64), onto Battlefield Blvd. N (Business 168), onto Campostella Road, onto E Brambleton Ave., onto Tidewater
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

GSA

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

Drive (Route 168).

Number of Official Parking Spaces: 1,050
Scoring: Operating
Current Total Annual Cost: N/A
Estimated Rental Rate1: $42.00/RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost2: $9,030,000

Background

VHA’s mission is to honor America’s veterans by providing exceptional healthcare that improves their health and well-being. To make access to healthcare easier, VHA utilizes CBOCs across the country. These clinics provide the most common outpatient services, including health and wellness visits. VHA continues to expand the network of CBOCs to include more rural locations, bringing access to care closer to veterans’ homes.

The CBOC in the South Hampton Roads area is an approximately 13,000 RSF facility located in Virginia Beach and is inadequately sized for the anticipated growth of the veteran population and service needs. The proposed lease will allow VHA to significantly expand its healthcare access in the area, providing much needed medical services to the fast growing veteran population.

Justification

The proposed lease would provide modern, efficient space for comprehensive outpatient services and address space and utilization gaps. The new lease will allow VHA to adapt to a growing veteran population and increased workload in the South Hampton Roads area.

This project is essential to ensure that veterans are able to access a full suite of services in a timely manner. The expansion of mental health services—including mental health screenings—by hiring additional mental health staff to provide behavioral therapy, family counseling, and substance abuse therapy on site would support the Department of Veterans Affairs’ goal of eliminating veteran homelessness. The lease would provide

1 This estimate is for fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

2 New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.
increased access to care for veterans living in the South Hampton Roads area who are currently seen in the undersized Virginia Beach CBOC or who commute in excess of 1 hour to another facility in Hampton, VA.

**Summary of Energy Compliance**

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

**Resolutions of Approval**

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

**Interim Leasing**

The Government will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.
PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on July 31, 2019

Recommended: ________________________________
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: ________________________________
Administrator, General Services Administration
COMMITTEE RESOLUTION
LEASE—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 364,831 net usable square feet of space, and 2,600 official parking spaces, for the Department of Veterans Affairs for a Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Fredericksburg, VA to replace and consolidate two existing leases in Fredericksburg at a proposed unserviced annual cost of $14,844,973 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the lease shall contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or if it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease of approximately 364,831 net usable square feet (NUSF) for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) outpatient clinic currently located in two leases totaling 21,551 NUSF in Fredericksburg, VA.

The lease will be delegated to VA, provide continued services for the Fredericksburg veteran community, and provide the necessary expansion services to meet current and projected service delivery gaps for healthcare in the local market.

Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupant:</th>
<th>Veterans Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current NUSF</td>
<td>21,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Maximum NUSF:</td>
<td>364,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion/Reduction NUSF:</td>
<td>343,280 (expansion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Maximum Rentable Square Feet:</td>
<td>492,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):</td>
<td>9,975 NUSF – 10/31/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,576 NUSF – 1/21/2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delineated Area:</td>
<td>North: Courthouse Rd. from Shelton Shop Rd. (SR 648) east to Andrew Chapel Rd. (SR 629)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South: Smith Station Rd./Spotsylvania Pkwy. (SR 628) from SR 208 to Hospital Blvd. to Mills Dr./US 17 to Jim Morris Rd. (SR 609)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East: Jim Morris Rd. (SR 609) from US 17 N to Tidewater Trail/US-17 BUS N to VA-3E/Blue and Gray Pkwy. to Kings Hwy. to Cool Springs Rd. to Deacon Rd. to Brooke Rd. to Andrew Chapel Rd. to Courthouse Rd. (SR 630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West: Smith Station Rd. (SR 628) from SR 208 to Gordon Road to Trench Hill Lane to River Road to Fall Hill Ave. (SR 639) to I-95N to Sandford Dr. to Celebrate VA Pkwy. to Warrenton Rd. (SR 17) to Poplar Rd. to Kellogg Mill Rd. to Mountain View Rd. to Shelton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

Number of Official Parking Spaces: 2,600
Scoring: Operating Lease
Current Total Annual Cost: $629,142
Current Total Unserviced Annual Cost: $485,492
Estimated Unserviced Rental Rate1: $40.69 per NUSF
Estimated Total Unserviced Annual Cost2: $14,844,973

Justification

A new 364,831 NUSF lease in Fredericksburg will replace and consolidate the two existing Community Based Outpatient Clinic leases. The current space in these leased facilities is insufficient to meet the current and projected needs of the veteran community. Space limitations and an increase in workload limit veterans’ access to services in a timely manner. Additionally, the existing locations have safety and security deficiencies.

The new facility will enhance VA outpatient services by closing space and utilization gaps identified in VA’s Strategic Capital Investment Planning process and will provide a single location in the Fredericksburg area to serve the outpatient care needs of veterans and their families. The new lease will allow VA to provide new specialty care services and enhance and expand the existing primary care, mental health, and specialty care services it currently provides to veterans in a rightsized, state-of-the-art, healthcare facility. Further, the intent of this lease is to facilitate collaboration and sharing of services with the Department of Defense (DoD).

The proposed lease will provide veterans in the Fredericksburg area better access to high-quality, reliable healthcare. A new lease also will provide future flexibility. Based on changes in veteran demographics, workload patterns, and emergent healthcare delivery practices, a lease will allow VA to resize, replace, or exit the proposed clinic lease as necessary. With this new lease, sufficient space will be available to provide the necessary primary care, mental health, and specialty care capacity to help ensure veterans have timely access to high-quality care.

As part of the proposed comprehensive outpatient care offering, the facility will include a fully staffed Compensation and Pension department. This facility also will have a strong focus on improving mental health services, reducing veteran homelessness, providing

---

1 This estimate is for fiscal year 2019 and may be escalated by 2.0 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is unserviced (taxes, insurance, management and maintenance and repair reserves are included); however, the lease contract may include operating expenses paid by the lessor.
2 New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes.
women's health services, and widely using telehealth services. The newly expanded clinic in Fredericksburg will also provide training opportunities for Virginia Commonwealth University medical students/residents and other training programs. In addition, the Outpatient Clinic in Fredericksburg will include 16,733 NUSF of space for DoD. The intent is for DoD to have access to VA ancillary and diagnostic services, as well as some specialty care. Due to the rapid growth in workload and the lack of available private-sector providers to accommodate any of the excess demand in the Fredericksburg area, the new lease is necessary to provide high-quality outpatient services to veterans in a timely manner.

Summary of Energy Compliance

Energy efficiency requirements will be incorporated into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. Offerors are encouraged to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required net usable area.

Interim Leasing

The Government will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.
PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on August 9, 2019.

Recommended: __________________________
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: __________________________
Administrator, General Services Administration
Resolution by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 334,103 rentable square feet of space, including 24 official parking spaces, for the Social Security Administration currently located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church, VA at a proposed total annual cost of $9,271,358 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agency(ies) agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 261 square feet or less per person, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 261 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the exercise of a renewal option of up to 5 years for approximately 334,103 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Social Security Administration’s (SSA) Office of Hearings Operations (OHO) and Office of Analytics, Review, and Oversight (OARO), currently located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church, VA. SSA has occupied space in the building since October 1, 2009, under a lease that expires on September 30, 2019. Additionally, employees currently housed in a lease at 4401 Ford Avenue in Alexandria, VA, that expires on June 5, 2022, will be consolidated into the existing footprint.

Renewal of the current lease located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church will enable SSA to provide continued housing for current personnel and meet its current mission requirements. SSA will have office and overall utilization rates at 156 and 261 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupant:</th>
<th>SSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSF:</td>
<td>355,809 (Current RSF/USF = 1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF:</td>
<td>334,103 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion/Reduction RSF:</td>
<td>21,706 reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current USF/Person:</td>
<td>279 (all-in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated/Proposed USF/Person:</td>
<td>261 (all-in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):</td>
<td>09/30/2019; 6/5/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delineated Area:</td>
<td>Fairfax County and Fairfax City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Official Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring:</td>
<td>Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Total Annual Cost:</td>
<td>$11,845,007 (lease effective 10/1/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Rental Rate¹:</td>
<td>$27.75 / RSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Annual Cost²:</td>
<td>$9,271,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This estimate is for fiscal year fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent per year to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

² New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.
Background

The mission of SSA is to deliver quality social security services to the public through the three programs it administers under the Social Security Act: the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program, the Disability Insurance program, and the Supplemental Security Income program. SSA’s OHO and OARO are two components responsible for holding hearings, issuing decisions, and reviewing appeals as part of SSA’s process for determining whether a person may receive benefits.

OHO is one of the largest administrative adjudication systems in the world and directs a nationwide field organization of administrative law judges (ALJ) who conduct impartial hearings and make decisions on appealed determinations involving retirement, survivors, disability, and supplemental security income benefits.

OARO reviews ALJ decisions on appeal by claimants, or on its own motion, and processes cases appealed to Federal court. The OARO Office of Appellate Operations serves through the Appeals Council as the final level of administrative review for claimants appealing administrative law judge denials and dismissals of claims. The Office of Appellate Operations also collects and analyzes nationwide data on policy compliance of adjudicators and performance of the adjudication process.

Justification

This location houses both OHO and OARO offices. Maintaining these operations is essential to SSA’s execution of functions under the Social Security Act.

The current lease at 5107 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA, expires on September 30, 2019, and SSA requires continued housing to meet its mission requirements until it can carry out a long-term consolidation plan. A 5-year lease renewal will provide SSA with sufficient time to formulate the consolidation plan and budget for move costs accordingly.

Summary of Energy Compliance

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute
approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 12, 2019

Recommendation:

Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved:

Administrator, General Services Administration
Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, the resolution passed by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee dated September 24, 2009 is amended:

Provided that, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 8 courtrooms and 16 chambers in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex and no more than 16 courtrooms and 20 chambers in the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, bringing the total number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex to 24 courtrooms and 36 chambers.

The proviso “Provided that, the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 22 courtrooms;” is amended to read “Provided, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 24 courtrooms;”.

The proviso “Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than six courtrooms or 12 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;” is amended to read “Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than eight courtrooms or 16 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;”. 
GSA

FACTSHEET
ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION
SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX
SAN DIEGO, CA

FY 2019 Project Summary

At its June 2017 meeting, the Judicial Conference Committee on Space and Facilities approved a project for the construction of 2 new district courtrooms (and requisite holding cells) and 4 magistrate judge chambers in the James M. Carter & Judith N. Keep Courthouse Annex (Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex) located at 333 W. Broadway in San Diego, CA. The additional courtrooms and chambers would support the space needs of authorized replacement judges for five district judges who have taken senior status and two district judges who are eligible to take senior status by the end of fiscal year 2019.

All Judicial Conference policies and business rules, including those on courtroom sharing, were considered and applied by the Judiciary in developing this project and funding for the project was included in the Judiciary’s FY 2019 Budget.

Although this project is reimbursable and requires no authorization of Federal Building Funds, GSA is unable to accept Reimbursable Work Authorization for the project due to a previous House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted for the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex (formerly referred to as the San Diego Courthouse Annex) on September 24, 2009. The resolution included the following provisions:

- “...that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 22 courtrooms;” and,
- “...that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than six courtrooms or 12 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;” and,

Completion of the project would result in 8 courtrooms and 16 chambers in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex. Along with the 16 courtrooms and 20 chambers in the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse (Schwartz FB-CT), this project would bring the total number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex to 24 and 36, respectively.

Therefore, for GSA to complete the proposed Judiciary funded project, the Committee would need to remove the existing restriction on GSA.

---

1 The total number of judges serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit is 38 including one Circuit Judge whose chamber is in leased space.
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Project Budget
GSA is not requesting authorization of Federal Building Funds for this project; the following information is provided for information only:

- Design: $958,000
- Estimated Construction Cost (ECC): $9,924,000
- M&I: $647,000
- Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC): $11,529,000

Overview of the Project
The additional Courtrooms would be constructed on the 12th floor of the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex while the Magistrate Chambers would be built out on the 7th floor. These expansions necessitate the relocation of the Clerk from the 12th floor to the 7th floor. This relocation, along with the construction of the Magistrate chambers would force the displacement of a portion of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) from the 7th floor of the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex into leased space in the San Diego area. IRS' remaining space requirement would continue to be housed in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex. Holding cells would also be constructed adjacent to the new courtrooms and would be funded by reimbursable funds from the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS).

The Judiciary would provide reimbursable funds to construct the two additional District courtrooms, four additional Magistrate chambers and the relocation of the IRS.

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Diego Courthouse Complex

James M. Carter & Judith N. Keep Courthouse Annex

The Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex was originally called the New San Diego Courthouse Annex building but was renamed in early 2015 to the James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep Courthouse in honor of two former federal judges. The 480,941 gross square foot (gsf), sixteen story (plus 3 underground stories) building has a modern style of off-white exterior brick and window glazing. It is connected to the Schwartz FBCT by an underground tunnel. Those two buildings, the adjacent multi-story federal holding facility, which is not owned

---

2 Additional funds would be provided by the AOUSC for the forced relocation of IRS to leased space including all move, data, and security costs.
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by GSA, along with the historic Jacob Weinberger Courthouse located a block south, form a Federal campus environment in downtown San Diego. The Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex building houses the U.S. Courts, U.S. Marshals Service, IRS and GSA.

Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse
The 895,247 gsf Schwartz FB-CT, at 880 Front Street in downtown San Diego, was built in 1973. It consists of two adjacent structures: a 6 story federal office wing, and a 5 story court wing with underground parking and basement offices. The building's two wings share an upper basement and are connected by a bridge between the fifth and sixth floors.

Impacted Tenant Agencies
U.S. District Court, U.S. Department of Justice - Marshals Service, Pretrial Services, Federal Public Defender, Department of Treasury - Internal Revenue Service, and GSA

Major Work Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Alterations</th>
<th>$5,072,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>1,943,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing</td>
<td>1,094,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>867,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ECC</td>
<td>$9,924,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification
By the end of FY 2019, the number of active federal judges housed in the San Diego Courthouse Complex is anticipated to increase from 30 to 37. After applying Judicial Conference policies and business rules, including those on courtroom sharing, the number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex would need to be increased to meet those requirements.
### FACTSHEET

**ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION**

**SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX**

**JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX**

**SAN DIEGO, CA**

**Space Requirements of the U.S. Courts – San Diego Court Complex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Courtrooms</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schwartz FB-CT</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Courtrooms</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz FB-CT Total*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current and Proposed Total Number of Chambers is 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Court Complex</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Courtroom</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Court Complex Totals**</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are 3 Circuit Judges currently serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit. 2 of the Circuit Judges are housed in the San Diego Court Complex, 1 is housed in leased space.

**Upon completion of the proposed project, 37 Judges will be housed in the San Diego Court Complex in 36 chambers - 1 chamber suite is and will be shared between a Senior and a Visiting Judge. With the addition of the 1 Circuit Judge currently in leased space, the total number of Judges serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit will be 38.
SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT
BANKING ACT OF 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1595) to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—The Act may be cited as the "Secure And Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019" or the "SAFE Banking Act of 2019".

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to increase public safety by ensuring access to financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers and reducing the amount of cash at such businesses.

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to providing financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, (B) activities described in section 1413(b)(A) conducted by a service provider.

SEC. 3. PROTECTIONS FOR ANCILLARY BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of sections 1966 and 1957 of title 18, United States Code, and all other provisions of Federal law, the proceeds from a financial service for a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider shall not be considered proceeds from an unlawful activity solely because—

(1) the transaction involves proceeds from a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider; or

(2) the transaction involves proceeds from—

(A) cannabis-related activities described in subsection (a) conducted by a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or

(b) SAFE HARBOR APPLICABLE TO DE NOVO DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall apply to an institution applying for a depository institution charter to the extent such subsection applies to a depository institution.

SEC. 4. PROTECTIONS UNDER FEDERAL LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to providing a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable), a Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, and the officers, directors, and employees of the Federal Reserve Bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, may be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeitures of the legal interest pursuant to any Federal law or regulation.

(b) SAFE HARBOR FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—A depository institution that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan or other financial service provided to an owner, employee, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of the legal interest pursuant to any Federal law or regulation.
SEC. 6. REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY REPORTS.

Section 311(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES.—

(A) In general.—With respect to a financial institution or any director, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution that reports a suspicious transaction pursuant to this subsection, if the reason for the report pertains to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, the report shall comply with appropriate guidance issued by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

(B) Definitions.—For purposes of this paragraph:

(1) CANNABIS.—The term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given the term ‘marihuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(2) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

(3) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 25.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(5) FINANCIAL SERVICE.—The term ‘financial service’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

(6) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ‘service provider’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

(7) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means the State of Alaska, the State of Arizona, the State of Arkansas, the State of California, the State of Colorado, the State of Connecticut, the State of Delaware, the State of Florida, the State of Georgia, the State of Hawaii, the State of Idaho, the State of Illinois, the State of Indiana, the State of Iowa, the State of Kansas, the State of Kentucky, the State of Louisiana, the State of Maine, the State of Maryland, the State of Massachusetts, the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, the State of Mississippi, the State of Missouri, the State of Montana, the State of Nebraska, the State of Nevada, the State of New Hampshire, the State of New Jersey, the State of New Mexico, the State of New York, the State of North Carolina, the State of North Dakota, the State of Ohio, the State of Oklahoma, the State of Oregon, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Rhode Island, the State of South Carolina, the State of South Dakota, the State of Tennessee, the State of Texas, the State of Utah, the State of Vermont, the State of Virginia, the State of Washington, the State of West Virginia, the State of Wisconsin, the State of Wyoming, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 7. GUIDANCE AND EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal banking regulators shall issue a written guidance for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate business or service providers.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION REPORT.

The Federal banking regulators shall issue an annual report to Congress containing:

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and the access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing:

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations or legislative recommendations for removing barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and expanding access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 9. GAO STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN SECURITY REPORTS ON FINDING CERTAIN PERSONS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the effectiveness of reports on suspicious transactions filed pursuant to section 311(b) of title 31, United States Code, at finding individuals or organizations suspected to or known to be engaged with transnational criminal organizations and whether any such engagement exists in a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian Tribe, or Indian country that has jurisdiction over a cannabis-related legitimate business.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

(1) CANNABIS.—The term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given the term ‘marijuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(2) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

(3) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 25.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ shall be treated as including any requirement to engage in activity pursuant to the law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

(c) HEMP DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘hep’ has the meaning given the term ‘marijuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

SEC. 10. GAO STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN SECURITY REPORTS ON FINDING CERTAIN PERSONS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the effectiveness of reports on suspicious transactions filed pursuant to section 311(b) of title 31, United States Code, at finding individuals or organizations suspected to or known to be engaged with transnational criminal organizations and whether any such engagement exists in a State, political subdivision of a State, Indian Tribe, or Indian country that has jurisdiction over a cannabis-related legitimate business.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

(1) CANNABIS.—The term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given the term ‘marijuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(2) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

(3) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 25.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ shall be treated as including any requirement to engage in activity pursuant to the law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 11. BANKING SERVICES FOR HEMP BUSINESSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-394) legalized hemp by removing it from the definition of ‘marijuana’ under the Controlled Substances Act;

(2) despite the legalization of hemp, some hemp businesses (including producers, manufacturers, and retailers) continue to have difficulty gaining access to banking products and services; and

(3) businesses involved in the sale of hemp-derived cannabinoid (‘CBD’) products are particularly affected, due to confusion about their legal status.

(b) FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR HEMP HEMP BANKING GUIDANCE.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal banking regulators shall jointly issue guidance to financial institutions:

(1) confirming the legality of hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, and the legality of engaging in financial services with businesses selling hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, after the enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018; and

(2) to provide recommended best practices for financial institutions to follow when providing financial services and merchant processing services to businesses involved in the sale of hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products.

(c) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘financial institution’ means any person providing financial services.

SEC. 12. APPLICATION OF SAFE HARBORS TO HEMP AND CBD PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of this Act (other than sections 6 and 10) shall apply to hemp (including hemp-derived cannabidiol and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products) in the same manner as such provisions apply to cannabis.

(b) RULE OF APPLICATION.—In applying the provisions of this Act described under subsection (a) to hemp (including hemp-derived cannabidiol and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products) the following shall be treated as including any requirement to engage in activity pursuant to the law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 13. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.

(a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless:

(A) the agency has a valid reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on the reputation of such customer or group of customers.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which:

(A) poses a threat to national security;

(B) is involved in terrorist financing;

(C) has business relationships with an entity located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C); or

(D) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall:

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations relied upon, the customer or group of customers being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer’s account termination described under subsection (b).
(2) Notice prohibited.—
(A) Notice prohibited in cases of national security.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer’s account termination.
(B) Notice prohibited in other cases.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under paragraph (1) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer’s account termination.
(d) Reporting requirement.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—
(1) the number of specific customers that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and
(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.
(e) Definitions.—For purposes of this section:
(1) Appropriate Federal banking agency.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” means—
(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831); and
(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.
(2) Institution.—The term “depository institution” means—
(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and
(B) an insured credit union.
In this Act:
(1) Business of insurance.—The term “business of insurance” has the meaning given such term in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5361).
(2) Cannabis.—The term “cannabis” has the meaning given the term “marihuana” in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).
(3) Cannabis product.—The term “cannabis product” means any article which contains cannabis, including an article which is a concentrate, an edible, a tincture, a cannabis-infused product, or a topical.
(4) Cannabis-related legitimate business.—The term “cannabis-related legitimate business” means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that—
(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State, as determined by such State or political subdivision; and
(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.
(5) Depository institution.—The term “depository institution” means—
(A) a depository institution as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));
(B) a Federal credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); or
(C) a State credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).
(6) Federal banking regulator.—The term “Federal banking regulator” means any of the following:
(A) the Comptroller of the Currency,
(B) the Federal Reserve System, the Office of Foreign Asset Control, the Office of the Inspector General of the National Credit Union Administration, the Department of the Treasury, or any Federal agency or department that regulates banking or financial services, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.
(7) Financial service.—The term “financial service” means a financial product or service, as defined in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5361).
(8) Inductor.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” means—
(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831); and
(B) the National Credit Union Administration.
(9) Provider.—The term “service provider” means—
(A) a person who manufactures, compounding, verifies, or in any way facilitates the natural growth of cannabis;
(B) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any otherancillary service, relating to cannabis; and
(C) does not include a business, organization, or any person or company that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, turing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.
(10) Service provider.—The term “service provider” means—
(A) a person who manufactures, and to include extraneous material 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 Colorado (Mr. McHenry) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. 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. 1185.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud we are here today to pass this bill about public safety, accountability, and respecting States’ rights. Forty-seven States, four U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia have spoken and legalized some form of recreational or medical marijuana, including cannabis. 318.2 million people live in those 47 States. That is 97.7 percent of the population.

However, because marijuana remains illegal under Federal law, businesses in these States are forced to deal in cash. These businesses, their employees, and ancillary businesses cannot access the banking system.

The fact is, the people in States and localities across the country are voting to approve some level of marijuana use, and we need these marijuana businesses and employees to have access to checking accounts, lines of credit, payroll accounts, and more.

This will improve transparency and accountability, and help law enforcement root out illegal transactions to prevent tax evasion, money laundering, and other white-collar crime.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this will also reduce the risk of violent crime in our communities. These businesses and their employees become targets for murder, robbery, assault, and more by dealing in all cash, and this
puts the employees and store owners at risk. Congressman Heck will speak directly to this point.

The SAFE Banking Act will create a safe harbor for financial institutions and their employees who choose to do business with a marijuana company.

Section 3 of the bill is particularly important to not only marijuana businesses but everyone who might do business with a marijuana-related company. This section would protect ancillary businesses like real estate owners, accountants, electricians, and vendors by clarifying that the proceeds from legitimate cannabis businesses are not illegal under Federal laws. This proceeds section is the key provision, allowing all cannabis-related businesses and their service providers to access the banking system without fear of reprisal.

We have worked with our Republican colleagues on a few changes to improve the bill since it was marked up in March.

As Mr. Barr will discuss, the bill now includes protections for financial institutions to provide financial services to hemp and CBD businesses since we have learned the provisions from the farm bill last year did not provide sufficient clarity for banks and credit unions to provide these services.

At Mr. Stivers' urging, we expanded the protections in the bill for various insurance products, such as workers compensation.

Additionally, we have added language from Mr. Luettke Meyer's Financial Institution Customer Protection Act, which passed the House 395-2 last Congress. This language would prohibit bank regulators from directing a bank to close an account for reputational risk. Congressman Heck will speak directly to this point.

The SAFE Banking Act will create a safe harbor for financial institutions—in the nature of our debate, it is usually about the nature of regulation for the capital markets and for banks—we heard little from the committees of jurisdiction over the banking and financial services committees of jurisdiction over the Financial Services Committee is the only one that has held a hearing on the issue of cannabis this Congress.

Now, I would say that is due to the leadership of Mr. Perlmutter and his tireless advocacy for this, but we only had one panel of witnesses. I voiced my concerns in our jurisdiction to Chairwoman Waters and to Congressman Perlmutter about my concerns for this.

In March of this year, I wrote Chairwoman Waters to express my belief that we need to have a better comprehension of the nature of this substance and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. I include in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1595. Before I go into the contents of my argument against this legislation, I want to start by commending the bill's sponsor, Mr. Perlmutter from Colorado, for his tireless advocacy of this sensible approach, and his willingness, even in the midst of the toughest negotiations around the subject matter, to keep his cool, to think through the import of the bill, and to seek compromise where he could.

It is quite a legislative endeavor that he has taken upon for himself, for this institution, for his State, and for States around the country. He has been a fantastic advocate.

And I would say that, standing in opposition to this bill, it is not because of his lack of good will. It is not for lack of his willingness to engage, but for a fundamental disagreement in the approach. We have been able to have real discussions around this that I think would make people more proud or more confident in this institution and our body politic, more broadly speaking.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague on the committee, Mr. Stivers from Ohio, for his work on the issue. Together, they have conducted themselves with wonderful integrity and respect for their colleagues and their colleagues' views and ideas, especially on an issue like this where it can create an enormous amount of controversy.

Twenty-one States have legalized medicinal marijuana, and 10 States have legalized the recreational use of the drug. However, cannabis remains completely illegal in 19 States. Federal law defines this as a drug that has "a high potential for abuse; no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States; and a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug . . . under medical supervision." That is the current Federal law.

This bill does not change the fact that cannabis remains a prohibited schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act.

To that end, if we seek to give financial institutions certainty, we should deal with the listing of cannabis as a schedule I substance, not debating a partial solution for financial institutions to what is a much larger problem and a larger societal issue that we must wrestle with.

Should States be allowed to continue to violate Federal law? Does Federal law need to be changed when it comes to the scheduling of cannabis?

We have an FDA that regulates cigarettes and e-cigarettes, which, as we know, there is the recent announcement that they will seek a ban on flavored e-cigarettes. But the FDA has no regulatory authority to regulate cannabis.

The bill we are considering today is one of the biggest changes to U.S. drug policy in my lifetime, yet it was done with little debate. While our committee has jurisdiction over financial institutions—in the nature of our debate, it is usually about the nature of regulation for the capital markets and for banks—we heard little from the committees of jurisdiction over the banking and financial services committees of jurisdiction over the Financial Services Committee is the only one that has held a hearing on the issue of cannabis this Congress.

Now, I would say that is due to the leadership of Mr. Perlmutter and his tireless advocacy for this, but we only had one panel of witnesses. I voiced my concerns in our jurisdiction to Chairwoman Waters and to Congressman Perlmutter about my concerns for this.

In March of this year, I wrote Chairwoman Waters to express my belief that we need to have a better comprehension of the nature of this substance and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. I include in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1595.

The Hon. Gregory W. Meeks, Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions, Washington DC.

Dear Chairwoman Waters and Chairmen WATERS: We write today to seek your agreement to delay consideration of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Act, currently scheduled to be marked up on March 26, 2019, until the Committee has a better understanding of the full range of consequences that enacting such legislation may trigger. As you know, marijuana is a schedule I controlled substance as defined in 21 U.S.C. 802. The impact that many state laws, which have legalized marijuana, have on the federal laws governing the manufacturing, use, and sale of marijuana, including proceeds, raise many questions and concerns.

Any change to these statutes, or those that impact them, has the potential to affect the Congress and the country. We must ensure that Congress has done its due diligence, including conducting thorough oversight and review, before moving forward.

The hearing at the Committee on Financial Services on February 13, 2019, made clear that we need to better comprehend and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. Many outstanding questions remain, which include but are not limited to the following:

1. What changes to our banking laws are necessary to implement the SAFE Banking Act or other legislation creating a safe harbor for cannabis-related businesses?
2. How would individual agencies enforce Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) requirements following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of BSA requirements?
3. How would individual agencies enforce anti-money laundering (AML) regulations following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? Would AML reforms be necessary?
4. How would individual agencies enforce Know Your Customer (KYC) rules following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of KYC rules?
5. How would individual agencies enforce Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) filing requirements and guidelines following passage
of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of SAR filing requirements and guidelines to ensure illicit financial activities were not being financed?

6. How would agencies enforce Currency Transaction Report (CTR) filing requirements and guidelines following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes are required of BSA filing requirements and guidelines?

7. In what ways are agencies working with state counterparts, including state banking and securities supervisors, under the existing regime? How would those cooperative relationships change with enactment of H.R. 1595?

8. Would H.R. 1595 require conforming changes to any of the statutes, rules, and requirements previously listed to ensure there are no unintended consequences, such as cartels and other bad actors gaining access to our financial system?

9. Would the safe harbor require any changes to the rules or processes governing federal deposit insurance systems?

10. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on nonbank financial firms, including insurers and investment companies?

11. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on third parties, including payment processors?

12. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on individual and institutional investors of cannabis-related businesses?

13. What are the implications of RR.1595 on federal, state, and local law enforcement, including the Department of Justice and the Drug Enforcement Agency?

14. How are proceeds from state licensed growers and distributors taxed under federal law? Relatedly, what conforming changes to our tax code are necessary?

15. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on other products and services offered by financial institutions, including but not limited to mortgage products, deposit advance products or general commercial lending?

As Members of Congress, and the Committee of primary jurisdiction, we owe it to our constituents and to the public to fully understand the implications of any legislation before supporting or opposing it. We urge you to adopt H.R. 1595 and any related legislation until we have a full understanding of the consequences of this bill.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,
Ranking Member.

BLAINE LUETKEMEYER,
Ranking Member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, in that letter, I listed a number of questions that have yet to be answered, including:

What steps will Federal financial regulators have to take to harmonize standards and protect against illicit activity of financial institutions?

What are the implications with respect to the Bank Secrecy Act, anti-money laundering requirements, suspicious activity reports, and currency transaction reports?

What are the implications of this bill on nonbank financial firms, including investment companies?

I know there have been additions, since we have come to the floor, to include insurance companies, and I think that is a positive step. But these are some of the basic questions that still need to be resolved.

It is also important that we understand whether this legislation could lead to bad actors, like drug cartels, that could more easily access our banking system in the United States. These concerns have been echoed by several former Directors of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and former Administrators of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

In a July letter from this year, former law enforcement officials serving from 1981 to 2014 have voiced concerns that the SAFE Banking Act could be exploited to provide easier, more cost-effective means for nefarious groups to launder money. I include in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, & Urban Affairs, Washington, DC.

Hearing Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, & Urban Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CRAPO AND BANKING MEMBER BROWN: We write as former Directors of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and former Administrators of the Drug Enforcement Administration to warn about the unintended consequences of the SAFE Banking Act to legalize the banking of federally illegal proceeds from marijuana.

Some Members of your Committee may be familiar with the Black Market Peso Exchange that has been in operation for several decades. This exchange allows international drug cartels to launder billions of U.S. dollars through international monetary exchanges and has ensnared many banks and mainstream U.S. law enforcement agencies.

The lesson that the Black Market Peso Exchange teaches us is that cartels will go to enormous lengths and use sophisticated and complex methods to launder money—since laundering money is the life-blood of criminal organizations. It is therefore a virtual certainty that cartels will seek to exploit the SAFE Banking Act if it provides them with an easier and more cost-effective means to launder their money.

Because cash made from the sale of marijuana looks the same regardless of what it was used to pay for, it will be extremely difficult for banks to know whether large bundles of cash presented for deposit were made from the sale of marijuana rather than from the sale of heroin, fentanyl, or methamphetamine.

In short, the SAFE Banking Act could inadvertently allow cartels to bring into banks duffel bags of cash made from the sale of illicit drugs that are killing tens of thousands of Americans every year.

Consider the current landscape of offering banking services to cash-intensive marijuana businesses. Even if customers are offered the opportunity to pay in credit, many customers will choose to pay cash to avoid being tracked within, the state seed-to-sale tracking system.

While banks know how much cash to expect from other cash-intensive businesses like dry cleaners or convenience stores, it will be very difficult to figure out when a marijuana dispensary is participating in a money laundering scheme. The scale of the marijuana industry is already such that tracing these transactions to the dispensary will be very difficult to figure out when a marijuana dispensary is participating in a money laundering scheme. The scale of the marijuana industry is already such that tracing these transactions to the dispensary will be very difficult to figure out when a marijuana dispensary is participating in a money laundering scheme.

Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legitimate marijuana businesses to launder cash.

FOREIGN CARTELS EMBRACE HOME-GROWN MARIJUANA IN POT-LEGAL STATES

FOREIGN GANGS ARE FINDING THAT BLACK-MARKET MARIJUANA IS PROFITABLE EVEN IN STATES THAT HAVE LEGALIZED CANNABIS

By Dennis Romero, Gabe Gutierrez, Andrew Blankstein and Robert Powell

LOS ANGELES—Attorney General Jeff Sessions called it ‘‘one of the largest residential forfeiture actions in American history.’’

In early April, local and federal authorities descended upon 74 marijuana grow houses in the Sacramento area they say were underwritten by Chinese organized crime. They filed court paperwork to seize the properties, worth millions of dollars.

Federal officials allege that legal recreational marijuana states like California, Colorado and Washington, where enforcement of growing regulations is hit-or-miss, have been providing cover for transnational organizations that are using big money to buy or rent property to achieve even bigger returns.

Chinese, Cuban and Mexican drug rings have purchased or rented hundreds of homes and use human trafficking to bring inexperienced growers to the United States to tend them. Federal agents say.

The suspects are targeting states that have already legalized marijuana ‘‘in an attempt


for cannabis? It also matters, of course, how cannabis is consumed. It can be smoked, vaped, eaten, or applied to the skin. How are absorption patterns affected?

Last summer before the legalization of marijuana in Canada legalized the recreational use of marijuana, Beau Kilmer, a drug-policy expert with the RAND Corporation, testified before the Canadian Parliament on the health consequences of the trend. He concluded that the growing segment of the legal market in Washington State was extracts for inhalation, and that the mean THC concentration for those extracts was more than sixty-five per cent. “We know little about the health consequences-risks and benefits-of many of the cannabis products likely to be sold in nonmedical markets,” he said. Nor do we know how higher-potency products would affect THC consumption.

When it comes to cannabis, the best-case scenario is that we will muddle through, learning more about its true effects as we go along and adapting as needed—the way, say, the once extraordinarily lethal innovation of the automobile has been gradually tamed in the course of its history. For those curious about the worst-case scenario, Alex Berenson has written a short manifesto, “Tell Your Children: The Truth About Marijuana, Mental Illness, and Violence.”

Berenson begins his book with an account of a converstion he had with his shrink, a psychiatrist who specializes in treating mentally ill criminals. They were discussing one of the many grim cases that cross her desk—the mass murderers who killed their own grandmother or set fire to their apartment.” Then his wife said something like “Of course, he was high, been smoking pot his whole life.”

Of course, I said. Yeah, they all smoke. Well, like coffee, isn’t it too, right?

Berenson used to be an investigative reporter for the Times, where he covered, among other things, health care and the pharmaceutical industry. Then he left the paper to write a popular series of thrillers. At the time of his conversation with his wife, he had the typical layman’s view of cannabis, which is that it is largely benign. His wife’s remark alarmed him, and he set out to educate himself. Berenson is constrained by the same problem the National Academy panel is faced with—that, when it comes to cannabis, we really don’t know very much. But he has a reporter’s tenacity, a novelist’s imagination, and an outsider’s knack for asking intemperate questions. The result is disturbing.

The first of Berenson’s questions concerns what he calls the most basic point about cannabis: its association with mental illness. Many people with serious psychiatric illness smoke lots of pot. The marijuana lobby typically responds to this fact by saying that pot-smoking is a response to mental illness, not the cause of it—that people with psychiatric issues use marijuana to self-medicate. That claim is partly true. In some cases, heavy cannabis use does seem to cause mental illness. As the National Academy panel declared, in one of its few unequivocal conclusions, “Cannabis use is likely to increase the risk of developing schizophrenia and other psychoses; the higher the use, the greater the risk.”

Berenson thinks that we are far too sanguine about this link. He wonders how large the risk is, and what might be behind it. In one of the most fascinating sections of “Tell Your Children,” he writes, “A surprising number of them seemed to have used only cannabis and no other drugs before their breaks. The disease became psychiatric in the same way that it looks as if to schizophrenia, but it had developed later—and their prognosis seemed to be worse. Their delusions and paranoia hardly responded to antipsychotics.”

Messamore theorizes that THC may interfere with the brain’s anti-inflammatory pathways in nerve cells and blood vessels. Is this the reason Berenson, wonders, for the rising incidence of schizophrenia in the developed world, where cannabis use has also increased? In the northern parts of Finland, incidence of the disease has nearly doubled since 1993. In Denmark, cases have risen twenty-five per cent since 2000. In the United States, hospital emergency rooms have seen a fifty per cent increase in schizophrenia admissions since 2006. If you include cases where schizophrenia admissions in the past decade have increased from 1.26 million to 2.1 million.

Berenson’s second question derives from the first. The first is about paranoia that often accompany psychoses can sometimes trigger violent behavior. If cannabis is implicated in a rise in psychoses, should we expect a rise in violent crime? Berenson wonders if cannabis use would be a predictor of violent behavior, and that marijuana use would predict the opposite. In fact, those who used only marijuana were three times more likely to be physically aggressive than abstainers were; those who used alcohol were 2.7 times more likely to be aggressive.

Observational studies like these don’t establish causation. But they invite the sort of research Berenson is pushing for. Berenson looks, too, at the early results from the state of Washington, which, in 2014, became the first U.S. jurisdiction to legalize marijuana. In 2015 and 2017, the state’s aggravated-assault rate rose seventeen per cent, which was nearly twice the increase seen nationwide, and the murder rate rose forty-four per cent, which was more than twice the increase nationwide. We don’t know that an increase in cannabis use was responsible for that surge in violence. But we do know that, at a time when Washington may have exposed its population to higher levels of marijuana we simply don’t know enough, because there haven’t been any “systematic” studies. But the panel’s unwavering confidence is scary, compared to Berenson’s alarmism. Seventy-two thousand Americans died in 2017 of drug overdoses. Should you embark on a procurable cannabis crusade knowing what it will add to or subtract from that number?

Drug policy is always clearest at the fringes. Illegal opioids are at one end. They are dangerous. Manufacturers and distributors belong in prison, and users belong in drug-treatment programs. The cannabis industry would have us believe that it’s produceto a coffee, belonging to the coffee. The flow Kana partners with independent multi-generational farmers who cultivate under full sun, sustainably, and in small batches, the promotional literature for one California cannabis brand reads. “Using only organic methods, these stews of the land have spent their lives balancing a unique and harmonious relationship between the farm, the genetics and the terroir.” But cannabis is not coffee. It’s somewhere in the middle. The experience of marijuana is relatively predictable; the experience of a few, at the margins, is not. Products or behaviors that have that kind of muddled risk profile are confusing, usually come from the margins, and are the benign middle to appreciate the experiences of those at the statistical tails. Low-frequency risks also take longer and are far harder to quantify, and the lesson of “Tell Your Children” and the National Academy report is that we aren’t yet in a position to make that case. The case probably belongs in the category of substances that society permits but simultaneously discourages. Cannabis are heavily taxed, and prohibited in workplaces and public spaces. Alcohol can’t be sold without a license and is kept out of the hands of children. Prescription drugs have rules about dosages, labels that describe their risks, and policies that govern their availability. The advice that seasoned potheads sometimes give new users—“start low and go slow”—is probably good advice for society as a whole, and at least until we better understand what we are dealing with.

Late last year, the commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Gottlieb, announced a federal crackdown on e-cigarettes. He had seen the data on soaring youth use among teen-agers, and, he said, “I’m genuinely concerned about the ways that F.D.A. would ban many kinds of flavored e-cigarettes, which are especially popular
with teens, and would restrict the retail outlets where e-cigarettes were available.

In the dozen years since e-cigarettes were introduced into the marketplace, they have attracted an enormous amount of attention. There are scores of studies and papers on the subject in the medical and legal literature, grappling with the questions raised by the new technology. Vaping is clearly popular among kids. Is it a gateway to traditional tobacco use? Some public-health experts worry that we're grooming a younger generation for a lifetime of dangerous addiction. Yet other people see e-cigarettes as a much safer alternative for adult smokers looking to satisfy their nicotine addiction. That's the British perspective. Last year, a parliamentary committee recommended cutting taxes on e-cigarettes and allowing vaping in areas where it had previously been banned. Since e-cigarettes are as much as ninety-five percent less harmful than regular cigaretttes, the committee argued, why not promote them? Gottlieb said that he was splitting the difference between the two positions—giving adults “opportunities to transition to non-combustible products,” while upholding the F.D.A.’s “solemn mandate to make smoking less accessible and less appealing to children.” He was immediately criticized: “Somehow, we have completely lost all sense of public-health per- spectives,” said Michael Siegel, a public-health researcher at Boston University, who wrote after the F.D.A. announcement:

Every argument that the F.D.A. is making in justifying a ban on the sale of electronic cigarettes in convenience stores and gas stations applies even more strongly for real tobacco. We don’t worry that e-cigarettes increase the number of fatal car accidents, diminish motivation and cognition, or impair academic achievement. The drugs through the gateway worry about children’s use of e-cigarettes are Marlboros, not opioids. There are no enormous scientific question marks over nicotine’s dosing and bio-availability. Yet we cautiously and carefully worry with nicotine, because it is a powerful drug, and when powerful drugs are consumed by teens, and would restrict the retail outlets where e-cigarettes were available.

In the meantime, Congress is working in a bipartisan way to come up with at least a measure of a solution, but I am hopeful that we can get the medical research necessary and the FDAs processes necessary for us to have that larger debate as well. I would welcome that debate, as I know the American people would as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to my friend for the kind words about working across the aisle. This has been a partnership in many respects, lots of interchange.

I would also say to my friend, the Financial Services Committee has certain jurisdiction. We couldn’t take up this marijuana issue, and that is the issue of whether or not cannabis businesses should be considered a schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act. I know Mr. PERLMUTTER and I share that same sentiment that we should have that larger debate.

In the meantime, Congress is working in a bipartisan way to come up with at least a measure of a solution, but I am hopeful that we can get the medical research necessary and the FDAs processes necessary for us to have that larger debate as well. I would welcome that debate, as I know the American people would as well.
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be incarcerated. We eagerly look forward to that legislation. We urge the Judiciary Committee to send it to the floor so that we can support it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member allowing me this time.

Let’s set aside the moral and societal aspects of cannabis and the debate and acknowledge that we have a problem. We do have a problem. We have States that have decided to violate Federal law; and within those States, we have banking institutions and businesses that are operating within the confines of the State, however, that are still in violation of the Federal law.

Now, here is what we do agree on: We need to have a goal of predictability for these financial institutions and for these businesses. However, I don’t believe that this bill will ultimately do that because the Federal Government still views this as a schedule I substance.

I had an amendment in committee, as the author of the bill well knows, that would have forced alignment with all of the various regulators. I think at the time, my recollection is, we counted 13 different Federal regulators that touch these institutions in one way or another.

The answer to that was, well, in the bill, we have a requirement that they are going to agree with each other within 180 days.

Well, this is not going to come as a surprise to those watching on C-SPAN. We can’t collectively tie our shoes here in Washington in 180 days, much less get through something that complicated.

My amendment said that this would go into effect only when and if all of the regulators could agree to the language of how to deal with it. I still think that is the right way to go.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) who has been working on this subject with me for the last 6 years.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from the State of Hawaii and in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act.

Before I do that, I want to acknowledge the leadership of this man for a very long period of time. The only reason we are standing here tonight about to vote on this is because of the tireless and brilliant leadership by the gentleman from Colorado. I thank him for it. It has been an incredible journey over a long period of time. I thank the chair of the committee as well for her strong and clear leadership on this.

Lastly, I would like to thank the two gentlemen from Ohio, Mr. STIVERS and Mr. DAVIDSON, who are not just allies, they are friends and have done excellent work in this regard.

This is a public safety bill and simple. If you want your neighborhoods to be safer, Mr. Speaker, vote “yes.” If you want your communities to be safer, vote “yes.” If you want the employees at the dispensaries throughout the 47 States who have some form of legalized cannabis, vote “yes.”

This is a public safety bill, and it is not hypothetical. It is real. Exhibit A, Travis Mason. June 18 of 2016, Travis Mason got up and went to work. He was full of optimism about life. He was a marine veteran. This country honored him. He was looking forward to his future, because he just had been informed that he was approved to take the Denver Police Department test. He was confident he would pass it. He had been studying for it.

So he kissed his lovely wife, Samantha, good-bye. They were both marine veterans, both just 24 with three small children. He kissed Aidyn and Daisy—they were twins—and little Juliana, and then he went to work. He was not hypothetical. It is real. Exhibit A, Juliana.

Because that was an all-cash settlement, because the Federal law did not allow for that business to be banked, to be within the guardrails of the financial system, an evil person walked in that night and shot Travis dead and left Samantha a 24-year-old widow with three small children. This was so unnecessary. If we pass this legislation that does not happen. This is not hypothetical.

You can be agnostic on the underlying policy of whether or not cannabis should be legal for either adult recreational use or to treat seizures for juvenile epileptics, but you cannot be agnostic on the need to improve safety in this area.

If you believe that the first two provisions, especially, of the Cole memorandum, which sets forth: Keep marijuana out of the hands of children and keep cash out of the hands of the cartels, if you support that, you must vote “yes” on this bill so that we can track this and so that we can monitor this.

If we do nothing, bad things will again happen. If we pass this law, if we pass the SAFE Banking Act, the public safety measure, then we can avoid another widow, Samantha, and another murdered clerk at a dispensary. We can make our neighborhood safer, and we can make our communities safer.

Please join us in voting “yes” on H.R. 1595.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act. As the gentleman did want to say, I appreciate the debate that we have had in our Financial Services Committee, but I think that we need to have the same debate in the Judiciary Committee.

We all know that over the last several years, States across the country have passed various laws to legalize marijuana for both recreational and medical purposes. That flawed approach has created a patchwork of State laws and regulations that have allowed for the spread of marijuana use across our nation.

Proponents of this bill claim that it will provide consistent guidelines for marijuana companies to do business across our national finance system. However, my concern is that the legalization will only provide safe harbor while legitimizing and encouraging more widespread use of this currently illegal drug.

The reality today is that we are voting to nationally legalize marijuana through our banking system rather than taking the correct approach, which I believe is to take a vote to legalize what is currently an illegal substance.

I would ask my colleagues who support this bill to think long and hard about what you are actually voting on today, because the consequences will be far-reaching beyond the intent of this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I move to strike 2 minutes from the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a co-chair of the Congressional Cannabis Caucus and a sponsor of the Marijuana Justice Act which we hope to see marked up and brought to the floor.

Ms. LEE of California. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let’s thank Congresswoman WATERS for moving this bill out of the Financial Services Committee and for
her support for our Marijuana Justice Act. I want to thank Congressman Heck for his clarity as to why this bill is necessary and for his support. And then, of course, my partner and friend, who has been on this issue so many years as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Cannabis Caucus in which I also serve as co-chair, Congressman Earl Blumenauer. I salute and thank everyone for getting us to this point.

The SAFE Banking Act would explicitly permit banks and other financial institutions to work directly with State legal cannabis businesses—legal cannabis businesses—instead of relying on cash transactions. This bill is not only timely but extremely necessary. Right now the cannabis industry needs access to safe and effective banking immediately.

Now, let me be clear. Federal law severely limits access to loans and capital for the cannabis business, especially, mind you, for those who have cannabis insurance businesses and convictions on their record. That means that less than one-fifth of the cannabis industry is owned or operated by people of color, even though African Americans have been shown to use cannabis at the same rate as White Americans, yet are incarcerated at about 80 percent more in terms of incarceration rates. This is just plain wrong. So this bill is a great first step at addressing all of these issues.

I tell you, Madam Speaker, communities of color should equally benefit from all of the laws that have been passed at the State level. They should have the opportunity to generate generational wealth for their families, too.

That is why, in addition to this bill, the House must bring forward legislation like my Marijuana Justice Act and the MORE Act, which addresses criminal justice reform, restorative justice initiatives, and convictions of color impacted by the failed and racist war on drugs.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Perlmutter, again, for his leadership and for working with us to get this to the floor.

Mr. McHenry. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Columbus, Ohio (Mr. Stivers), who is the ranking member of the National Security, International Development and Monetary Policy Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee. He is a great advocate for the bill.

Mr. Stivers. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act. The bill provides a limited safe harbor for banks and credit unions to open and maintain accounts for marijuana-related businesses and other nonmarijuana-related businesses. I personally don’t grow recreational marijuana. But for me, this bill has nothing to do with the larger debate about marijuana and whether it is a good or bad thing. Instead, I am narrowly focused on the public safety aspects of this bill. The inconsistencies between State and Federal law have created a situation where a growing number of State-regulated businesses are operating on a cash-only basis. As a result, a lack of access to banking makes it easier for criminals to wash and move money—money that makes them a magnet for violent robberies.

The transactions of cash-only businesses are not subject to rigorous anti-money laundering or know your customer requirements that should be required for bank account holders. This makes it difficult for regulators and law enforcement to trace transactions or to freeze money.

The SAFE Banking Act will make our communities safer by getting cash off the streets and into regulated financial institutions, so we can root out fraud and other illegal activity. The bill also extends the safe harbor to any proceeds indirectly received from these businesses and also provides a safe harbor to down the street or the landlord of these businesses.

Importantly, the SAFE Banking Act does not change the legal status of marijuana. Additionally, H.R. 1595 also includes provisions that would prevent financial regulators from denying or discouraging access to the banking system for other legal businesses as happened in 2014 through 2016. This protection is a major protection for other legal businesses.

I want to thank Mr. Perlmutter and Mr. Heck for their incredible advocacy on this. I want to thank Chairwoman Waters and Ranking Member McHenry for their honest and hardworking efforts, even when they disagree. And I want to thank Senator Cory Gardner who has championed this bill in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1595. Mr. Perlmutter. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of supporters for the SAFE Banking Act from a broad coalition, including the National Association of Attorneys General, including 38 State attorneys general, 20 State Governors, and 18 State banking supervisors, the United Food and Commercial Workers, the Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the American Bankers Association, the National Bankers Association, the Federal Reserve, and the National Cannabis Roundtable, the National Association of Realtors, Brinks, Inc., the National Armored Car Association, the American Financial Services Association, and ScottsMiracle-Gro.

H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, is supported by a wide range of national organizations, State attorneys general, the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), Credit Union National Association (CUNA), Independent Community Bankers Association (ICBA), America Bankers Association (ABA), Mid-size Bank Coalition of America (MBCA), National Bankers Association (NBA), Third Party Payment Processors Association (TPPPA), Law Enforcement Action Partnership (LEAP), The Real Estate Roundtable (RE), National Association of REALTORS, Safe and Responsible Banking Alliance (SARBA), American Land Title Association (ALTA).

American Property Casualty Insurance Association (APCIA), The Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers (CIAB), Reinsurance Association of America (RAA), Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America (Big ‘I’), Wholesale Specialty Insurance Association (WSIA), National Association of Professional Insurance Agents (NAPIA), National Association of Professional Employer Organizations (NAPEA), National Cannabis Industry Association (NCIA), Minority Cannabis Business Association (MCBA), National Cannabis Roundtable (NCR), Cannabis Trade Federation (CTF), ScottsMiracle-Gro, National Armored Car Association (NACA), Third Party Payment Processors Association (TPPPA), Law Enforcement Action Partnership (LEAP), The Real Estate Roundtable (RE), National Association of REALTORS, Safe and Responsible Banking Alliance (SARBA), American Land Title Association (ALTA).

Mr. Perlmutter. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer), who has been the quarterback of a lot of this cannabis legislation.

Mr. Blumenauer. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy, the leadership, and you have heard from a number of the champions in this House fighting for a more rational policy regarding cannabis.

We are in this fix today because Congress has refused to provide the partnership and the leadership that the States demand. The States aren’t waiting for us. As you have heard, 47 States have taken steps to legalize some form of State legal cannabis.

The most ridiculous aspects of our being out of sync is what we have seen in terms of access to banking services. Congressman Heck elaborated I think very emotionally and effectively about the dangers that this presents. We have an opportunity to fix that problem.

This is an $11 billion industry and growing, and it is growing because the people and the States have demanded it. We need to step up and solve one of the biggest problems, and that is simply that we don’t have access to banking services. I have worked on this issue for decades. I have never met a human being who feels that there is any good
Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for working with me in a bipartisan way to include two amendments that will aid hemp farmers and businesses in my district to access financial services.

Kentuckians have a deep interest in the production, cultivation, and sale of industrial hemp, and we have historic connections to this, too. Many Americans may not know, but my predecessor in the central Kentucky seat in Congress, Speaker of the House Henry Clay, was once a hemp farmer. Now, thanks to the farm bill, the hemp industry in the Commonwealth is booming once again.

Much of the resurgence of the industry occurred under the Industrial Hemp Research Pilot Program, established by the 2014 farm bill. Since the program's enactment in 2014, the number of approved acres in Kentucky increased from 922 to over 50,000. In 2018, sales of hemp products were three-and-a-half times more than the previous year.

The 2018 farm bill took it a step further and fully legalized industrial hemp, ending 80 years of prohibition of the plant. Hemp is now completely exempt from the Controlled Substances Act. Despite these positive steps forward, hemp businesses still have trouble accessing financial services like bank accounts, loans, and payment processing.

This bill will provide additional clarity for banks, insurance companies, and card processors that they can, in fact, do business with legally operating hemp businesses. It would also direct our Federal financial regulators to issue joint guidance to financial institutions on how to serve hemp and CBD businesses without legal risk.

There is amazing potential for hemp and hemp-derived products. One hemp farmer and his district has an exclusive deal with Patagonia to provide hemp for farming. Toyota, which has the largest manufacturing facility in my district, is exploring the use of hemp for car interiors. Hemp farmers in my district are cultivating hemp to produce products ranging from nutraceuticals, dietary supplements, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, apparel, footwear, fashion, and even industrial paper and construction materials.

But for hemp producers and businesses to fully scale up and take advantage of the descheduling under the farm bill, they need access to financial services.

And, again, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for working with me in a bipartisan way, and I urge support for H.R. 1595.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protections and Financial Institutions.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, there has been a seismic shift in the legal treatment of cannabis, led by Colorado and other states that have decriminalized to some extent and legal businesses are permitted to varying degrees, including in my home State of New York. But Federal drug laws and bank regulations have not evolved to reflect this new reality. We need clear, harmonized laws, which the SAFE Banking Act provides.

Without passage of this bill, the legal cannabis industry is forced to operate mostly in cash, depriving law enforcement of important financial data and creating avoidable security risks for companies and their employees.

With the passage of this bill, entrepreneurs, employees, and financial institutions operating legally within the bounds of State and local laws will no longer bear the burden of a punitive Tax Code, high compliance hurdles, the lack of all basic financial services, and significant security risks.

I am proud of the work Mr. PERLMUTTER has done on this bill, and I compliment him.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a great member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

This is a banking bill. It defends civil liberties with a simple concept: If it is legal in your State, you should be able to bank it. No Federal regulator should be able to block an American’s lawful access to the financial system.

In Ohio, legal, State-regulated businesses are being forced into using cash or intermediaries. This bill will help get cash off our streets and into the regulated financial system.

I am also pleased the bill includes Mr. LUETKEMYER’s legislation to stop the closing of accounts on the basis of political biases or motivations.

For far too long, financial institutions have said: You are not going to bank those people, are you? It is time to defend civil liberties and pass this important bill.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I urge bipartisan, broad support of its passage.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this commonsense legislation, the SAFE Banking Act.

When I was a State senator in California, I was visited by Dr. Moynihan, who came to visit my office to ask that I refer to his daughter to the closing of accounts on the basis of political biases or motivations.

It breaks my heart to think that legitimate businesses could not pay their taxes with cash, yet customers like Mr. Moynihan can’t use a credit card. He also has to pay with cash to get legitimate products. It doesn’t make sense.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please support commonsense legislation. Please vote “aye” on this legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, there is 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for working with me in a bipartisan way and urge support for H.R. 1595.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protections and Financial Institutions.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, there has been a seismic shift in the legal treatment of cannabis, led by Colorado and other states that have decriminalized to some extent and legal businesses are permitted to varying degrees, including in my home State of New York. But Federal drug laws and bank regulations have not evolved to reflect this new reality. We need clear, harmonized laws, which the SAFE Banking Act provides.

Without passage of this bill, the legal cannabis industry is forced to operate mostly in cash, depriving law enforcement of important financial data and creating avoidable security risks for companies and their employees.

With the passage of this bill, entrepreneurs, employees, and financial institutions operating legally within the bounds of State and local laws will no longer bear the burden of a punitive Tax Code, high compliance hurdles, the lack of all basic financial services, and significant security risks.

I am proud of the work Mr. PERLMUTTER has done on this bill, and I compliment him.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

This is a banking bill. It defends civil liberties with a simple concept: If it is legal in your State, you should be able to bank it. No Federal regulator should be able to block an American’s lawful access to the financial system.

In Ohio, legal, State-regulated businesses are being forced into using cash or intermediaries. This bill will help general bed the burden of a punitive Tax Code, high compliance hurdles, the lack of all basic financial services, and significant security risks.

I am proud of the work Mr. PERLMUTTER has done on this bill, and I compliment him.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, there is 2 vision minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 2 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for yielding, and it is on behalf of those cannabis patients in Fort Walton Beach and across the Sunshine State that I rise in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

I am proud to have been a part of drafting Florida’s medical marijuana laws, and it is ludicrous that the Congress of the United States would stand between people operating under the color of State law and their ability to access the financial system.

It is good for no one to have billions of dollars rolling around outside of the accountability, efficiencies, and safeguards that the American financial system provides.

A vast majority of States have legalized some form of cannabis, and if a business is legal in that State, it should have the same financial protections as any other business.

I am a proud original cosponsor of the SAFE Banking Act, and I thank my colleagues for their tireless work on this issue. I know the bill is not perfect, but hopefully, this will build some commonsense momentum for real cannabis reform.
Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. Plaskett).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, today, because federally regulated banks and other financial institutions may face prosecution if they offer their services to businesses selling legal cannabis products across 47 States, D.C., and Puerto Rico, many businesses are forced to operate in a cash-only business, making them targets for theft and creating opportunities for tax evasion and money laundering.

It is simply unfair to deprive legal, State-approved businesses of financial services any longer. Social equity will go further by allowing businesses to come out of the shadows.

As chair of the House Committee on Agriculture, my colleagues and I have worked to deschedule the marijuana. I am pleased that this legislation was made inclusive of hemp as it moved through the process. I have heard from a number of legal hemp businesses that have experienced similar issues.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my colleague, for the inclusion of the territories.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I strongly support this bill and congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for their hard work.

We have to pass this bill because it is a public safety issue. Banks can’t serve cannabis businesses, an $11 billion business, because it is still illegal at the Federal level, which means that legal marijuana businesses around the country operate in all cash.

This is a huge public safety issue because storing huge piles of cash in warehouses is a magnet for criminal activity. But it also means that companies that just provide services to marijuana businesses, like electric or water utilities, are also getting cut off from the banking system. Undermining people’s access to basic utilities creates a public safety issue. But it also means that companies that just provide services to marijuana businesses, like electric or water utilities, are also getting cut off from the banking system. Undermining people’s access to basic utilities creates a public safety issue. But it also means that companies that just provide services to marijuana businesses, like electric or water utilities, are also getting cut off from the banking system. Undermining people’s access to basic utilities creates a public safety issue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.
RESCHENTHALER and TIMMONS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as aye, aye.
are undeniable: sanctuary cities constitute a threat to public safety. Meanwhile, as this body fails to act, the number of victims continues to grow.

We are a nation of laws, and we must uphold our laws and not reward State and local officials who deliberately and flagrantly disregard the laws of this body.

When I was a State senator in Tennessee, we addressed the problem. I authored a bill and added teeth to our sanctuary city laws, anti-sanctuary city laws, so any city that would choose to ignore the law would lose their State economic funding.

It is time for Congress to act. Despite all of our disagreements, all this bill does is allow the victims to be heard, that is it. It requires the ombudsman created by this bill to collect their stories and the data on these victims.

Under this amendment, any victim of a crime committed by an illegal immigrant in a sanctuary jurisdiction can file a report with the ombudsman. This allows victims and their families an opportunity to be heard by policymakers in Congress and by the Department of Homeland Security.

Why would we not let the victims be heard?

The ombudsman will analyze reporting patterns, make recommendations on how we decrease these incidents. This amendment would at least provide an outlet for the growing number of victims and their families to ensure that their stories are told. Hopefully, we will act tonight on behalf of the victims.

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, there is no one here who better understands what is happening on the southern border than those of us who actually live on the U.S.-Mexico border. There is no one here for whom border security is more important than those of us fortunate enough to live on the southern border.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003, American taxpayers have spent over $300 billion on the agencies that carry out immigration enforcement; and the rights of those of us who live within 100 miles of the border, and that is the southern border as well as the northern border, our rights have been eroded.

What Congress has not done is create the corresponding transparency, accountability, and oversight needed over these investments. H.R. 2203 will do that.

The Republican motion only seeks to divide us. Quite simply, this is a poison pill amendment that has no relevance to what we are trying to do here with this bill.

Some of my colleagues seem obsessed with dehumanizing immigrants, casting them as criminals to be feared and even hated.

Let me remind Members that the recent massacre in El Paso, Texas, was not carried out by an immigrant, but, by a killer, a U.S. citizen who drove 600 miles across the State of Texas to slaughter Mexicans and immigrants. And he did this in one of the safest cities in America. Immigrant communities and border communities remain among the safest cities in America.

And my Republican colleague completely misses the point of the ombudsman, the office of the ombudsman. An ombudsman is supposed to be focused on oversight related to the inner workings of the Department, not on external policy issues. This amendment is a side show that detracts from that mission.

Accountability, oversight, and transparency should not be controversial. And much of what is in this common-sense bill is precisely what we have seen embraced by law enforcement, local law enforcement in our communities. It would provide a well-funded and powerful Federal law enforcement agency to adhere to those same values?

Instead of pursuing symbols of division, we ask our Republican colleagues to support fundamental accountability and oversight over the hundreds of billions of dollars we have given to DHS and support transparency for a powerful agency.

History will not judge us kindly for the way that this administration has treated migrants, agents, and border communities like mine. It will judge us in this Chamber even more harshly if we continue to call for more symbols of division.

Let us commit to responding in a way that honors our sacred credo of our country, “E pluribus unum”—out of many, we are one.

Let us commit to responding in a way that honors the sacrifice of exiles, the Statue of Liberty, and our heritage as a nation of immigrants. That is who we are. It is who we always will be.

Let’s work together and make sure that our response is one filled with common sense and compassion. I urge a “no” vote on this motion and a “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

The Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule X, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 576.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 216, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allred</td>
<td>Barragán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basso</td>
<td>Beatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenauer</td>
<td>Blunt Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonamici</td>
<td>Boyle, Brendan F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (MD)</td>
<td>Brown (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Bustos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td>Casapé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson (IN)</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Casten (IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Clark (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Cleaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condra</td>
<td>Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (CA)</td>
<td>Davis, Dan K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>DeFazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBene</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delain</td>
<td>Denham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSaulnier</td>
<td>Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingell</td>
<td>Doggett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Michael F.</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espaillat</td>
<td>Eshoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falzone</td>
<td>Faso (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia (IL)</td>
<td>Garlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the adoption of a resolution calling for a committee investigation of charges against the officer in question. Wherein in the past 25 years, the House of Representatives has moved forward with impeachment against a federal officer three times, each initiated by an impeachment inquiry resolution approved by the full House, not by a unanimous vote of the Speaker.

Whereas on May 12, 2019, the House approved H. Res. 421, authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether the House should impeach G. Thomas Porteous, a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Whereas on October 8, 1998, the House approved H. Res. 581, authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist for the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

Whereas the Committee Report to accompany HR 1998 stated: "Because the issue of impeachment is of such overwhelming importance, the Committee decided that it must receive authorization from the full House before proceeding on any further course of action."

Whereas that report further stated: "Because impeachment is delegated solely to the House of Representatives by the Constitution, the full House of Representatives should be involved in critical decision making regarding various stages of impeachment."

Whereas the Speaker’s extraordinary decision to move forward with an impeachment inquiry without any debate or vote on such a resolution by the full House undermines the voting privileges afforded to each Member and the constituents they represent.

Whereas this unprecedented and politically motivated decision by Speaker Pelosi represents an abuse of power and brings discredit to the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the House of Representatives disapproves of the Speaker’s action.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Clerk read the title of the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019.

A recorded vote on the motion to table the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community is ordered.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, answered “present” 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 548] YEAS—421

McKinley    Roby
McNerney    Rodgers (WA)
Meadows    Roe, David P.
Mendez    Rogers (AL)
Meng    Rogers (KY)
Menzer    Rooney (FL)
Mitchell    Roeper
Mooney (NV)    Rose, John W.
Moulton    Routier
Mucarzel-Powell    Rouzer
Mullin    Roy
Morrie    Royal-Alward
Moulton    Ruiz
Murphy (FL)    Rumpf
Murphy (NC)    Ryan
Nadler    Sanchez
Napolitano    Sarabanes
Neal    Sease
Ness    Schakowsky
Norcross    Schiff
O’Halleran    Schneider
Ocasio-Cortez    Schrader
Ogilvie    Scott (VA)
Paisano    Scott, Austin
Palone    Scott, David
Palmer    Sensenbrenner
Panetta    Serrano
Pappas    Sewell (AL)
Pascarell    Shalala
Payne    Sherman
Perkins    Sherman (AL)
Perlmutter    Shimkus
Perry    Simon
Peters    Siro
Peterson    Slotkin
Phillips    Smith (MO)
Pinegar    Smith (NE)
Pocan    Smith (NJ)
Porter    Smith (VA)
Posey    Smucker
Pressley    Soto
Price (NC)    Spanberger
Quigley    Spence
Raskin    Speier
Ratcliffe    Speier (NC)
Reed    Stearns
Roechenthaler    Stein
Rice (NY)    Steube
Richmond    Stevens
Riggleman    Young

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert    Massie

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham    Higgins (LA)
Clyburn    Joyce (OH)
Crawford    Marshall
Cummings    McEachin

So the resolution was agreed to.

The vote of the resulting was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESPIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Lee of Nevada) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

H.B. 3532

September 25, 2019

Hon. Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Speaker Pelosi:
I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security. It was my great honor and privilege to serve on the Homeland Security Committee since I was first elected to Congress, and I will continue prioritizing national security issues through my work as Chair of the House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security as well as the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

During my tenure in Congress, I was given the opportunity to serve on four committees that shape our nation’s domestic and foreign policy. I relinquished this seat on the Homeland Security Committee to make room for the new Republican House members elected in the recent special elections. By accepting this offer, I trust that my colleagues will best serve the Republican conference overall.

Sincerely,
John Ratcliffe,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.
September 25, 2019
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That is why I am proud to support stricter background checks before a gun purchase and a ban on high-capacity magazines, which should only be available to trained American soldiers.

But we must do more.

Like so many Members return to districts where gun violence is all too common and where it is rare to find a family that has not lost a member to this national menace.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS ALIVE AND WELL

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the issue of human trafficking, which is still alive and well today.

The United States has been ranked among the top three nations of origin for victims of human trafficking in 2018, according to a recent report by the State Department, and is the number one consumer of sex trafficking worldwide.

This is absolutely unacceptable, and as a Member of Congress, we must use all means necessary to rid our Nation of human trafficking and keep people safe from this kind of abuse.

That is why, this week, I will be introducing two bills to help combat this. They are the Prevent Trafficking in Our Schools Act, and the COMBAT Act of 2019.

The Prevent Trafficking in Our School Act instructs the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of Education to develop a pilot program to train school officials and teachers to identify signs of trafficking in our schools and educate these same officials on the prevalence in our community.

The COMBAT Act addresses the fact that the U.S. does not have an official count for domestic human trafficking by requiring a report to Congress on the prevalence of human trafficking happening within the United States.

I ask for support on these bills.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, today the transcript was released of the conversation between the President and, if not, we must have it as quickly as possible.

Let me also say that today we had a very important hearing in the Judiciary Committee regarding the ban on assault weapons. It has been 53 days since El Paso, 52 days since Dayton, and 25 days since Odessa.

It seems that the leadership of the NRA finds my statements attractive, and so they have taken to the airwaves with their cousin, FOX News, to talk about the opinion that I had regarding the AR-15. I told them, “it was as heavy as 10 boxes.”

As a person who believes in the First Amendment, I have a right to say that. To all of the members of the NRA: I believe in your beliefs and your right to believe them, but you are being led by an unfortunate group of leaders who simply want to attack and have no solutions.

I will take the hit from the NRA to save lives. I am not afraid of the NRA.

PFAS REMEDIATION

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss a very important matter and one that is bipartisan in nature.

I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan, Mr. Kildee, for helping us organize and bring awareness to an issue that affects communities across the United States.

As co-chair of the Congressional PFAS Task Force, I am pleased that PFAS remediation efforts are receiving the attention so desperately needed.

In Bucks and Montgomery Counties, we have seen firsthand the negative impacts PFAS contamination has had on our community. Further action must be taken.

Earlier this year, the House and the Senate passed their NDAA bills that both included important provisions to address PFAS contamination. These provisions will help to clean up contaminated sites, stop PFAS from polluting our drinking water in the future, and protect our servicemembers and our first responders.

In order to protect veterans and families in our communities from PFAS, in the final NDAA, we must have the best PFAS provisions from the House and Senate NDAA bills.

Madam Speaker, I call, tonight, for all NDAA conferences to ensure resources for PFAS remediation efforts are included in the final package. This issue cannot wait any longer. Congress must act now.

MARIJUANA INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP FROM BANKERS

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in overwhelming support of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

Almost 3 years ago, Nevada voters went to the polls and voted to legalize recreational marijuana, making Nevada one of five States to legalize marijuana in the 2016 election.

After its legalization, local business owners invested in Nevada’s legal cannabis market, creating jobs and opportunity. The Nevada marijuana market quickly exceeded expectations, growing rapidly to become a burgeoning industry.

Within 10 months, Nevada also exceeded the initial 1-year projection of tax revenue, bringing in more than $55 million in taxes for our schools, money that would have otherwise flooded the illicit drug market. Today, Nevada raises more revenue from cannabis excise taxes than alcohol excise taxes.

Interestingly enough, the marijuana industry did this without incurring vast detrimental to society, creating an addiction crisis, or serving as a gateway drug, as marijuana opponents have long argued.

CONGRATULATING ERIN WILLMAN FOR CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISABLED ADULTS

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Erin Willman of Warren, Pennsylvania. Just 22 years old, Erin is running her own business, White Cane Coffee.

Erin founded her company with an important goal in mind: to provide people with disabilities with self-sustaining jobs.

Erin is blind and on the autism spectrum. She believes that providing a welcoming environment centered around a good cup of coffee is a natural way to promote inclusivity.

White Cane Coffee offers eight different roast varieties, and each bag includes braille-friendly labels.

Despite being capable and wanting to work, almost 90 percent of adults with autism are either unemployed or underemployed. For many, jobs are extremely difficult to find; and for others, work environments are not supportive or are even hostile to those who are disabled. Erin is helping to bridge this gap by empowering autistic adults in her community.

I am proud of the work that Erin is doing every day to create opportunities for autistic adults in Warren County.

CANNABIS COMPANIES NEED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO HELP THEM START AND GROW

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Erin Willman for creating opportunities for disabled adults.
Mr. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, which passed this House this afternoon.

Maine voters have legalized marijuana. Like every other business, cannabis companies in Maine and other legal states are investing in local financial institutions to help them start and grow.

Maine credit unions and banks want to help. They were early advocates of the SAFE Banking Act. They recognize that a safe harbor is necessary so that lenders can assist this emerging industry sector, to the benefit of consumers, lenders, and law enforcement.

Just yesterday, a banker from southern Maine contacted me out of regret. The bank had to close a long-time customer’s account when they found out he was a delivery driver for a legal marijuana producer. Due to potential Federal liability, the bank lost a customer. The citizen lost his trusted financial institution.

Does he have to keep his earnings under the mattress?

This makes no sense. The SAFE Banking Act will fix this problem by allowing lenders to legally serve marijuana businesses. It promotes security by ensuring transactions are done through regulated institutions, not with bags of cash.

AAKASH PATEL NAMED BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR BY THE INDO-US. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of Tampa Bay’s most impactful business leaders, Aakash Patel.

Aakash was recently honored as Businessman of the Year by the Indo-U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a group that provides Asian American professionals and entrepreneurs a platform to share and collaborate.

Aakash currently serves as the chairman of the Early Learning Coalition of Hillsborough County, a 501(c)(3) that provides quality childhood care and after-school programs to many of the children in my district.

At the age of 27, Aakash founded a local consulting firm, with an expertise in public relations, targeted networking, and social media. Under his leadership, his small group of millennials, over the last 9 years, has actively resourced over 150 companies.

His love and passion for our community is also seen in his role as the youngest board member of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce and with his selection as an honorary commander at MacDill Air Force Base.

Please join me in congratulating one of Tampa’s most well-established rising stars in the business community, Aakash Patel.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 54, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-218) on the resolution (H. Res. 591) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DISPLAY ON NATIONAL MALL BY THE HISTORICAL VEHICLE ASSOCIATION

(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, I want to point out a unique opportunity for viewing. The U.S. Park Service, their division of the Historic Vehicle Association, places on display in The National Mall, several times a year, unique vehicles with unique histories.

Right now, in a glass case just a couple of blocks from here in The National Mall is the 1966 Volkswagen van that belonged to Esau and Janie Jenkins from South Carolina, who were long-time revered civil rights leaders back in the day, transporting people to rallies and to get them out to vote and for voter registration, education, all sorts of things in the civil rights movement, starting back in the 1940s until they obtained this van and used it for many years.

It was brought out from a field where it had been deteriorating over many years, was brought back to life in this glass case, will be here for the rest of the week.

I encourage people to go down and check it out and see what the Historic Vehicle Association is doing.

□ 1845

GOOD ECONOMIC NEWS

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is going to be one of those evenings where I am going to try to actually go through sort of complex numbers, but a lot of it is incredibly optimistic.

I am going to do two things tonight: Part of this is just some frustration on numbers that I keep seeing out there that aren’t being discussed here in this body of incredibly optimistic in the economy.

And the second thing is: I want to talk about, remember last week the theme was global warming, climate change, the environment, and I had my issue of The Economist on what is called the climate issue.

I want to talk about some really amazing technologies that I can’t believe weren’t discussed last week that are about to create stunning breakthroughs.

So, let’s first actually talk through this. I have this intense frustration that my brothers and sisters on the left and even a number of us on the right, don’t talk enough or at all about the amazing good things happening to the American worker, to people out there who had a pretty rough previous decade.

The math is the math. So the premise I want to give right now is economic growth is moral because it uplifts, it makes work valuable, it improves your future, your retirement, and your ability to take care of your kids. Economic growth is moral.

The reason I have this particular board up—and we try to do this every week—is what are some of the greatest threats to our society?

I actually believe it is the stunning size of our unfunded liabilities. Once again, and I say again, every week when I am behind this microphone—the next 30 years, if you take Social Security and Medicare and remove it from the 30-year window, this country, the Federal Government, the CBO projection, $23 trillion, if the bank, if we pull Social Security and Medicare into that number, then we are $103 trillion in debt—negative.

That is not Republican or Democrat math, it is just demographics. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers. We are moving into our earned benefits, and the honest truth is, the resources that were required to meet these earned benefits were never set aside.

So how do we keep our commitments?

We are actually proposing over and over and over that it is a combination. There is no magic bullet. It is a combination. Madam Speaker, you have got to grow the economy like crazy. So tax policy that grows and expands, trade policy that grows and expands, immigration policy that grows and expands, regulatory policy that grows and expands, and incentives to be in the workforce that grow and expand the economy.

The adoption of disruptive technology to change the price of healthcare is absolutely necessary. We need incentives for Americans who are older and who feel they are healthy and still want to work, 23 million in the labor force. We go over these details over and over and over again.

There is a way to make the math survivable without some of the lunacy of functionally almost buying constituencies, just managing the reality of our demographics and our current promises. Once again, every 5 years, just the
growth in Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements—just the growth—will equal the Defense Department. That means every 10 years two Defense Departments is just the growth.

CBO projects that in the next 10 years, 91 percent of the growth will be in spending on Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements. Much of that is calculated with actually a new much, much lower medical inflation. It is demographics. It is population shifts moving into those benefits.

You would think, Madam Speaker, if those who come behind these microphones actually loved and cared for their brothers and sisters, they would actually try something new, and that would be invest in a calculator, tell the truth about the math, come together, and make it work. We believe there is a way to make it work.

Part of the reason I am behind the microphone this evening is I want to talk about some of the amazing things that are happening, proving the first part of that discussion, that you can change the economic cycle. I have been on the Joint Economic Committee now for years, I am one of those freaky smart professors, demographers, and economists would come and sit in front of us and say: David, it looks like your future is a 1.8, maybe a 1.9 GDP growth. We are going to have a labor force that is going to be somewhere into the mid-50s as people retire, because remember 10,300 Americans turn 65 every single day.

That was our future, Madam Speaker, and you couldn't make this math work at all.

So how many times did you hear the term a fiscal cliff is coming? Then this crazy thing has happened the last couple of years where we changed our tax law and we updated our trade environment. We are still negotiating, trying to update our trade environment. But just those couple of levers changed the economic life for so many Americans. Yet this place is so incredibly sour, I don’t know why there is not joy.

I want to walk through some of these numbers. Look, these are just some of the headlines. Associated Press said that U.S. household income finally matches 1990 peak, while poverty rate hits 14.1 percent 2001. That is just they call inflation-adjusted dollars. We had a lost decade. We had a couple of lost decades. We are back.

For the first time, most new working-age hires in the U.S. are people of color. It turns out, what we would sit in the Joint Economic Committee a couple years ago, we would hear that those who didn’t have graduate degrees, those who didn’t finish high school and who didn’t have these particular skill sets were going to be signed out of the permanent underclasses. Besides just the common cruelty of accepting that, the darkness of accepting that, it turns out it wasn’t true.

Why isn’t there joy? This is an editorial from The Wall Street Journal from the editorial board on the 20th, and there are some numbers in here we have been tracking. They did a fine job sort of lumping it together, and they left out on this floor in some of those 1-minute comments a couple weeks ago, a number of our brothers and sisters on the left were just outraged that in 2018, Medicaid rolls declined.

Do you know how they declined? It turns out they declined because workers’ earnings increased by 3.4 percent while the poverty rate decreased by another half a percent. So now the poverty rate is at 11.8. It is still unacceptably high. It is also the lowest since 2001, and some of the fastest reduction of poverty in U.S. history was just last year.

If you say you care about those who don’t have many of the same opportunities or haven’t had them in life, Madam Speaker, shouldn’t there be just a little recognition there is something pretty amazing happening out there. In the economy for these folks we were being part of the permanent underclass? Yet they have the fastest growing wages in those lower quartiles.

I am sorry. I know I get behind this microphone and often sound like an accountant on steroids. I struggle with a microphone and often sound like an accountant on steroids. I struggle with a story, a powerful narrative. So many of our brothers and sisters around here get behind this microphone and are great at telling stories. But what was more important, being part of the permanent underclass? Yet they have the fastest growing wages in those lower quartiles.

As a result, real median earnings— and let’s stop for a moment. When you hear the words “real median earnings,” Madam Speaker, what does that mean? It is something we call inflation-adjusted dollars. So, if we tell you your income went up 2 percent, but last year inflation was 1 percent, you only went up 1 percent. So when you hear the terms real dollars or constant dollars or inflation-adjusted dollars, it means we have made up for inflation, so your purchasing power is held constant.

As a result, real median earnings for female households with no spouse present jumped 7.6 last year.

How many speeches have been given on this floor over the last decade about that population and the crushing burden of poverty?

More happened last year than had happened in the previous few years in moving that population out of poverty.

I am sure our brothers and sisters on the left when they hear the actual math will be joyful because they care about these folks, right?

The poverty rate among female households declined 2.7 percent for African Americans—Blacks—4 percent for Hispanics, and 7.1 percent for their children. Those are amazing numbers.

It is part of my point that I keep trying to make over and over. Economic growth is moral.

But what was more important, because the irony of this editorial, the real cure for inequality, it turns out those making less than $35,000 in inflation-adjusted dollars has fallen 1.2 percent, because they were making more. But when you actually look at the amount where the income growth was, it wasn’t at the upper quartiles of income. It looks like the growth in income with what they say in the lower quartiles. Meaning, as this editorial—and we still don’t have the math yet, but we are tracking it, we are probably not going to have it for another year when we look back at 2019—but preliminarily 2019 may be the year, the first year in modern times, where income inequality actually shrinks.

It is not because the wealthy didn’t get wealthier. It is because those in the lower income finally were receiving pay raises, because they are finally working in a world where there are more jobs than there is available labor, so their labor is more valuable.

Isn’t that exciting? We all get together, Republicans and Democrats, and figure out how to do more of this?

The editorial touches on this, but I want to give an explanation. As 10,300 Americans retire every day, those are often individuals who are near the peak of their earning cycle, their lifetime earnings. The economists for years and years had said they expected to see a certain mean income fall because high-skilled workers, because of their time in the workforce, they were retiring and their salary was going to come out. Younger generation of poverty. It turns out, some of our youngest workers have had some of the biggest pops in income.

Mean incomes increased in households between the ages of 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 by 9.1 percent and 5 percent, respectively. Those young workers had some of the most aggressive, positive pay raises in all of society.
How much have we heard that on our media? How about our financial press? How much here on the floor? How much from those who care about social policies?

Look, the reality of it is that something pretty amazing is happening out there in our economy. When you saw the August unemployment numbers of how many Americans who were not even looking came back into the labor force, because, back to our previous point, labor force participation, a growing economy, is moral. It is something that I hope everyone here, no matter what your ideology, is joyful about. That economic expansion, we are starting to see it in the early data from CBO, and soon, hopefully, the Social Security actuaries. The dates of running out of money in our earned entitlement programs are getting pushed off because of the amount of payroll taxes that are coming in.

As you look at these numbers, try to absorb how stunning. Earnings for single female households in just 2018—we are not talking multiple years—just 2018 of 7.6 percent. If I had shown up here a couple of years ago and said that is what 2018 was going to produce, you would have laughed me out of the place, but it happened.

Poverty rates for female households are down 2.7 percent; for Hispanic, down 1 percent. The 2.7 is African American.

Hasn’t this also been the goal around here? We were going to find policies that created a level, egalitarian sort of equity in participating in the American Dream, the economic expansion. It is happening.

I am sure when my brothers and sisters on the left see these numbers, they will soon be coming to these microphones overjoyed, joyful, excited that the policies from the Republicans over the last couple of years have brought economic numbers that a lot of those really smart professors, economists, and demographers who sat in front of us over the last decade said were impossible.

We need to rethink. If you claim you care, maybe we should engage in policies that really do work. Just as the Wall Street editorial makes very, very clear, we have seen distribution not lift people out of poverty. In many ways, the math has kept them in poverty. But the economic expansion, the economic miracle from the last couple of years has really been great. Maybe we need to consider doing more of it. So, look, that is just an intense frustration I have.

I want to start with this slide, sort of as the thought experiment. I am someone who is skeptical about the environment, but I also care about telling the truth about the math. Virtue signaling does not make the environment healthier and cleaner. It may get you reelected. It may get you some nice comments on a Twitter or a blog. It doesn’t make the environment better. So every once in a while I will bring this slide up.

D.C. is one of the communities that has banned straws. Bless them. How many U.S. straws end up in the ocean? Oh, pretty much none.

Madam Speaker, 90 percent of the ocean plastic—and I am someone, before I go any further, to represent one of the greatest districts you can imagine, lots of smart people, lots of people who care. Lots of people have chosen to move their lives, their existence, their prosperity, and work hard in the Phoenix-Scottsdale desert. But our economic growth is something that you used to love to go to the ocean and go scuba diving. So plastic in the ocean was always one those things you talked about, you cared about.

Madam Speaker, 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, eight of them in Asia, two of them in Africa. If you cared about plastic in the ocean, you would do something that is simple and logical: Go to the 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean, and do something.

A number of us on the Republican side are trying to find ways to adjust parts of our foreign policy, our environmental aid, some of our engineering skills, and those things to those locals so that you can get rid of straws, even though 90 percent of the problem is these 10 rivers, eight in Asia, two in Africa.

If you claim you care, learn the actual facts, because virtue signaling does not make this world cleaner.

Let’s talk about this last week and optimism. Amazing article, a company called TerraPower, and apparently, Bill Gates is a substantial investor in it. It is a new, dramatically more efficient type of generating nuclear. There were some numbers in the article that I thought were important for the continuation of the thought experiment.

About 20 percent of America’s electric power comes from nuclear. Seventeen percent comes from renewables. Nuclear still is more than renewables. About 63 percent is from fossil fuels.

Here is the problem with that: If you take a look, the column here on my right—if you are watching this, you have a chance here. Do you notice something? The two lines are almost identical. If you are someone that is giddy—and look. I am from Arizona. We love our photovoltaic, but we also have the largest nuclear power plant, which is run by Arizona Public Service, in the country at amazing uptime. They do an amazing job running that facility. But this is nuclear power coming offline. That is photovoltaic going online.

You will notice there is no net positive. If you are someone that cares about CO₂, greenhouse gas going into the atmosphere, unless you are stabilizing nuclear power, instead of taking it offline, you didn’t get anywhere. But we will do it bipartisan, demonstrating you can do these things—is we updated what we call the carbon sequestration tax credit.

This is a facility that is up and running—what is it?—outside the Houston area, in Texas. I hope I don’t butcher the technology, but it is a natural gas-fired power plant with no smokestack.

They figured out how to take the natural gas, explode it, slam it through these pipes, spin to produce electricity, and on the other end, capture all the CO₂. Then they sell it, recycle it. Now we are learning they can take that CO₂, and through a process—I think you have to put it to like 150 bars of pressure and the CO₂ turns out it becomes an incredibly clean-burning fuel because it is really pure carbon.

This facility, I think—if I remember the article—they are trying now to find funding to go up to 300 megawatts. But they have proven you can burn a hydrocarbon, produce base-load electrical power, and not have a smokestack.

The technology is up and running today and, apparently, a few miles away, there is another plant that is doing the same experiment with coal and no smokestack.

This is a big deal, but there are many of us who also think of the greenhouse gas emissions, how we can reduce those. When you have countries like China and its Belt and Road Initiative, it is bringing on 32, 33 coal-fired power plants with functionally almost no greenhouse gas mitigation, carbon capture. They are not using the newest technology.

What happens to a world where someone like myself says that we need the economic growth, that we don’t have the economic growth, that we can never keep our economic promises that we have made to our seniors? Retirees are paying for this in the long run, in our economic expansion, but we want a clean environment.

The lunacy of some of the proposals, I beg of them, please, come by our office. We have binders of the disruptive technology that is coming out. This is one that I think we have to be joyful about.

How many of you have ever heard the discussion of negative carbon emissions? We have discussed this concept for 100 years. You can pull CO₂ out of the air.

It turns out this facility is up and running in its pilot project. Bill Gates
is also a funder of this. It is in Canada. I wish it was in Arizona. They are claiming right now that their facility can pull carbon out of the air for about $100 to $150 a ton, capture that carbon, package it, and make a clean-burning fuel out of it.

If the rest of the world continues to go the way it is going, the concept that we now have the technology to yank carbon out of the air, and if it is really heading toward $100 a ton, it is at the threshold where it is economical because the dollar values—some of the sequestration tax credits we do, but also the ability to convert it back into a fuel, it is almost in the money.

This is exciting. How many did you hear talk about this technology over the last 10 days? It is here.

My beloved university, Arizona State University, the biggest university in the United States, has an entire center devoted to this concept of technology that has a negative carbon sink. Functionally, it pulls carbon right out of the air. Their technology is passive, where the other one is active.

The professor working on this—I have met with him—freaky smart. He has a joyful view that basically says let’s let the technology compete. Whoever does it the best will win.

This one is more a distributive model of this passive collection where you can put it in lots of locations. Part of it is the cover for your bus stop, but it is also pulling carbon right out of the air. The technology is passive, where the other one is active.

The technology is here, so the Malthusians of this place—and if you don’t know what that means, please go look it up—somehow think we need to go back and live in the dark ages, basically, or that man has demonstrated over and over technology is a disruption.

Look, when I was growing up, I remember having a teacher read us the Population Bomb, scaring me to death that humans was out, the world was all going to be starving. How many of our kids out there today hear the propaganda on some of the reactionaries, the folklore about what is happening out there, that they are going to be in a planet that is burning up in their late teenage years?

The issues are real, but so are the technology solutions. It turns out solutions often aren’t as elegant as a great speech with lots of virtue signaling. I am very proud of the things that are happening out there.

A final bit of this thought experiment is—years ago, we were blessed—we had a Ph.D. of physics. I think he is now—well, he is at one of those special agencies that does really complex stuff right now. We did a math experiment for us. Methane, in our formula, was considered 84 times more greenhouse-causing in its first year than carbon. So, okay, you get 84 to 1.

☐ 1915

He came to me with this math experiment saying, if you could build a substantial pipeline or multiple pipelines in west Texas and a couple other large hydrocarbon-producing areas and it was designed to capture methane and take that methane and pull it in in enough density to actually convert it to a fuel, and then he had that and a couple other things, you hit the Paris accord numbers.

Isn’t that exciting? How many of our brothers and sisters here are already saying we need to be building a bunch more pipelines to go collect that methane so we can capture it, comprehend it, make sure it doesn’t go into the air except pipelines are, functionally, part of the religious process here and need to be opposed.

If anyone is watching, listening, go look this up: photosynthesis, 40 percent. I actually believe this may be the single most disruptive bit of technology in our lifetimes.

It looks like the inherent problem of plants. You remember all of your high school biology classes? We were told plant cells have had, for millions of years, a small flaw. Sometimes they really, really want that carbon molecule so they can make a sugar out of it and, instead, they grab an oxygen molecule.

Apparently, through synthetic biology, they figured out how to rearrange that plant cell so it always grabs the carbon. It grows the sugar, and the plants grow 40 percent more efficient.

Think about what would happen if that technology was part of our commodity crops, our fresh produce, the things we eat. The world would feed itself for another 250 years. It would mean 40 percent less land, 40 percent less water, 40 percent less fertilizer.

It turns out, world agriculture produces 2.2 times the greenhouse gases of every car on Earth. Do you know, if you had this type of technology as the crops for around the world, it would be equal to removing every car off the face of the Earth?

And, yes, it is a GMO, because the fix was done through a type of synthetic biology. But it would equal removing every car off the face of the Earth.

These are joyful thought experiments, but the technology is real, and it is here. We have to figure out, as a society, we can grow economically as a world.

My soon-to-be 4-year-old little girl can have an amazing future. We don’t have to be terrified about the debt cliff that is going to crush us because we grew. And we can have the amazing clean environment and deal with the issues of greenhouse gases.

Are we ready to pull our heads out and actually do that crazy thing of reading and math and understand the technology disruption is in front of us? Madame Speaker, are we ready to adopt, embrace the technology disruption that allows us to grow, prosper, and meet so many of our goals?

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

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader, Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, it is with grave concern for our country, our longstanding Western security alliances, and liberty itself that I rise today.

I have the distinct privilege of serving on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and co-chair the Congressional Ukraine Caucus.

As the Congresswoman from a district with a strong Ukrainian heritage and tens of thousands of citizens who understand what liberty demands, I hold a unique perspective and, dare say, deep knowledge to speak on the events of the past several days to provide some additional context on why the conversation between President Donald Trump and the newly elected President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, is so distressing to our national security.

The American public has looked on in horror as America’s President, President Trump, has willfully neglected his oath of office and sacred duty to defend the best interests of our Nation in favor of his own and, in effect, promote the interests of Russian dictator Vladimir Putin.

This week, we learned of yet another instance in which our President has put national security at risk in favor of advancing his own personal, partisan, political objectives.

According to a highly redacted White House memo released this morning, new Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky was quoted as saying he was "ready to buy more U.S. antitank missiles to defend his nation against Russian invasion."

And President Trump, without skipping a beat, responded: "I would like you to do us a favor, though."

A favor to receive the funds that this Congress passed and appropriated? A favor to disburse the funds already slated for Ukraine until President Trump held them back to ask a favor?

That is illegal. It is unconstitutional.

And it is dead wrong.

This exchange is not only a clear violation of the law; it is an unprecedented abuse of power that undermines our national security, violates our Constitution, and compromises the struggle for liberty on the continent of Europe that includes America’s most trusted allies through instrumentalities like NATO.

Article I of the Constitution clearly states that all legislative power shall be vested in the Congress of the United States and that Congress holds the awesome power of the purse.

On July 18, President Trump purposefully directed his administration to
withhold nearly $400 million in defense assistance for Ukraine from the State and Defense Departments’ budgets.

These funds were voted by Members of the House and Senate. And, frankly, at one point this year, we did not know that we would ever get these funds back. When we learned that we was, I joined my fellow Ukraine Caucus co-chair, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY of Chicago, in issuing a statement demanding that the money we had voted for be released.

Members of Congress wrote the President letters and sent them to the White House and were told by the administration that, well, you know, it was “an interagency delay” that caused the funds not to be released to a nation at war with Russia.

Russia invaded Ukraine, not the reverse. And the scrimmage line for liberty on the continent of Europe now is at the Russian-Ukrainian border, and our President delayed the release of those funds.

The President sought to make the release of national security funds passed and appropriated by this Congress contingent on asking a new foreign leader for a favor—a favor—prior to release of those funds.

Congress must compel the release of the full conversation that occurred between President Trump and the new President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, as well as the full whistleblower complaint as was previously submitted to the Office of Inspector General.

We do not have the full release. I will say more about that in a moment.

The document we were provided today was not a complete transcript of the conversation that our President had with President Zelensky. We only got about 11 minutes of a conversation that lasted upwards of 30 minutes. Congress must demand the full transcript and have investigative branch officials in contempt if they refuse to give us the full documents.

Like so many Americans, I am disgusted by President Trump’s repeated betrayal of American interests in favor of Vladimir Putin’s.

This President’s efforts to coercize Ukrainian President Zelensky, an allied leader, into helping him win re-election by urging congressionally supported military aid as leverage is not only a dramatic betrayal of the President’s constitutional duty; it is also the latest example of Trump doing Putin’s bidding.

I am certain that our President’s relationship with Vladimir Putin didn’t start with his veiled support for Putin’s election meddling or inviting the Russians to hack the Democratic National Committee or even lobbying, most recently, for Russia to be re-admitted to the G7, our most trusted allies, when Russia has invaded Ukraine’s sake.

Who benefits when Ukraine loses military assistance? It is an easy question. Russia, the country that is waging a bloody war in Ukraine for over 5 years.

Who is to say Putin wasn’t listening in when Trump blackmailed Zelensky? Madam Speaker, no Member of Congress has traveled to Ukraine as many times as I, beginning long before I was in Congress and long before the Berlin Wall fell. I can say with confidence that Ukraine, today, is the scrimmage line for liberty’s defense on the continent of Europe. And that is why President Trump’s decision to withhold this money is so troubling.

There is no more important strategic military alliance for liberty than America’s membership with European nations in NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Every minute of every day, NATO stands united to defend against dictatorships and protect our liberties.

Russia has always hated this organization and will do anything to disrupt the Western alliance, and she is hard and fast at work doing that as we stand here this evening.

We know the battlefields of Europe directly influenced the founding of our own Republic and our fundamental ideals of democracy. NATO stands ready, as we stand here tonight, to defend our liberty. In return, we keep our word—our word—for our NATO allies, a promise that has never been contingent on a single President’s political objectives back home.

After the collapse of communist Russia in 1991, Ukraine became a free nation. Ukraine had been occupied for all of its modern history but began its zig-zagged path forward to the free world, a path that has been torturous and fraught with danger and setbacks and, yes, bloody murder.

To this day, there exists an insidious network of corruption within Ukraine and Russian oligarchs whose tentacles reach far across Ukraine and the rest of the world, seeking to undermine the Western alliance while protecting the self-interests of the selfish, corrupting the path that continues to this day in that part of the world and, frankly, even reaching our shores.

It will be a permanent blot on American history that certain Americans, including President Trump’s campaign manager and several other Trump operatives, were actually involved in supporting these oligarchs and the undemocratic forces that are trying to undermine the Government of Ukraine every time by_criteria_defined_in_our_organizational_bylaws themselves. And these oligarchs steal and plunder billions of dollars with their Kremlin allies.

Despite these setbacks, since Ukraine’s Euromaidan Revolution of Dignity and Pride years ago, Ukrainian people have bravely demonstrated their resolve to commit to their nation’s democratic future.

The latest example is their historic Presidential and parliamentary elections, watched by international observers lauded as free and fair.

Meanwhile, Russia’s devastating invasion of Ukraine has resulted in more than 13,000 Ukrainian deaths, including civilians who have been targeted by Russian missiles, 30,000 injured, and more than 2 million displaced internally.

It is sad that Ukraine must fight a war on their own—a holy war against Russia, for which she is completely underarmed, and one against the enemy from within, the scourge of corruption, both perpetuated by Russian influence.

In fact, when Boris Nemtsov, a brave Russian, was prepared to lead a demonstration for Ukrainian independence, he was killed on the steps near the Kremlin—how about that?—in Moscow.

That is how Russia plays.

Ukraine’s new President, Volodymyr Zelensky, and his party in the Rada won a significant majority because he promised, finally, to root out this corruption.

While the ink is fresh on the Zelensky Presidency, we have high hopes for him and his ability to live up to the expectations of his people. It would be tragic if President Trump compromised him with his recent missteps.

In order to make good on his promise to root out corruption, President Zelensky must make clear his independence from every oligarch. A prime example is his benefactor, the infamous Ukrainian oligarch Igor Kolomoisky. Kolomoisky serves as an example of corrupt influence on Ukraine’s fragile political system.

With a net worth of over $1.2 billion—and I am sure that is a lowball number—Kolomoisky is one of the richest and most corrupt oligarchs in Ukraine. He also owns the television channel that ran the show “Servant of the People” that propelled Zelensky to stardom and popular acclaim.

The question for history will be: Will Ukraine’s new President be able to rise to the highest aspirations of those who voted for him? Or will he be mired in corruption at home and by entrapment by foreign leaders like President Trump?

Kolomoisky, like other oligarchs, did not become rich due to their acumen. Rather, they used lies, intimidation, cheating, stealing, money laundering, and killing—yes, killing. These are their stock in trade.

Kolomoisky used his company, PrivatBank, as a personal piggy bank by issuing endless loans to himself and, frankly, laundering billions of dollars—billions of dollars—including in this country, mainly in real estate.

In one instance, Kolomoisky hired hundreds of thugs—think about this—with iron rods, rubber bullet pistols, chainsaws, and baseball bats to raid a plant in order to take it over. He didn’t buy it. He stole it illegally, a macabre demonstration of a hostile takeover.

Due to Kolomoisky’s corruption and looting of the PrivatBank, the bank had lost $5.5 billion, putting Ukraine’s...
The newly reconstituted PrivatBank, which was taken over by the nation of Ukraine because, next to Ukraine, being the paths of repressive regimes. Freedom-lovers simply do not accept that way of life for ourselves or for the future of Ukraine.

For these reasons, I have invited Valeria to come to Capitol Hill to share her courageous story in the face of such brutal intimidation.

Corrupt oligarchs, with their ill-gotten gains, launder money to the West, where they know our laws will keep their ill-gotten money safe. How ironic it is that the Kremlin mouthpieces mock our values of openness and our strong tradition of rule of law while Putin’s cronies safely store and invest their loot elsewhere.

I can tell you that, in our country, recent reports have noted that Kolomoisky and his business partner, Gennadiy Bogolyubov, have funneled vast funds through various Delaware-based shell companies into properties and businesses around our Nation, even in my district of Cleveland, Ohio, where Kolomoisky has become downtown Cleveland’s largest commercial real estate owner. How about that?

It is not just in my State. It is in Florida. It is across this country. This is what is going on with the kind of corruption that spreads across our world, and it is why we have to pay attention to what is happening in Ukraine.

Kolomoisky laundered $470 billion through a Cyprus-based shell company between 2006 and 2016, potentially the largest money laundering case in history.

It is now reported that the FBI is currently investigating these international financial crimes. I fully support their investigation to get to the bottom of these corrupt dealings across the world but, certainly, in the region that I live.

The United States and our allies must send a message that such malign behavior will not be tolerated. We cannot be complicit in empowering foreign money laundering and the enrichment of corrupt oligarchs. We cannot encourage the kind of complicity that the President inferred in his remarks to President Zelensky in his recent conversation.

The United States and our allies can take steps to combat the illicit flows of money that empower the oligarch economy of money laundering, blackmail, murder, and extortion. Congress must enact beneficial ownership transparency legislation to prevent malign actors from easily opening shell companies here. We must continue to support investigative journalism, not just in Ukraine, but here in order to maintain our own liberty and remain the bastion of liberty for the free world.

President Zelensky and the newly elected Rada must now make good on their campaign promises to serve the people of Ukraine, not the oligarchs. Ukraine’s new President must fully support the work of anticorruption that has been promoted by even many Members of our own Congress, including Representative Brian Fitzpatrick from Pennsylvania, who has worked so hard to establish that effort even prior to his service here in the Congress.

The critical steps to perform the tasks include the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, the National Agency on Corruption Prevention, as well as the Anti-Corruption Court. The judicial system must be given true independence to root out corruption free from any kind of outsider political influence.

Madam Speaker, the Ukrainian people have our full support in their efforts to shake off the rapacious grip of corrupt oligarchs supported by Russia. Democracy shines in the sunlight, and we want that sunlight to shine here. Any conversation between our President and the new President of Ukraine that can reveal any attempt to undermine true independence for United States Congress is the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus Representatives’ statement condemning President Trump’s attempts to slow-roll $250 million in congressionally appropriated military aid for Ukraine, known as the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

"President Trump’s decision to slow-walk this congressionally appropriated military funding for Ukraine is disturbing and demonstrates once again his affinity for Russia and Russian President Vladimir Putin.”

"This funding is vital to preserving democracy in Ukraine and Eastern Europe and must not be delayed or hindered in any way.

"With Russia’s unprovoked, unwarranted and murderous invasion of Ukraine and with over 10,000 innocent Ukrainians now having been killed, the President and the United States should not be a defender of Russian interests. President Trump has repeatedly berated our closest allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for demanding sanctions on Russian oligarchs, and advocated for Russia being allowed back in the G7."

"The President of the United States should be a champion for liberty, not a pawn for dictators. This funding cannot be delayed."

MEMORANDUM OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Subject: Telephone Conversation with President Zelensky of Ukraine

Date, time and place: July 25, 2019, 9:03–9:33 a.m. EDT Residence.

The President: Congratulations.

President Zelensky: You are absolutely right. Mr. President. We did win big and we worked hard for this. We worked a lot but I would like to confess to you that I had an opportunity to learn from you and to a few of your skills and knowledge and were able to use it as an example for our elections.
and yes it is true that these were unique elections. We were in a unique situation that we were able to achieve a unique success. I’m able to tell you the following; the first time, you know, you have to congratulate me when you won my presidential election, and the second time you are now calling me when my party won the parliamentary election. I think that’s very important and I’m sure that we can talk more often and we can talk over the phone more often.

The President: [laughter] That’s a very good idea. I think your country is very happy about that.

President Zelenskyy: Well yes, to tell you the truth we are trying to work hard because we wanted to drain the swamp here in our country. We brought in many many new people. Not the old politicians, not the typical politicians. We want to have a new format and a new type of government. You are a great teacher for us and in that.

The President: Well it’s very much of you to say that. I will say that we do a lot for Ukraine. We spend a lot of effort and a lot of time. Much more than the European countries are doing and they should be helping you more than they are. Germany does absolutely nothing for you. All they do is talk and I think it’s something that you should really ask about. I was speaking to Angela Merkel she talks Ukraine, but she doesn’t do anything. A lot of the European countries are the same way so I think it’s something that you should look at. The United States has been very very good to Ukraine. I wouldn’t say that it’s reciprocal necessarily because things are happenings that are not good but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine.

President Zelenskyy: Yes you are absolutely right. Not only 100%, but actually 100% of the following: Russia is following us talk to Angela Merkel and I did meet with her. I also met and talked with Macron and I told them that they are not doing quite as much as they need to be doing on the issues with the sanctions. They are not enforcing the sanctions. They are not working as much as they should work for Ukraine. It turns out that even though logically, the European Union should be our biggest partner but technologically the United States is a much bigger partner than the European Union and I’m very happy that we are having such a strong relationship.

The President: Congratulations on a fantastic job you’ve done. The whole world was upset but congratulations. The whole world was upset but congratulations. We have a beautiful country which would welcome you in the White House, feel free to call. Give us a date and we’ll work that out. I look forward to seeing you.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you very much. I would be very happy to come and would be happy to meet with you personally and get to know you better. I am looking forward to our meeting. I would like to invite you to visit Ukraine and come to the city of Kyiv which is a beautiful city. We have a beautiful country which would welcome you. On the other hand, I believe that on September 1 we will be in Poland and we can meet in Poland hopefully. After that, it might be a very good idea for you to travel to Ukraine. We can either take my plane and go to Ukraine or we can take your plane, which is probably much better than mine.

The President: Okay, I will think about that. I look forward to seeing you in Washington and maybe in Poland because I think we are going to be there at that time.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you very much Mr. President.

The President: Congratulations on a fantastic job you’ve done. The whole world was watching. I’m not sure it was so much of an upset but congratulations.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you Mr. President bye-bye.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

BILLY PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 25, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1058. To amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to
research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAROUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the Congressional Record: A letter from the House Administration, transmitting notification that during Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 no payments were made from the General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Labor.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2296. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Steven M. Shepro, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of Lieutenant General on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2297. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approval of retired Vice Admiral Mark F. Faison III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2298. A letter from the Director, Naval Reactors, transmitting the Executive Summary of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program's latest reports on environmental monitoring and radioactive waste disposal, radiation exposure, and occupational safety and health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2299. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Student Assistance General Provisions and Federal Family Education Loan Program (Docket ID: ED-2018-OSPE-0027) (RIN: 1840-A026) received September 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 968); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Controls for Lower Performing Radar and Continued Temporary Modification of Category XI of the United States Munitions List (Public Notice: 10779) (RIN: 1400-AE68) received September 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 968); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2301. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s Freedom of Information Act 2018 Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(F)(ii)(I); Public Law 99-575, Sec. 503(b); (110 Stat. 1755); (121 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2302. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Relations, transmitting the Commission’s report stating that it did not complete or initiate competitive sourcing for conversion of supporting staff for the agency for the prior fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 677(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2303. A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting a report on postal officers and employees who received total compensation in calendar year 2018, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3868(c); Public Law 109-435, Sec. 506; (120 Stat. 3236); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2304. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter on the Department’s Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Annual Report to Congress, 2018, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20307(b); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2305. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (Docket No.: 17081777-8161-02) (RIN: 0648-XG901) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2306. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 18031813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG916) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2307. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atlantic Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (Docket No.: 18031813-9170-02) (RIN: 0648-XG916) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2308. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 18031813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG916) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2309. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting the PBO IP Act FY 2018 report, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 3001; Public Law 107-278, Sec. 222 (122 Stat. 2474); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination in Tiwari v. Shanahan, No. 17-cv-282 (W.D. Wash.), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 3301(a)(1); Public Law 107-278, Sec. 222 (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2311. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Freedom of Information Act 2018 Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20307(b); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.
Victims Compensation Fund, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3525(b); Public Law 98-473, Sec. 1208; (98 Stat. 2162); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit concerning United States v. Jumana Nagarwala et al., No. 17-cr-2290 (E.D. Mich.), filed Feb. 22, 2019, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530A(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania concerning Miller v. Barr, No.2:17-cv-2627 (E.D. Pa.), filed Feb. 22, 2019, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530A(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan of United States v. Jumana Nagarwala et al., No. 17-cr-20274 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 20, 2018), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530A(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice, transmitting the Department’s reports titled, “Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act: Report to Congress” and “Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Programs: Eleven Case Studies”, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 115-113, Sec. 2(a); (131 Stat. 2267) and 34 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 115-113, Sec. 131 Stat. 2279; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s reports, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportaiton and Infrastructure.

2296. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s draft of a bill to authorize funds for major medical facility projects and leases for FY 2020 and medical facility leases originally requested in FY 2019; jointly to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for Education and Labor, for a period to be continued in force such insurance coverage at the option of the enrollees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. HARRISON): H.R. 4484. A bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such insurance coverage at the option of the enrollees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADOWS: H.R. 4485. A bill to establish a public buildings partnership pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York): H.R. 4486. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to establish a State Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. LOWE, and Mr. SCHRADER): H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. WALKER): H.R. 4488. A bill to develop and implement national standards for the use of solitary confinement in correctional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. FORTEY and Mr. BASS): H.R. 4489. A bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of rates for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. HARRISON): H.R. 4484. A bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such insurance coverage at the option of the enrollees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADOWS: H.R. 4485. A bill to establish a public buildings partnership pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York): H.R. 4486. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to establish a State Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. LOWE, and Mr. SCHRADER): H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. WALKER): H.R. 4488. A bill to develop and implement national standards for the use of solitary confinement in correctional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. FORTEY and Mr. BASS): H.R. 4489. A bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of rates for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. BURGESS:
H. Res. 4490. A bill to require the Inspector General, Department of Justice, to submit a report to the Congress on the number of firearms recovered by the Bureau in cases in which such a denial was issued after the firearm was transferred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself and Mr. CLEVERLY):
H. Res. 4491. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. STIVICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL, F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):
H. Res. 4492. A bill to direct the Investment Committee to invest the investment choices of investors in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H. Res. 4493. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SENSENIBRNNER, Mr. GALVAGNO, Mr. MOOLOENAR, and Mr. HUZENGA):
H. Res. 4494. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to report a final rule relating to the listing of the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUZI (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. COOK):
H. Res. 4495. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DUNN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HARDER of California):
H. Res. 4496. A bill to extend indemnity for wildfires and hurricanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. HAALAND):
H. Res. 4497. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make improvements to the Federal Student Aid Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIBES (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PARCHMELLER):
H. Res. 4498. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources 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. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. GRANGALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HURST, Ms. KOWALL, Ms. PINOZZI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCNEESEY, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CARDOZ of Illinois, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KERTING, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KASS of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CASE, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WATERMAN SCHROEDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LANDEVIN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NGUSE, Mrs. DÍAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MORELLI):
H. Res. 509. A resolution expressing the need for immediate climate action in response to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, and 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. RUZ:
H. Res. 500. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JOHNSON of New York, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BLIRIKAS, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. SCHERRY):
H. Res. 592. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the eradication of smallpox and the importance of vaccination in the United States and worldwide; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. STEVERS):
H. Res. 594. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. GRJALVA (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHAANNA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILD, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):
H. Res. 594. A resolution expressing profound concern about threats to human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and the environment in Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, 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. HOLDING, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONNOILLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. LAWRENCE:
H. Res. 595. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BUDD:
H. Res. 4481. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PENCE:
H. Res. 4482. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers握住 of Congress and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government).

By Mr. SCHERRY:
H. Res. 4487. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. RICHMOND:
H. Res. 4488. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:
H. Res. 4489. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BURGESS:
H. Res. 4490. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and

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;
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States or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. MALINOWSKI:
H.R. 4691.
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.
H.R. 492.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.
H.R. 4949.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 4945.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.
By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:
H.R. 4946.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. SHALALA:
H.R. 4947.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Mr. SIRES:
H.R. 4948.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 3: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NORIEGA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 88: Mr. PETTERSON.
H.R. 94: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. McCOLLUM.
H.R. 132: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 333: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 444: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 510: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. SCHUERMANN and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 535: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 548: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 553: Mr. ROY.
H.R. 587: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 647: Mr. CONWAY, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. RESCHTENHALER.
H.R. 808: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 896: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 894: Mr. PETTERSON.
H.R. 4175: Mr. Crist.
H.R. 4193: Mr. Quigley, Ms. Craig, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Walz, Mr. Engel, and Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4236: Ms. Velázquez.
H.R. 4272: Mr. Case.
H.R. 4295: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 4270: Mr. Engel.
H.R. 4291: Mr. Caskey.
H.R. 4276: Mr. Keating.
H.R. 4272: Mr. Waltz, Mr. Engel, and Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4428: Ms. Hill of California, Ms. Nort
H.R. 4429: Ms. Herrera Beutler.
H.R. 4446: Mr. Mast and Mr. Gaetz.
H.R. 4460: Mr. Pappas.
H.R. 4466: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.
H.R. 4472: Mr. Sensenbrenner.
H.R. 4480: Mr. Crenshaw.
H.R. 4486: Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 4492: Mr. Kim, Ms. Underwood, Mr. Harner of California, and Mr. Newhouse.
H.R. 4505: Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Evans, and Ms. Houlahan.
H.R. 4510: Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Pocan, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Langevin, and Mr. Gooden.
H.R. 4511: Mr. Engel.
H.R. 4512: Mr. Sherman.
H.R. 4513: Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Tlaib, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Lewis, and Ms. Moore.
H.R. 4514: Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Costa, Mr. Keating, Mr. Lipinski, and Mr. Mitchell.
H.R. 4516: Mr. Rose of New York.
H.R. 4517: Mr. Crow and Mr. David Scott of Georgia.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

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

Let us pray.
Eternal God, thank You for Your sanctifying truth. Use our lawmakers to live Your truth for the glory of Your Name. May Your truth keep them from the things that can pollute their lives and dishonor You.

Lord, forgive us when we are reluctant to submit to You with our bodies, minds, and spirits. Make us all vessels of honor prepared for every good work.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

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

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute as in morning business.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT
Mr. GRASSLEY. We are getting toward the end of the year, and one of the issues I would like to get done—which has to go through the House of Representatives first—is the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. In regard to that agreement’s helping agriculture, I want to start by laying out the fact that there is a lot of anxiety in agricultural America.

Even though the harvest is about to start across Iowa, we had a really difficult, tough spring getting the crops in. There is a crop to be harvested, however, and farmers will now be doing that job. They hope they can cover their costs. And while they are doing that, they are thinking about putting in next year’s crop.

Passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement would inject more certainty into the plans that the farmers have about this year’s harvest and the plans they have for next year’s crop. Passage of that would signal to the world that here in the Congress are very serious about passing new, modern trade arrangements.

Yet we are running out of calendar days in 2019. Congress must step up and deliver for our hard-working farmers, as well as workers in America and small business in America and, in a sense, by getting this agreement passed, helping all of America. The time for the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement is now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday evening, Speaker PELOSI announced that the House of Representatives will begin what she called “an official impeachment inquiry.” But, really, we know that House Democrats have been indulging their impeachment obsession for nearly 3 years now—a never-ending impeachment parade in search of a rationale.

The very day President Trump was inaugurated, the Washington Post ran a news story with this headline: “The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun.” That was the day of his inauguration. Later that year, there were articles of impeachment introduced over the President’s language. So clearly, this has been an ongoing project for House Democrats since practically the moment that Secretary Clinton lost the election.

For months, Democrats insisted that Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation or the work of the Senate Intelligence Committee would prove their theories about a conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia. It didn’t happen. The facts disappointed them, but the impeachment parade kept marching along.

Yesterday, even though a bipartisan committee investigation into the new whistleblower allegations is underway—and just hours after the President offered to publicize the details of his phone call with the President of Ukraine—the dam finally broke. Speaker PELOSI couldn’t hold back the far left any longer. Before any of us even had the facts in hand, she caved to the left and announced an impeachment inquiry.

If this all sounds familiar, that is because at the time—literally, 1 week ago—the same Democrats were shouting about impeaching Justice Kavanaugh. That rush to judgment was based on a sketchy story in a major newspaper that promptly had to publish an enormous correction. But 1 week later, here they go again, threatening impeachment without the facts in hand.

Senate Republicans support the established proper procedures for considering this whistleblower report. In the meantime, while our friends across the Capitol rush to judgment and dive...
deeper into their nearly 3-year-old impeachment addiction, we will stay focused on the American people’s business.

**BORDER SECURITY**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, President Trump led the Federal Government to recognize our insecure southern border for what it is: a national emergency, a humanitarian and security crisis. Congress had heard plea after plea for more border security funding. We heard from senior leaders and career Border Patrol officers. We heard about all the surging illegal crossings, the unprecedented numbers of family units, and the strain on our facilities.

Yet Washington Democrats decided that giving this very real crisis the resources it required might anger the far left, which wants them to oppose President Trump at any cost. So the President tapped into a longstanding, 40-plus-year-old Presidential authority and reprogrammed a narrow set of funds to address the urgent crisis.

I have never been shy about my commitment to the institution of Congress and to our authorities, not least being the appropriation of taxpayer dollars. But we are talking about 40-plus-year-old Presidential authorities in current law. Unlike President Obama, who vaguely shrugged off the Federal Court when he established his DACA policy, President Trump’s decision was squarely within existing law. Nevertheless, our Democratic colleagues made the Senate vote to undo the President’s declaration back in March. Their resolution fell far short of earning a veto-proof majority.

Now, still unwilling to work with the President and Republicans on a long-term bipartisan solution for border security, Senate Democrats are making us repeat the same show vote again.

I would urge all colleagues to once again vote for border security and vote against the Democrats’ resolution when it comes up later today.

I understand the Democratic leadership would like to invent a false choice between border security and other important military construction projects. They want to tell the American people that we can either have border security or these other important projects, but for some reason, we can’t have both.

There are two problems to that argument:

Problem No. 1 is that it is a false choice of Democrats’ own invention. The only reason there could be any tradeoff between border security and these other priorities is their refusal to support commonsense border security. The only reason there is any tradeoff is that Democrats have refused to work with the President.

Problem No. 2 of their argument is that Congress has the full power to ensure that all of the military construction projects are fully funded. Work is ongoing on appropriations and the NDAA. It would be easy to ensure that these projects get all of the money they need.

Later today, the Senate will vote on exactly that. We will vote on several motions to instruct our NDAA conference. One of those motions will be a Republican proposal that we insist on fully funding these projects for our own servicemembers.

With the Kentuckians I represent, this is pretty simple. Kentuckians want our Nation to have a secure southern border. Kentuckians want full funding for the middle school at Fort Campbell—funding they have been waiting on for years, which is funding I proudly secured in the first place. Kentuckians know perfectly well that with everything the United States of America spends money on, there is no earthly reason the Democrats should force us to have one or the other. They don’t want to be used as pawns in the Democratic political game.

Even my Democratic colleagues who don’t support the administration’s border security agenda should not take out their frustrations on our Armed Forces. Every single Member of this body should be able to support the meaningful way fund military construction. I would urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on that motion later today.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 450.

### The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

### The motion was agreed to.

### The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor.

### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

### The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor.


Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 names.

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

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

**LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

**RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

S.J. Res. 54 is discharged, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

Later today, the Committee on Armed Services was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT**

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, readers of Forbes might have seen an article earlier this month entitled “Russian Navy To Be First To Field Hypersonic Cruise Missiles on Submarines.” Articles like this are a timely reminder of the ever-present need to invest in our military.

It can be easy to take U.S. military superiority for granted, but our military preeminence did not come out of nowhere. Our military is strong as a result of sustained investment and commitment. If we don’t stay committed to maintaining our military strength and advantage, we will lose them.

Meanwhile, as the Forbes article reminds us, other countries are busy investing in their militaries. Great powers with aggressive military tendencies are building up their armed forces and investing in the weapons and equipment of the future. We need to ensure that our military is not falling behind.

Later today, we will vote on additional measures related to the National Defense Authorization Act—legislation that we take up every year to authorize funding for our military and our national defense. Both the House and
Senate passed versions of this legislation this summer. Now Members from both Houses are working on reconciling the House and Senate versions of the bill. The Senate-passed National Defense Authorization Act was a strong bill, and I hope the final bill will look a lot like it.

Right now, our military is rebuilding after years of underfunding and the strains of the global War on Terror.

In November 2018, the bipartisan National Security 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 Russia or China, and the Commission noted that we would be especially vulnerable if we were ever called on to fight a war on two fronts.

Here in the Senate, Members of both parties have been working together to address the military’s rebuilding needs and ensure that we are prepared to meet any threat.

The bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act that we passed in the Senate in June authorizes funding for our military’s current needs and for the equipment and technology of the future. It invests in ships, combat vehicles, and planes—including development of the future B-21 bomber, which will be based at Ellsworth Air Force Base in my home State of South Dakota—and continued procurement of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter. It will ensure that our military is as strong as it is. Both the House and Senate versions of the National Defense Authorization Act authorize a 3.1-percent pay increase for our troops—the largest increase in a decade. This is not only something our troops have earned, it is also an important way to retain troops in our All-Volunteer Force when the economy is as strong as it is. Both the House and Senate bills also focus on addressing the recent significant health and safety issues faced by many families with private on-base housing.

I hope House and Senate conferees will produce a strong bill and that both Houses will be able to pass this legislation in the near future.

In a 1793 address to Congress, President George Washington noted:

If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repell it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising dignity must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

The surest way of preserving peace is to be strong militarily. Weakness is a tempting target for aggressive regimes and evil men. Strength, on the other hand, can and does restrain those who might otherwise pursue war with the United States or our allies. Maintaining our military strength helps ensure the security of our country and her inhabitants. It also helps promote peace around the world.

We can’t change the fact that there will always be bad actors who will threaten our freedom and security, but we can assure that we are always prepared to meet any threat.


I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, Speaker NANCY PELOSI announced that the House of Representatives has transmitted the whistleblower complaint to Congress. The nature of that whistleblower complaint has been revealed, and the House will make a decision on how it should be handled.

The House members have spoken to her many times over the past few days. I know she did not make this decision lightly and took no pleasure in making it. It is her carefully considered judgment that it is now in the best interest of our country and our Constitution to proceed with an impeachment inquiry.

I strongly support Speaker Pelosi’s decision. If we don’t reckon with President Trump’s transgressions, the very near future will be a leading political rival. The President’s conduct made an impeachment inquiry unavoidable.

The events of recent days have brought sharply into focus the question of whether President Trump abused the powers of his office and betrayed the public trust for personal political gain. In open defiance of the law, his administration has thus far sought to block the transmission of an official whistleblower complaint to Congress. The nature of that whistleblower complaint has been revealed, and the Inspector General has been asked to review it.

I hope, I pray it is a harbinger of things to come, where we can look at the facts, not at the politics, and come to conclusions because, without doubt, the White House and the President’s congressional allies will rush to call this effort a partisan witch hunt no matter how serious the allegations or how evenhanded the inquiry. I would remind everyone that just yesterday, every Senate Republican agreed that the White House did not know the whistleblower complaint from Congress was wrong. There was unanimous, bipartisan agreement in the Senate on that point. Not a single Senator objected. Let me be clear, nonetheless, because I know we are prone to partisan charges and countercharges, and I want to be clear: there was no evidence of partisanship and there was no evidence of witness tampering.

This inquiry was not taken up for partisan reasons, and it does not prejudge an outcome.

We need to see the complete, unredacted whistleblower complaint without further delay. The whistleblower complaint must be able to testify without fear of intimidation, and then we must pursue the many relevant avenues of inquiry that I just described.

Yesterday afternoon, the entire Senate—47 Democrats and 53 Republicans—agreed to my resolution calling for the whistleblower complaint to be transmitted immediately to Congress—a reflection of the seriousness with which these events are viewed on both sides of the aisle. This was unexpected.

In the past, when we have asked to look into President Trump, our Republican colleagues have stonewalled. But to their credit, they realized the seriousness of this situation and unanimously agreed to support our resolution. I hope, I pray it is a harbinger of things to come, where we can look at the facts, not the politics, and come to conclusions because, without doubt, the White House and the President’s congressional allies will rush to call this effort a partisan witch hunt no matter how serious the allegations or how evenhanded the inquiry. I would remind everyone that just yesterday, every Senate Republican agreed that the White House did not know the whistleblower complaint from Congress was wrong. There was unanimous, bipartisan agreement in the Senate on that point. Not a single Senator objected. Let me be clear, nonetheless, because I know we are prone to partisan charges and countercharges, and I want to be clear: there was no evidence of partisanship and there was no evidence of witness tampering.

This inquiry was not taken up for partisan reasons, and it does not prejudge an outcome.
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Mr. President, on another issue, not directly related but with the same cause, with the same word, and with the same concern, an overreaching Exec-utive are the emergency declaration.

The commencing of the impeachment inquiry in the House, while significant, is not the only significant action Congress will take today, nor is it the only action dealing with the President's overreach.

Today the Senate will vote on President Trump's national emergency declara- tion, which he is using to steal money from our military in order to fund a border wall. Rather than accept the majority's bipartisan majority has repeatedly rejected this idea, after dragging the country through the longest government shutdown in Amer- ican history when he didn't get his way, President Trump deliberately circunvented Congress.

Democrats universally opposed the President's outrageous decision to de- clare a national emergency, so let me direct my remarks this morning to my Republican colleagues.

There are two crucial reasons for my Republican colleagues to vote to termi- nate this emergency.

First, the vote today is the surest and likely the only way to restore funding the President has stolen from our troops and military projects across the country. President Trump promised Mexico would pay for the wall, not American taxpayers, and certainly not the military—the men and women and their families involved in keeping our Nation secure. President Trump broke that promise, leaving over 120 mil- litary projects hang in the balance: a middle school for military families in Kentucky, medical facilities in North Carolina, a hurricane relief project in Florida, an Air Force Base in Colorado, a fire station in South Carolina, and construction projects in Indiana, Louisi ana, Georgia, and more. These were all carefully considered by the military and Department of Defense and put in place at the very last minute. These were not frivolous projects at all. A vote for the President today is a vote in favor of cutting fund- ing for our military and slashing sup- port for critical military projects in Red States and Blue States.

Second, and maybe even more importantly, my Republican colleagues should vote to terminate the emer- gency declaration today on constitu- tional grounds. Under the Constitu- tion, the power of the purse lies with Congress not the President. By declar- ing a national emergency, the Presi- dent has trampled on that authority and is violating the constitutional sep- aration of powers. We know what an emergency is—situations of great risk, the risk of war. Of course, the President should have flexibility then but not on a pol- icy decision where there is great dis- pute in the Congress and in the country and when the President lost in the legis- lative battle that ensued. By voting to endorse the President's emergency— this expansive and political stretching of the word "emergency" in a way it has never been stretched before—Re- publican Senators will set a dangerous precedent that could embolden not just this President but future Presidents to ignore congressional authority.

So today my Republican colleagues face a choice of whether or not to de- fend our troops, whether or not to de- fend their States, whether or not to de- fend this Chamber's undeniable con- stitutional powers.

Last time we held this vote, 12 Re- publican colleagues joined us in voting to undo the emergency. I hope we do so this time because this isn't about Republicans and Democrats. We don't want any President, Democratic or Re- publican, to overreach and use the word "emergency" to overcome con- gressional will. This is about checks and balances, not about Republicans and Democrats, and the need for the Senate to rein in an out-of-control Exec- utive.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The article details a bill Senate Democrats wanted to use to exploit al- legations of conflicts of interest be- tween President-Elect Trump's busi- ness dealings and President Trump's duties as President. Bear in mind, the bill, if passed, entitled "Democrats are Paving the Way to Impede Donald Trump." Believe it or not, this was not just click bait. This was a published article in a major magazine in December 2016.

Before the President had taken his oath of office—bear in mind, he was President-elect at that time—in De- cember of 2016, Vanity Fair published an article entitled "Democrats are Paving the Way to Impede Donald Trump." Believe it or not, this was not just click bait. This was a published article in a major magazine in December 2016.
party to support a resolution to impeach President Trump. The same effort failed again in 2018, and it failed again in 2019. Their efforts to use the Mueller report to whip the Nation into an impeachment frenzy failed. How frustrating that it all has been for a party and a movement that all but promised they would find a way to impeach the President because they absolutely could not believe he won that election in 2016.

It is important to remember and to note that even people chose President Trump and not the Democratic candidate. That didn’t matter. Democrats vowed to take him down anyway. They were going to make him pay a very heavy price by making him the victim of a campaign of personal destruction.

Now, conveniently, a year before the election, here they go again. They are indicating they think they have cracked the case.

In November 2018, House Speaker NANCY PELOSI gave a statement to the Associated Press saying: “We shouldn’t impeach the president for political reasons and we shouldn’t impeach the president for political reasons.”

Let me say that for the West Tennesseans participating in the telephone townhall I mentioned earlier, it was painfully obvious that congressional Democrats had finally given up and embraced politics as usual. They see this for what it is: vitriol, anger, jealousy, spite. They know that President Trump and a Republican-led House and Senate delivered much needed tax and regulatory relief, which was exactly what the American people wanted and precisely what Tennesseans were telling us: Get government off our backs. Get government out of our pocketbooks.

We are a nation built on the rule of law and a nation that believes in adhering to the law. Tennesseans, and the American people, want fairness. They want equal treatment. They want justice. And they know injustice when they see it. What they do not want is a breathless revenge scheme orchestrated by a political party.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate is going to be voting on the motion to instruct conferees for the National Defense Authorization Act to backfill the military construction money the President stole from our troops with a wall that he gave his word Mexico would pay for.

This is very, very troublesome. I say this as both dean of the Senate and as President pro tempore emeritus. In that role, I have arguably supported and voted for more funding for our military and their families than any Senator—Republican or Democrat—in this Chamber, but on this one, I will urge a ‘nay.’

As Members of the Senate—there are only 100 of us to represent 350 million Americans—we have a profound responsibility to support those who sacrifice everything for our country. We should not let this be a partisan issue. As I said recently—$3.6 billion for our troops than any Member of this body from the soldier we have sent across the globe to the military family left at home, we—all 100 of us—have a responsibility to these men and women, regardless of our politics and our ideology. It is that responsibility that has drawn me to the Senate floor today. I cannot and will not support this motion.

There is $6.1 billion. Let me say that again. There is $6.1 billion—that is $2.5 billion from the Department of Defense and $3.6 billion from military construction projects—that President Trump has stolen from the men and women of our military in fiscal year 2019 alone. Why? Just for just an ineffective, vanity wall—a wall that he boasted to the press last week was the “Rolls-Royce” of walls.

But just like every Rolls-Royce in the middle of the desert, Trump’s wall is now more than our military can effectively, and completely useless. Experts agree that a wall will do nothing to address the humanitarian crisis along our southern border.

Families fleeing violence in their home counties—fleeing murder, rape, and other crimes—are openly turning themselves over to Border Patrol officials. They are not trying to sneak across the border. It is a lot different than absconding across the border in the middle of the desert.

What has $6.1 billion in stolen funds purchased for the American taxpayers? Here is the money that was taken away from our military: Children continuing to go to a middle school in Kentucky every day that Pentagon officials have described as ‘deficient, inadequate, and undersized’—we took money from that to pay for the wall. Buildings that do not meet the military standards for fire safety or management of explosives, putting American citizens at risk—we took money from correcting that to pay for the wall. And there are numerous cases of infrastructure problems that are detrimental to our military’s readiness and DoD’s national security mission. That is not even mentioning the military housing with mold issues, inadequate daycare facilities for the children of military families, and all the 127 military construction projects President Trump canceled—not delayed but canceled—tore down, to pay for his Rolls-Royce of a wall in the middle of the desert.

The $6.1 billion for a Rolls-Royce in the middle of the desert is an even heavier burden for our military families to bear. Outrage does not even begin to describe how I feel about President Trump’s actions.

Today, we are being asked to somehow cover up his theft, cover up the fact that he broke his word about Mexico, and cover up the fact that this is a vanity project. We are being asked to give our constitutional blessing to President Trump’s contorting the law beyond recognition.

I believe that the Senate is the conscience of the Nation. Consorting the law to undo congressional funding decisions by fiat is not following our conscience, and I will not stand for that.

I am being asked to take the first step to approve $3.6 billion in emergency spending to replace part of what the President stole. Let’s make another thing clear. This spending is on top of the discretionary caps agreed to by Congress and the President. So we are being asked to finance this coverup on our children and grandchildren through deficit spending.

I would say this to the President: I believe you said that Mexico was going to pay for your wall. You breached your word about Mexico, not their families, and not future generations of American citizens. If this were not troubling enough, last week, the press reported in the Washington Post that the Trump administration does not even intend to use this funding to replace what they stole. “The plan is to sell it as replenishment money for the Defense Department for the $3.6 billion they took this year,” said one administration official. “Then, once they got it from Congress, they would take it again.”

What is the saying? Fool Congress once, shame on you. Fool Congress twice, well, shame on us. Congress got fooled once. Are we just going to stand by idly and allow Congress to be fooled again?

I have heard a lot of speeches on this floor, and politicians often wax poetic about their love of our troops. Yet this body—the 100 Members of this body that should be the conscience of our Nation—has done nothing to constrain President Trump’s ability to continue to steal from those troops. We have done little more than shrug at this abuse of our constitutional authority. We have just looked away from the egregious treatment of our troops as a little more than a piggy bank for the President’s political pet project. I don’t stand for that. I am not going to support that. I will not abandon our profound responsibility to support those who sacrifice everything for our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, our friends in the House, led by Speaker PELOSI, have adopted a new strategy for handling allegations of wrongdoing. It is a dangerous approach, one in which they choose to put their politics before the facts and politics trumps everything else, including the law.

Yesterday evening, Speaker PELOSI announced that the House is now moving forward with impeachment President Trump. When the announcement was made, the only information they had in their hands was press reports—no report of the transcript, no facts, no evidence, no nothing—and that they were not even sure who they needed to hook, any angle, any straw they might be able to grasp in order to justify this unjustifiable action was good enough for them—hearsay and press reports.

House Democrats began this process of impeaching the President based on a so-called whistleblower complaint they hadn’t even read, which detailed a call they hadn’t seen a transcript of. Meanwhile, we know the media eagerly reported that the “whistleblower” didn’t even have a knowledge of the situation—something we now know to be true. In other words, the alleged whistleblower doesn’t legally qualify as a whistleblower because he or she wasn’t there when the conversation took place. But, rather, reported something that somebody told somebody else—otherwise known as hearsay. Forgetting the evidence, giving people an opportunity to be heard, and the facts considered. Rather than looking into that, they decided on a result they wanted to achieve and were looking at trying to backfill a justification or something that is unjustified based on the facts we know now.

Of course, we know what this is. This is a continuation of the election in 2016 where our Democratic friends can’t believe that Hillary Clinton lost the election to Donald Trump. We know that after that, they claimed: Well, Hillary Clinton’s the popular vote winner. Forget the Constitution and the role of the electoral college. Because of the constitutional requirement that the electoral college vote and whoever wins the majority becomes President—they said: Forget the Constitution.

Then there was the former FBI Director, Comey, who leaked memos to a buddy of his and then asked him to leak them to the press because he wanted to make sure that special counsel was appointed to investigate and potentially prosecute President Trump. We know this investigation went on for years and cost millions of dollars and ended up with the conclusion no crime and no evidence. You can imagine the disappointment of our friends in the media who had written about this assuming that President Trump would be indicted, maybe convicted of some offense, only to find out there was no collusion, no obstruction, and no charges.

So now we know that the Speaker and her colleagues in the House have grabbed hold of this straw without knowing the facts and without even waiting for the evidence to be revealed. The Speaker’s decision to impeach the President says everything you need to know about their intentions. It doesn’t matter what the facts were, it was not: it is about relitigating the 2016 election—something our Democratic colleagues have never ever been able to accept. They are trying to defy the voters who voted for President Trump in 2016.

Does a whistleblower complaint deserve to be examined and taken seriously? Absolutely. In fact, the Senate Intelligence Committee, on which I and the Presiding Officer sit, will do just that. We are in the process of doing that. Before the Speaker’s announcement yesterday, the President had agreed to release the full, unredacted transcript of the call, and this morning, he did. Tomorrow, the Senate Intelligence Committee will hear from Acting Director of National Intelligence Joseph Maguire, as well as the Inspector General for the Intelligence Community, Michael Atkinson, to learn more about their role in this process. That is exactly how this matter should be dealt with here, by the rules, I would say by the book, and make sure that everybody’s rights are protected before people begin to cast unjustified and slanderous allegations.

Our friends in the House, the House Democrats, are burning flames here; they have been pouring gasoline out for months through their baseless oversight hearings and all-out obsession with the Mueller investigation, which ended up with a big belly flop. Yesterday, Speaker PELOSI lit the match, and there is no turning back now. The American people have made abundantly clear that this sort of partisan exercise is not what they want, especially when it comes at the expense of other important work that we are not going to be able to accomplish because of this obsession with eliminating President Trump. In a poll this summer, only 34 percent of Texans supported impeachment.

While so much remains in the air, this move has made one thing clear: Our House colleagues have zero interest in doing the jobs they were elected to do in 2018, and given the fact that the voters gave them the majority, they should lose governing and in passing legislation. Instead of working with both sides of the aisle to pass bipartisan legislation to lower drug costs, to try to address the concerns about mass shootings, to ratify the trade agreement known as the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, and otherwise try to make life better for the American people—that is not the route they have chosen. They have chosen a partisan, political path, which will absolutely suck all the oxygen out of the country, the obsession with impeaching President Trump, the obsession of the media and the American people until it is concluded, crowding out anything and everything else that we might do that might improve the lives of regular Americans.

The Democrats’ decision to move forward with impeachment and toward removing the President from office will make solving these big challenges facing our country impossible. House Democrats aren’t doing what is right and what is best for our country; they are driving an even bigger wedge between the American people to serve their partisan political interests and using the Constitution to hedge a political fight.

Now, make no mistake about it—when Special Counsel Mueller was doing his investigation, it was an investigation to see whether crimes had been committed and if they had been, to present that evidence to a grand jury and indict those who were more likely than not to have committed those offenses and then to try the case to a conclusion in a court. That is not what impeachment is. Impeachment is solely a political exercise, and it is a political exercise to defeat President Trump even though the American people voted for him as the President of the United States.

Notwithstanding the gasoline that House Democrats have been pouring on this issue and the fact that Speaker PELOSI decided to light the match and to ignite it yesterday, one thing is sure, and that is that cooler heads will prevail here in the Senate. We know bipartisan legislation is possible. We have done it before, and it can be done again. House Democrats’ obsession with the 2016 election has gone too far, and in fact, they should be embarrassed by what they have done. Meanwhile, we will carefully examine the record, root out the evidence, and follow that evidence wherever it may lead. It is important to have a fair trial before you decide to hand out punishment, not hand out the punishment and then somehow look for justification for an already reached conclusion.

DEBBIE SMITH ACT OF 2019

Mr. President, on another matter, it has been 4 months since we passed the Debbie Smith Act of 2019. This legislation sailed through the Senate without any Senator voting against it. And why would they? It is as bipartisan—you might even say nonpartisan—as they come.

The Debbie Smith Act, as Members know, sends vital funding to State and local crime labs to test DNA evidence. It authorizes training for law enforcement and forensic nurses and enables law enforcement to identify violent criminals and get them off the streets.

The benefit of the Debbie Smith Act is wide-ranging, but it continues to deliver on the initial goal of reducing the national rape kit backlog. That is right—at one point, there were as many as 400,000 untested rape kits sitting in labs or on evidence shelves in police lockers, and each one of those rape kits is a potential key to identifying a person who had committed a sexual assault or some other crime.
In Texas alone, the Debbie Smith Act has helped us reduce the backlog of untested rape kits by approximately 90 percent. Since 2001, we have gone from roughly around 20,000 untested rape kits to 2,000. That is still too many; we need to test all of them. We have made serious progress, and I won’t be satisfied until that untested rape kit number gets to zero, but to do that, Congress needs to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act.

It should be obvious, but I will say it anyway. This program transcends politics or party. Allowing it to expire is a disservice to the victims and the advocates who have championed this legislation since it was first enacted 15 years ago.

I introduced the Debbie Smith Act of 2019 in the Senate with my friend and colleague from California, a Democrat, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, which just demonstrates bipartisan support from Republicans, Democrats, victims’ rights groups, law enforcement, you name it. But despite all of that, Speaker PELOSI has refused to bring this legislation to the House floor for a vote, and unless they pass it soon, this critical program will expire for the first time in a week.

There was absolutely no problem reauthorizing this critical program in 2008 or 2014, but clearly times have changed. Our House Democratic colleagues aren’t above politicizing something as noncontroversial as reducing the rape kit backlog.

If House Democrats allow this to expire, funds could soon be taken away from crucial activities like prosecuting cold cases, reducing the backlog, or capacity enhancing efforts. It is simply inexcusable and shameful that Speaker PELOSI and the House would allow the Debbie Smith Act to expire when they had a bipartisan bill in their hands for 4 months.

We urge our colleagues in the House to quit the games and pass this critical legislation to support victims of sexual assault without further delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am here today because our elections are still not secured against the threat of foreign interference.

After years of our intelligence community, our congressional committees, and some of our closest allies sounding the alarm about foreign election interference, we are right back here where we started because this body has failed to act. To me, it is pretty remarkable.

No one in this body would think that the appropriate protections against foreign interference into our power grid should be a partisan issue. No one would advance theory that protecting our financial system against foreign cyber attacks should be a partisan issue. So why would anyone think to allow the basic protections of the machinery and systems that is the essential component of our democracy, our voting system, in any way to become a partisan issue? My hope is we can avoid that.

Some may point to the fact that additional money has been appropriated for State and local election authorities, funds that have been used to upgrade part of our election infrastructure. I am proud to have been part of the initial efforts to secure these funds ahead of the 2018 elections, and I am genuinely worried that a continuing stream of funding to secure the 2020 elections. But we need to make one thing absolutely clear. Additional funding for election security is a necessary part of securing our elections, but it is not a sufficient defense against foreign attacks on our democracy. Money alone will not solve this problem.

Moreover, the funding we are talking about in the CR comes with no guidance or direction for State and local election officials. Listen, I have no interest in trying to federalize what has traditionally been a State and local function, but it is absolutely a tradition that this body sometimes makes voluntary Federal funding available only to jurisdictions that meet certain criteria or guidelines. The truth is, right now, with no guidelines, if a State or locality wants to use these so-called election security funds to upgrade their machines or systems to the latest, more secure models, they can do that. But they can also buy machinery and equipment that lacks proper security features—that could lack a paper ballot backup. Heck, they could even use these funds to buy the “vote here” signs and those stickers we all proudly wear on election day.

The truth, unfortunately, is that the problem is not with our State and local election officials. In fact, the decentralized nature of our local elections system is actually one of our best defenses against election interference.

The problem is not a lack of policy solutions. Frankly, I think a lot of us on both sides of the aisle, including very good work by folks like the Presiding Officer, know exactly what we need to do to secure our election infrastructure.

We need a voter-verified paper trail for every vote. Everyone should have the confidence that no matter where they vote in America, it is forbidden, if there were ever a hack into a machine or a machine doesn’t work—there is a paper ballot backup so that every vote will be accurately counted.

We need to make sure, as well, just as in any major operation, that we have postelection audits.

We can and must do more to secure our voter registration systems. None of this is Democrat, and none of this is Republican; it is an integrity and security aspect of how Americans vote.

The problem is the lack of political will in the U.S. Senate and the lack of interest from the White House to actually secure our elections.

There is one reason, and that is the man majority leader allows this kind of bipartisan election security legislation to proceed, our elections will remain vulnerable to manipulation by foreign actors. I also firmly believe that these bipartisan bills—which, for example, Senator LANKFORD has been one of the leaders on—would get 75 or 80 votes even in our divided Senate.

You don’t have to take my word on the nature of the threat. Every one of our intelligence agencies is continuing to tell us that Russia is actively hacking up to 2020, and we are running out of time to do something about it. As a matter of fact, Robert Mueller, who led the special counsel’s investigation efforts, testified under oath that Russia is attempting to undermine the 2020 elections “as we sit here.”

For almost 3 years, Senators from both parties have worked on legislation to make sure we are ready for the threats our democracy will face in 2020. Unfortunately from other bad actors who are adapting Russia’s playbook because they saw how successful Russia was in 2016. They were both successful in a relatively inexpensive way to disrupt our system and, in many ways, to pit us against each other. Yet the Senate has not brought up a single piece of election security legislation—not a single vote, not a single markup.

For almost 3 years, Senators from both parties have worked on legislation to make sure we are ready for the threats our democracy will face in 2020. Unfortunately from other bad actors who are adapting Russia’s playbook because they saw how successful Russia was in 2016. They were both successful in a relatively inexpensive way to disrupt our system and, in many ways, to pit us against each other. Yet the Senate has not brought up a single piece of election security legislation—not a single vote, not a single markup.

(Mr. LANKFORD assumed the Chair.)

The bills we are proposing are largely bipartisan. We are talking about straightforward, low-hanging fruit that in normal times would have overwhelming, if not unanimous, support.

We need to pass legislation that secures our election infrastructure with the tools I just laid out: paper ballots, post-election audits, and enhanced cyber security for election systems.

We are saying that the Department of Homeland Security and local election officials should be able to talk to each other in a classified setting so they can know the threats they are facing. We are saying that if local election officials have reason to suspect that a serious cyber security incident has occurred, they need to alert the appropriate Federal officials and, if true, appropriate congressional officials need to know as well.

I also believe we need online ads to follow the same rules as TV, radio, and print advertising. If you are seeing an election ad that was produced or bought in St. Petersburg and paid for in rubles, I think Americans have a right to know. We are saying that if
Russia attacks our elections again—or any other foreign power—they should immediately face sanctions. Of all things, you would think the President would be willing to punch back against an attack on the sovereignty and integrity of our elections.

Finally, we are saying that if a foreign party reaches out to your campaign offering dirt on a fellow American, the appropriate response is not to say thank you; the appropriate response is to call the FBI. The DHS motto, “If you see something, say something,” needs to apply in terms of interference in our Presidential elections.

The truth is, what happened in 2016 will happen again in 2020 if we are not prepared. That is why we cannot allow election security to become a partisan issue. I spent a lot of time working with my Republican colleagues on these bills. I want to particularly recognize the President’s Office, who has really been one of if not the leading voice on these bipartisan efforts to secure elections. I know he has been working relentlessly to find a way to help get this legislation to the floor, and I thank him because these are commensurate and disproportionate proposals that will make our democracy more secure against foreign attack.

We should hold hearings, if necessary, offer amendments, and vote on this critical legislation while we still have time. That is what we were sent here to do, and that is what we must do if we are going to secure our democracy in 2020.

**Healthcare**

Mr. President, I want to turn to protections for people with preexisting medical conditions because these protections are under threat by this President.

Under the pretext of so-called short-term plans, the Trump administration is pushing healthcare plans that, once again, allow insurance companies to discriminate against Americans based on their medical history. These skinny plans—or I refer to them as “junk plans”—also undermine the Affordable Care Act’s requirements that insurance cover things like emergency room visits, maternity care, and other essential benefits.

Let me be clear. The reason this market has suddenly been flooded with these plans—in many cases advertising in low-income markets that these are ACA or ObamaCare plans—is not because Congress passed any law. The President tried and failed twice to pass legislation ending these protections for folks with preexisting conditions. Since they couldn’t get their way in Congress, now they are using Executive action to try to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

I have introduced a resolution under the Congressional Review Act that would use this executive power to desitalize the health insurance market and weaken protections that Americans count on. Today I am filing a discharge petition so that it will bring this resolution to the Senate floor for an up-or-down vote. The truth is, every Member of this body knows someone—either in their family or close relatives—with a preexisting condition. The American Academy of Pediatrics—these Members themselves have preexisting conditions. In Virginia alone, more than 1 million people live with preexisting conditions.

Before the Affordable Care Act, an insurance company had every right to deny these individuals coverage, charge them unaffordable premiums, or, when they got that condition, terminate their plan. I think we all agree we can’t go back to those days. The administration knows perfectly well that these junk plans don’t offer real benefits. They have been warned repeatedly by hundreds of patient groups, physicians, hospitals, and insurance, including the American Heart Association, AARP, the American Academy of Pediatrics—just to name a few of the organizations that have come out against these plans. All of these stakeholders are telling us the same thing: The Trump administration’s plan will weaken consumer protections and disproportionately hurt sick and older Americans.

My Republican colleagues insist that they actually support protections for folks with preexisting conditions. OK. With this CRA, I think there is a chance to prove it. This resolution we are introducing today will force an up-or-down vote on these junk plans that explicitly undermine protections for preexisting conditions. If my colleagues truly support these protections, they should vote yes. It is that simple. Instead of abiding or going along with the administration’s effort to undermine the stability of the healthcare market, let’s not do that. Let’s go back to the ACA. Let’s look at how we can work together on better access to Affordable Care Act. I serve on the committee, and I know the Finance Committee has taken a first step. I hope there will be more—in terms of putting some reasonable constraints on drug prices. It is not fair or right that Americans pay more for drugs than anyone else in the world and, in a sense, subsidize the R&D for the whole world.

There are a host of areas where we can find agreement. Let’s make sure that one part of the ACA that I think everyone agreed to was this notion that folks with preexisting conditions should not be discriminated against. I think the CRA would allow the Senate to go on record on this critically important issue. I look forward to the opportunity to have this voted on and debated when we come back from the break.

I yield the floor.

My colleagues, irrespective of whether you support or oppose a border wall, I urge you today to support this resolution and stand up for the separation of powers laid out in our Constitution. In doing so, you are standing up for our Constitution.

Thank you.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution to terminate the emergency declaration. I want to thank Senator Udall, the Senator from New Mexico, for his leadership. The question presented by this resolution is not whether you are for a border wall or against a border wall. The question is not whether you believe the security at our southern border is sufficient or it should be strengthened. Instead, the question is a far more fundamental and significant one. The question is simply this: Should the Congress of the United States of America yield its constitutionally prescribed power of the purse to the President?

The answer to that question, regardless of who is in the White House and who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.

Congress alone is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing money to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to decide how that money is to be spent from the U.S. Treasury. Congress alone is empowered to control who is controlling Congress, should be no.
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 Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[RoCcall Vote No. 302 Leg.]

YEAS—54

A resolution (S. Res. 332) instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the conference on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 630A of the House amendment (relating to the prohibition of reduction of Survivor Benefit Plan survivor annuities by amounts of dependency and indemnity compensation).

A resolution (S. Res. 333) instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 816 of the House amendment (relating to polyfluoroalkyl substances for land-based applications of firefighting foam).

A resolution (S. Res. 334) instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 316 of the Senate bill (relating to the use of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances for land-based applications of firefighting foam).

A resolution (S. Res. 335) instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the members of the conference to include the provisions contained in section 2006 of the Senate bill (relating to reimbursement of certain military construction funds).

A resolution (S. Res. 336) instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the members of the conference to consider potential commonsense solutions regarding family and medical leave, including voluntary compensatory time programs and incentives through the tax code.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions to instruct conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate rescind from 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. today for a briefing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in a few minutes, I want to speak about President Trump's nomination of Eugene Scalia to be the Secretary of Labor, but first I want to introduce two speeches that I made in Tennessee into the RECORD. I notice the room nearly cleared when I observed I was about to make some speeches, but at least there are some people watching.

The first speech was on August 26 of this year in Clinton, TN. It had to do with the Clinton 12. These were 12 students, some as young as 14 years of age, who walked down a hill and enrolled in Clinton High School in 1956—63 years ago—and became the first students to integrate a public school in the South. Many of us remember what happened the next year in Arkansas, when Governor Faubus stood in the door, and President Eisenhower had to send in the troops to integrate Little Rock Central High School. I remember those days very well. I was in high school myself then.

It is hard to imagine the courage it must have taken for those children to walk down that hill and integrate that school. Most of them were there in Clinton, TN, when they were honored in the month of August.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on the Clinton 12 Commemorative Walk we took that day be printed in the RECORD following my remarks about Mr. Scalia.

TENNESSEE VALLEY FAIR

Secondly, the Tennessee Valley Fair. It is a big event in Knoxville, TN, that was held on September 6. It was attended by almost everybody we took that day has anything to do with politics in Knox County, which means the room was full with 500 or 600 people.

It was an opportunity for me to make a suggestion to the people of Knoxville about what to celebrate. Many of us had been watching Ken Burns' "Country Music" special on PBS. He reminds us that Tennessee has a lot to celebrate in terms of country music. His first two hours were about Bristol, TN, which is the birthplace of country music. It is where Roy Acuff and New York City went to Bristol, in 1927, put an ad in the paper, saying: "Hillbillies, come down out of the mountains with your music," and here came the Carter family, Jimmy Rogers, and several others.

One of the people on Mr. Burns' show this week was Charlie McCoy, the harmonica player, a great musician. It reminded me of a time when I was Governor and recruiting the General Motors Saturn plant to Tennessee. We had the executives coming from Detroit. We talked about what to serve them for dinner. We served them country ham. We talked about whom to have play a piece of music after dinner, and I invited Charlie McCoy to play his harmonica.

A Nashville woman came up to me and said: Governor, I am so embarrassed.

I said: Why is that? She said: You had all those fine people from Detroit, and then you had that harmonica player. She said: What will they think of us? Why didn't you offer them Chopin?

I said: Madam, why should we offer them average Chopin when we have the best harmonica player in the world?

The better people of Nashville had resisted for a long time calling Nashville Music City, but of course Music City is a wonderful signature, a great personality, and it is only today Nashville is such a celebrated city today.

In the same way, Knoxville has violated the Biblical injunction about don't keep your light under a bushel because it rarely talks much about Oak Ridge. So the speech I made would suggest that the sign at the Knoxville airport, which says, "Welcome to Knoxville: Gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains," ought to say instead, "Welcome to Knoxville: Gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains and the Oak Ridge Corridor."

There are nearly 3,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians who work at
the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the largest science and energy laboratory in America, and at the University of Tennessee and at the Tennessee Valley Authority. That part of the personality of the Knoxville area needs to be celebrated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks on the Clinton 12, that my speech at the Tennessee Valley Fair on September 6 be printed in the RECORD.

NOMINATION OF EUGENE SCALIA

Mr. President, in my remaining time, I would like to say a few words about Eugene Scalia and the President's nomination of him to be Secretary of Labor for the United States.

The Senate will vote, probably tomorrow, on whether to confirm Mr. Scalia. I certainly hope the Senate does, and I believe the Senate will.

We have known for two months that President Trump intended for Mr. Scalia to be the Secretary. He announced that he was doing so on July 18. We have had all of his papers since August 27. Those are the government ethics papers and the committee papers that are necessary. They all came a month ago. He gave us a copy of all of his writings. He came to a hearing the other day. The Presiding Officer was there. He testified for three hours. We had two rounds of questions. Senators could ask anything they wanted. He offered to visit, over the last month, with every member of our committee and did with all but two. I know plenty about Mr. Scalia. He answered another 418 questions that committee members asked him after his hearing.

I think two months is long enough to consider him and consider all that information.

I remember when President Obama's Secretary of Education stepped down in the last year of the President's term. I encouraged the President to nominate Mr. John King, whom the President wanted to nominate, but he was afraid he couldn't be confirmed because we, the Republican majority, disagreed with him. I disagreed with him. I said: Mr. President, it is important for you to have a confirmed member of your Cabinet and to have that person considered and confirmed promptly. It is important to the Senate to have a Cabinet member who goes through the process of questions and advice and consent. That is our most important function in many ways.

We confirmed John King in a month. We have had two months to consider Mr. Scalia, and that should be enough. He has a broad background in labor and employment law. He is a partner in a major Washington, DC, law firm, so he knows all the issues. He spent a year as Solicitor of Labor in the George W. Bush administration. He left the firm to be Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in 1992. Academically, he is very well prepared. He went to the University of Virginia. He was editor in chief of the University of Chicago Law Review. He has been a guest lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School and an adjunct professor at the David A. Clarke School of Law at the University of the District of Columbia. He is very well qualified.

It is important for the Department to have a well-qualified, steady leader. I like the demeanor that Mr. Scalia showed in his hearing. The Democratic members of the committee were there, and they were very vigorous in their questioning. I also like the fact that they were elkaar. They didn't take the attitude that sometimes happens in U.S. Senate—that you are innocent until nominated. They took the attitude that he was a well-qualified person with whom they disagreed, so they asked him questions. He answered them, and he did a good job.

I like the fact that the Trump Administration has taken steps to create a more stable environment by having a more sensitive joint employment standard that doesn't make it too difficult for American families to own and operate franchises. There are more than seven hundred thousand American franchise establishments. That is the way you get into the middle class in America.

We need a steady hand there to make sure that happens properly.

I like the fact that the administration has a more reasonable overtime rule. The overtime threshold needed to be changed, but the last administration raised it too high too fast. It caused church camps to have to lay off people and close in the summer. It had all sorts of unintended consequences and bipartisan opposition. The administration announced yesterday a more reasonable step.

Next, association health plans. Among the people in America who have the hardest time paying for insurance are those who make $50,000 a year and don't get a government subsidy. Association health plans help people who can't be offered insurance to get the same kind of insurance that people who work for IBM or big businesses get—insurance that covers pre-existing conditions and offers the same sort of consumer protections.

It has been estimated by Avalere that the association health plan rule that the Department of Labor put out would help three to four million Americans be able to afford health insurance and save their premium costs by several thousand dollars a year. Mr. Scalia can work on that.

Mr. President, I received 32 letters in support of Mr. Scalia's nomination from small business owners, employers, industry groups, and his colleagues. I will mention a couple.

Former Occupational Safety and Health Administration official Cass Sunstein wrote:

His decency is part of what makes him someone who tends to go case-by-case, and to end up where the facts and the law take him. He does not have an ideological straightjacket. He takes issues on their merits.

Thomas Suwan, who was Senator Ted Kennedy's counsel, wrote:

Gene is precisely the kind of person that our country needs in the Cabinet: experienced, ethical, professional, open-minded, fair and brilliant.

There are a number of other letters from former Department of Labor career attorneys, Chicago Law Review editorial board members, Fraternal Order of Police members, and others. Suffice it to say that the country is fortunate the President has nominated Eugene Scalia to be the U.S. Secretary of Labor. He has conducted himself admirably in the two-month process of going through the Senate confirmation. We have a chance to bring that to a conclusion tomorrow. My hope is that the Senate will confirm him and that he will be in office by the end of the week.

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

COMMENORATING THE CLINTON 12 WALK
Thank you Mayor Frank. To Lt. Governor McNally, Congressman Fleischmann, Representative Bob Clement, Judy Gooch, students and teachers, and especially, to members of the Clinton 12 and their families and friends.

It is hard standing here to imagine the courage that it took some of them as young as 14 years of age, to take a walk that we just took this morning and become the first students to integrate a public high school in the south.

In that year, 63 years ago, I was a rising junior at Maryville High School, about an hour away.

I remember reading in the Knoxville newspapers about John Kasper, and the demonstrations, and how the men and women we honor here today couldn't be intimidated.

I remember the uncommon courage of then-governor Bob Clement, whose son Bob is here, who sent in state troopers and national guardsmen in support of the Clinton 12.

Today it seems like it would be an easy decision, but it was not an easy decision for the governor.

I remember that the very next year in 1957, it was a different story in Arkansas. The governor of Arkansas had signed a law that closed the door and stopped students from coming into Little Rock Central High School, and President Eisenhower mobilized the National Guard to support the students.

It's unpleasant to remember some of the things from then.

It's unpleasant to remember the Boys' and Girls' State program that we high schoolers would attend, was then segregated by race.

That the Alcoa student, who later became the first African American basketball coach at the University of Tennessee, who was a teenager and wanted to go to the University of Tennessee football game, had to sit in a section of the stadium that was reserved for blacks.

It's unpleasant to remember that there never had been an African American athlete played in the Southeastern Conference, or there hadn't been a black Supreme Court Justice in Tennessee, or a black chancellor, or a local judge.

It's unpleasant to remember that African American students couldn't sit at the front of the bus, couldn't sit at a lunch counter, and when traveling across our state and other states in the South, had to sleep in the car because no motel would admit them because of their race.
So it is good to celebrate that things are very different today, and it’s important to remember the courage of the Clinton 12 and to celebrate that progress.

But it’s important to remember, as we celebrate the Clinton 12, that things could be even better.

We still have a ways to go.

We have a United States Senator from South Carolina, whose name is Tim Scott. He is an African American Senator elected from that state.

He told me that he was arrested seven times within the last few years in his home town in Charleston, South Carolina, basically for being a black man in the wrong place.

And at the time, he was the Vice Mayor of Charleston.

When I first came to the Senate several years ago, your city manager, Steve Jones, came to see me to tell me Clinton’s vision for preserving the story of the Clinton 12.

It’s been a great pleasure to work with him and the city and so many of you to try to help him do that.

Our former senator, Bill Frist, worked with us to help bring some of the first funding for Green McAdoo Cultural Center.

And a new law we passed in 2009 directed the Secretary of the Interior to take the first steps to making it part of our National Park System.

The late reverend Benjamin Hooks, a Tennessee president who was President of the NAACP, once told me this: “Remember, our country is a work in progress.

But that gets harder to do the older you get.

I said, “Well, it’s like this. A few years ago, your city manager, Steve Jones, came to see me to tell me Clinton’s vision for preserving the story of the Clinton 12.

And I think it was because the war ended in 1918 and everybody came home and had a burst of enthusiasm about our country.

They wanted to celebrate what was good about it.

And so here came the fair.

So this fair has been celebrating all the things I just talked about.

And also, had you come to the Tennessee Valley Fair over the last century, you could see pigs jumping through hoops, you could see dancing horses, you could see the wildest roller coaster ride, and you could see the fastest new car.

That’s why people came to the fair.

But in the depression, Professor Harcourt Morgan, who later was the U.T. president and the TVA Board Chairman, suggested this. He said, “We ought to use the fair to try to think differently what we have to celebrate in the Knoxville area.”

So in that spirit, let me take about five or 10 minutes and suggest to you what I think we ought to be celebrating in the Knoxville area.

And we have plenty to celebrate.

I mean, telling Eddie earlier, you’d come down to the airport and there’s a sign that says, “Welcome to Knoxville, Gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains.” We’ve got the biggest mountains in the East, the most visited park. That’s something to celebrate.

Ken Burns is going to have on television this year his summer music. He thinks it may be more popular than his Civil War series.

Where was the birthplace of country music? Right here in East Tennessee.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has become the largest public utility in the United States.

The University of Tennessee has become a major research institution and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory has grown from a Manhattan Project to build a bomb to win a war, to becoming the nation’s largest science and energy laboratory, the home of the world’s fastest computer, and the home of the best new work in 3-D printing for manufacturing.

So we’ve got a lot to celebrate.

Let’s add up those last three. Let’s add up TVA, U.T., and Oak Ridge for just a minute. When I do that, here’s one thing I get: about 3,000 scientists and engineers.

You know, I’ve been at the forefront of concentration of brainpower in the Knoxville area as exists in North Carolina’s research triangle, Route 128 of Massachusetts, or it even rivals the Silicon Valley—which we know a lot about—California.

The trouble is when we come to Oak Ridge, the rest of us in this area are guilty of violating the first rule of the city of Knoxville, Tennessee, which is to hide your light under a bushel.

We just don’t talk about it much. It’s not so unusual. It just doesn’t happen to us.

About every 10 years at night in Nashville, someone asks the question, “What will we come up and say, “We’re getting a bad reputation. We’ll get known for all this hillbilly music in Nashville. Can’t we remind people we’re making a symphony?”

I remember once when I was governor, I invited the General Motors executives from Detroit to have dinner at the mansion.

And while they were recruiting the Saturn plant like everybody else was.

So Honey and I decided we would serve a country ham. I mentioned to them that Mc Coy to play the harmonica after dinner.

A Nashville lady came up to me afterwards and said, “Governor, I’m so embarrassed about what I see. About that harmonica player, what will those fine people from Detroit think of us?” And I said, “Madam, why should I offer them average Chopin when we got the best harmonica player in the world?”

Nashville is pretty happy about being Music City and off they go.

So I go to Memphis and they’re worried about Nashville. They said, “Nashville’s got this, Nashville’s got that.”

I say, “Well, wait a minute. Okay, let’s have a jobs conference.”

So we had a jobs conference and what did they do? Well, they said, “We’ve got Beale Street, we’ll clean it up, we’ll build an agricenter. Nashville doesn’t want to do that, that fits us. We’ll get the ducks back walking in the Peabody Hotel.”

And there went Memphis.

And then here come the people from Chattanooga. “You gave Memphis money, we want to build a $2 million aquarium.”

I said, “Why would you build such a stingy aquarium? If you’re going to build the biggest aquarium from Baltimore to Miami someone will come to see it.”

And that is what they did. And in the meantime they noticed they had the beautiful Tennessee River Gorge and a great downtown. And look where Chattanooga is today.

So let’s think about Knoxville, just a minute, and all those cities.

The idea of hiding our light under a bushel doesn’t just belong to the cities.

It’s all over the state.

Some of you will remember Tennessee homecoming ’86 when I asked everybody to find something to celebrate in your community—invite everybody to come do it, and then have a celebration.

And in the Forest Brook neighborhood in Knoxville, they invited everybody to come home on the 4th of July and they had a celebration.

And in Hickman County, Minnie Pearl and the people who lived there made a quilt with all the names of the little communities in Hickman County so the children would know, for example, where Bonita Aqua came from.

And in Nashville, they invited all the writers who grew up in Tennessee to come home and they did. And the Festival of Books still is going on in Nashville.

So I think it’s important to stop worrying about what you’re not and start celebrating what you’ve got, which is why I have a suggestion to make in the spirit of Professor Harcourt Morgan, who said, “We ought to use the fair to take a little different look about what we have to sell them.”

I suggest that we change the sign at the Knoxville airport and we say “Welcome to Knoxville, Gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains and the Oak Ridge Corridor.”

Since the new governor is also an engineer, understands why we need to do that.
Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, earlier this month, I went to Joint Base Andrews, which, as I think many of you know, is not far from here. It is where the President boards Air Force One. The mission at Joint Base Andrews is broad. The Air Force does an incredible job in service to our country. I went there to take a look at the Child Development Center. The Child Development Center was first constructed in 1941 not as a childcare center but for other purposes. It has had serious challenges, as the Air Force put in their request to build a new childcare center—a new child development center.

I visited classrooms that had to be closed because of a sewage backup, which happens regularly and flows into the kitchen area of this particular facility. I saw the results of a roof that collapsed during a heavy snowstorm that now has been replaced, but the use of that part of the building is compromised. I saw the concerns expressed about pest control, about an HVAC system that does not work properly, and about a facility that doesn’t have the capacity they need in order to deal with the needs of our Air Force personnel.

It was for that reason that the Air Force has made this one of their top priorities in military construction, to replace this 1941 facility. Through the competitive process that is used under the Department of Defense, this project rose to a top priority and was included in the President’s budget and approved by Congress at $13 million for a replacement.

Let me read from the Air Force’s justification in requesting these funds. It says:

Not providing this facility forces members to use more expensive, less convenient and potentially lower quality off-base programs. These off-base child development centers typically cost $9,400 more than on-base, creating an additional cost to the families and military personnel. Quality of life will be severely degraded, resulting in impacts to retention and readiness because Airmen and their families will not have a safe and nurturing environment for child care.

That will be the consequences if we don’t replace the structure. Why do I talk about that? Because this was one of 64 projects that were included in the President’s emergency power transfer, taking this $13 million from the replacement of a child development center and using it for his wall. It was one of three projects in Maryland. We had $895 million.

There was another project at Joint Base Andrews dealing with hazardous material, the place where they unload hazardous material. They want to do it away from where the President’s plane flies. That makes abundant sense. That was cut and transferred over to the wall.

For those of you who have been to Ft. Meade—an incredibly important facility—to get there when you have a traffic problem. It is almost impossible. Part of the moneys that were transferred was to alleviate those concerns—the traffic.

The President took 64 projects—$3.6 billion, including this Child Development Center at Joint Base Andrews, to use to pay for his wall. He told us during the campaign that this was being done in an effort—that Mexico would pay for it. We now know that the airman families at Joint Base Andrews were charged $180 more per child because they don’t have a safe facility. This facility has a hard time passing accreditation considering the situation. That is not me telling you this; this is the Air Force telling you this. Yet those funds were taken away. Why were they taken away? Because the President used his emergency declaration power to do this.

I believe this was an unconstitutional abuse of power. Let me quote from the Senate's resolution this is what the President said in the Rose Garden in announcing the so-called emergency. I am quoting the President of the United States:

I could do the wall over a longer period of time. I didn’t need to do this. But I’d rather do it much faster.

Is that an emergency? Is that contradicting the direct dictate of Congress? Let me just remind my colleagues of the Constitution, article I, section 9, clause 7. It is the Congress that has the power to declare war. It is the Congress that is responsible for the purse of the federal government. It is the Congress that appropriates the money, not the President of the United States. He carries out our instructions. Yet he uses, by his own words, something he wanted to do for himself rather than a national emergency to transfer those funds. It is wrong. It is not just this Senator saying it is wrong; we got a letter from several Senators, former Senators and former Members of the House—Republicans—who commented on this. The signatories to this letter include Senator Blumenthal, Mickey Edwards, Chuck Hagel, Jim Kolbe, Olympia Snowe, and Richard Lugar. They are respected Republican Members of this body. Let me quote from their letter.

Our oath is to put the country and its Constitution above everything, including party politics or loyalty to a president. . . . The power of the purse rests with Congress . . . if you allow a president to ignore Congress, it will be not your authority but that of your constituents that is deprived of the protections of true representative government.

This is not about loyalty to a President or a party loyalty; this is about respecting the constitutional responsibilities of the article I legislative branch of government.

We just took a vote. We can do something about it—S. J. Res. 54, terminating the national emergency. We got a majority of the Senators who voted for this. Senate is moving forward. We expect this will not be the last word, and that is why I am taking the floor time now. We are going to have
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another opportunity to do this. We may have an opportunity to override a Presidential veto. We are going to need more support. I urge my colleagues to please look at the Constitution of the United States we took the oath to uphold. Look at Members who have served alongside the past who are warning us that this will come back to haunt our constituents in their constitutional checks and balances, having the Congress be the people’s body here—not the President of the United States re-passing laws and making appropriations.

Let us do the right thing. Let us exercise the checks and balances that are in our system. Let us see this S.J. Res. 54 become law. Let us reverse this emergency declaration. Let’s do it for the Constitution. Let’s do it for the U.S. Congress. Let’s do it for the men and women in our military service who are being denied the necessary military construction projects, including those serving women at Joint Base Andrews who need a child development center that protects the welfare of their children.

For all those reasons, I hope this becomes law.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MEDICAL BILLING

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, for the past couple of weeks, New Hampshire and many other States across the country have been flooded with millions of dollars’ worth of dark money advertisements. These ads have been all over TV and social media.

Let me just be clear. They haven’t been aimed just against me in New Hampshire; they have been running against Democrats and Republicans in competitive races across this country.

We have also had flyers that have been jammed in the mailboxes all across New Hampshire. I even got several of the flyers myself. This is an example of one. I will read it in just a minute.

I want to point out that the goal of this campaign has been to stop Congress from acting to address surprise medical bills.

For example, this flyer makes the dishonest claim that addressing surprise medical bills would lead to hospital closures and doctor shortages. In fact, she says:

Imagine if the care we needed wasn’t there when we needed it the most. Rate setting is a healthcare nightmare—hospital closures, doctor shortages, windfall profits for big insurance companies. Don’t put big insurance companies in charge of our healthcare. Stop surprise medical bills.

Then you turn it over, and it says:

Tel Jeanne Shaheen to stop rate setting. Say no to putting big insurance in charge of our healthcare. Say no to making it harder to see our chosen doctors when we need them the most. Say no to big insurance profits at our expense. Tell Senator Jeanne Shaheen to put patients first.

You read that, and you think I am all about trying to put insurance companies aside. Don’t tell you who is sending it. But you look at it—and we did a little digging, and we found out that the ads say that they are paid for by an organization called Doctor Patient Unity. You read that, and you think, well, you are worried about patients. You look at that, and you think they are worried about hospital closures. This is from Doctor Patient Unity, so this must be someone who cares about patients. Don’t believe it.

The truth is, these flyers and the ads that have been running in New Hampshire and across the country are paid for by two private equity firms on Wall Street. They don’t care about patients. They care about profits.

They have spent over $2 million in New Hampshire. If you look across the country, they have spent tens of millions of dollars. Just imagine that in New Hampshire, there is 1.4 million people or something like that. In New Mexico, 1.3 million people. Montana, 1.1 million people. In Arizona, 7 million people. They have not targeted any of those places, they have targeted New Hampshire.

They have spent over $2 million in New Hampshire. If you look across the country, they have spent tens of millions of dollars into improving healthcare for the people of this country.

The public doesn’t know this because they have been left completely in the dark. Due to the Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision, special interests can spend unlimited amounts of money and stay anonymous. So the average person throughout the country who gets one of these flyers is not going to know who paid for these ads. They are not going to know who is getting the benefit of the costs from surprise medical billing.

This ad campaign is not only confusing to voters; it is exhibit A in how our campaign finance system is broken. The voices of Granite Staters who are struggling to pay surprise medical bills are being drowned out in this case by private equity firms on Wall Street. They don’t care about patients. They don’t care about the costs. They don’t care about the quality. They don’t care about your health. They have spent over $2 million in New Hampshire results in a surprise bill from an emergency room visit.

Let us do the right thing. Let us exercise the checks and balances that are in our system. Let us serve as a reminder that Congress has desperately needs to put a stop to all this.

Today, I strongly encourage my colleagues in the Senate to move this effort forward. The special interests that are behind these surprise medical bills and pushing up all of our healthcare costs have to be tuned out.

This is about making sure that when a Granite Stater or any American goes to a hospital, they can have faith that their insurance is going to cover their costs. We should not—we must not—let private equity firms on Wall Street bully Congress or derail the bipartisan efforts that are taking place in this body to address surprise medical bills.

We have an opportunity to address this and serve as a reminder that Congress has to reform our broken campaign finance system. Special interests shouldn’t be able to hide behind nice-sounding front groups like Doctor Patient Unity.

We know these private equity firms are responsible for these ads only because of investigative reporting that was done by Bloomberg, the New York Times, and some others. Sadly, this is the exception rather than the norm because usually dark money never gets exposed.

In closing, I want to send a very clear message: I don’t care how many ads these special interests run, how many
mailers they send out, or how many millions they spend. Granite Staters who have had their family budgets upended by surprise medical bills must be prioritized over the special interests who want to profit off of them. Health care costs have skyrocketed, and tackling surprise medical bills must remain at the top of the Senate’s agenda.

Thank you.
I yield the floor.
I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Blackburn). The clerk will call the roll.
The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, right now, HBCUs, like Wilberforce and Central State in my State of Ohio, and other minority-serving institutions are facing a fiscal cliff. If we don’t act now, this week, HBCUs and other schools will face crippling funding cuts. These schools are a critical part of our Nation’s higher education system. They have a rich legacy and a proven track record of educating students of color and other underrepresented students.

Another word is Holmesville, founded in 1856 as the Nation’s first private institution of higher education for Black students in this country—an institution that we are so proud of in southwestern Ohio. Central State has a rich legacy of educating students and is an 1890 land-grant institution.

Many of us worked in the last farm bill to right a historical wrong and to make sure all 1890 land-grant universities, including Central State, have access to the funding they deserve. They have fostered generations of African-American students. We know that without HBCUs, millions of Black students would have been denied the opportunity to pursue higher education. There simply was no place for them in many places in this country. They would have been left out of careers in law, academia, agriculture, politics, the sciences, and so many other fields.

Our country owes an enormous debt to HBCUs. Key funding for HBCUs and minority-serving institutions—MSIs—expires September 30. Without this funding, school budgets will be thrown into chaos. They will likely consider program cuts and layoffs. We need to pass a clean extension.
The House has done its job and passed the FUTURE Act. It seems the Senate is always doing its job. It passes legislation, and then the legislation dies in the Senate graveyard. We have seen it on issue after issue. This is as important an issue of them. We must protect the HBCUs. We must extend the mandatory funding for all MSIs for 2 years. It is time for the Senate to do the same. HBCUs and MSIs have to overcome enough hurdles every day to educate their students. The Senate should not be one of those hurdles. We need to pass the FUTURE Act now.

As I mentioned, we have been working to ensure the mandatory funding for all MSIs for 2 years. It is time for the Senate to do the same. HBCUs and MSIs have to overcome enough hurdles every day to educate their students. The Senate should not be one of those hurdles. We need to pass the FUTURE Act now.

I yield the floor.
I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.
The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Perdue). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERTIME RULE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, something happened in the last 48 hours or so that affects 40,000 to 50,000 people in my State and affects, literally, probably 1 million people or more around the country. These are people who are making $30,000, $35,000, $40,000, or $45,000 a year.

Essentially, the President of the United States robbed them of their overtime. This isn’t histrionics. It is not alarmist. It is fact. This is how it works. If you are managing a fast food restaurant and you are making $40,000 a year, and if the company decides to call you the night shift manager—the management decides to declare you as management—it means you can work all hours, 50, 55, 60 hours a week. They don’t pay you a cent—not pay you time and a half. They don’t pay you time and a half. They don’t even give you another cent more than your $40 hours.

Worse, if you are a middle-income worker making $35,000 or $40,000 a year—not enough to have a middle-class lifestyle like you could have had in this country 20 or 30 years ago—and management decides they are going to classify you as management, they can work you as many hours as they want without a cent of overtime.

Now, that has been a problem for years. Five years ago, we fixed it. The Vice President of the United States with Secretary Tom Perez came out to Columbus, OH. I worked on this issue. We made this announcement at a small manufacturing firm. They supported this agreement, and many businesses did. This would have meant that for anybody making up to about $46,000 a year, if they worked those extra hours and they were called management, from then on they were going to get overtime—time and a half. That is what overtime pay is about. That is what the overtime rule is about.

President Trump got rid of the overtime pay rule, and that is that he is on the side of workers, but you can’t say you support workers individually if you don’t support workers collectively. The President says: I care about these individual workers. If he really cared about these individual workers, he would have, in essence, robbed 40,000 to 50,000 Ohioans—and I don’t know how many million Americans—or their overtime pay. We passed that rule. The Obama administration sent the Secretary of Labor to Columbus, OH, and I recall the Secretary of Labor made this announcement. On behalf of 150,000 Ohio workers who were making $30, $40, $45, and up to $46,000 a year, we celebrated
that they were going to get time and a half. If they were away from their family, working those extra 10 hours, which meant working 50 hours a week, or an extra 20 hours and working 60 hours a week, they were going to take home $80,000 a year. They were going to get time and a half pay if they did that week after week.

This President says he is for workers. Then, he changes this rule. In a sense, he robbed those people. This new rule deprives millions of workers, literally, of the overtime pay that supports workers and rewards work. Do you pass legislation that supports workers and rewards work? Do you honor work? Do you respect workers and fight for the dignity of workers? You on? Are you on the corporations' side or the workers' side? Is it more likely to support—does that do? That means more concentration, more job security and more safety in the workplace. But if you say you care about workers individually, but you don't care about workers collectively. What does that mean? It means when that workers have a union, they get better pay, they get better benefits, they have retirement, they have healthcare, and they have more job security and more safety in the workplace. But if you say you care about individual workers but you don't care about workers collectively, then you simply don't care about workers. This President says he is for workers. Then, he changes this rule. It is a White House betrayal from his campaign promise and didn't do it. There were lots of tax cuts for the rich. Almost 80 percent of the corporations that cut the President did that for Wall Street executives. In the White House, whatever corporate America wants, this White House gives them every single time. If corporate America wants to move overseas. The CEOs. Who gets hurt every time? It comes down every time on the side of corporations against workers.

And all we know something about CEOs. When I was a kid, CEOs made about 30 to 1 in CEO pay versus the average worker. Now it is about 300 to 1. Who gets the tax cuts in this country? The CEOs. Who gets hurt every time? It is moderate wage earners. I hear this talk of populism, that the President is a populist. Well, populism is never racist or never anti-Semitic. It doesn't divide people. It doesn't push some people down to lift people up. That is something we have seen far too much of.

To me, this overtime rule was sort of the last straw. You give tax cuts and massive giveaways to the wealthiest 1 percent and encourage more corporations to move overseas.

The President’s tax bill says this, which is almost not even believable: If you have a company in Mansfield, OH, or Toledo, OH, you pay a corporate tax rate of 21 percent. If you shut down that production in Mansfield and Toledo and move to Guadalajara or Guangzhou, you pay 10.5 percent. What does that mean? The biggest corporations are going to move overseas as wages continue to be depressed in this country.

I was in the White House with the President in a room one day during the tax bill. After he signed this tax bill, he said: You’re going to start seeing a lot more money in your paycheck.

We know that was a lie. Corporations reap the benefits, and then spend their windfall not on workers’ wages or growing the company but on stock buybacks. General Motors received huge tax cuts. They moved more jobs overseas and they spent product in in Hamtramck, MI, and in places like Lordstown, OH. He stacked his Cabinet and the National Labor Relations Board with corporate stooges who spent their role careers undermining workers on behalf of corporations. His new Labor Secretary, Eugene Scalia, is a corporate lawyer who has fought over and over against worker rights. Think about this. The Secretary of Labor whether it is a pretty conservative Secretary of Labor, whom Republicans over here are likely to support, or a more progressive, pro-worker Secretary of Labor, whom Democrats are more likely to support—is usually somebody who cares about workers and workers’ rights. The new Secretary of Labor appointed by President Trump is a corporate lawyer. He spent his entire career attacking workers, attacking workers’ rights, trying to put unions out of business, trying to encourage de-certification of elections, and trying to come down every time on the side of corporations against workers.

I said this before. You can’t say you care about workers individually, but then when they care about workers collectively. What does that mean? It means when that workers have a union, they get better pay, they get better benefits, they have retirement, they have healthcare, and they have more job security and more safety in the workplace. But if you say you care about individual workers but you don’t care about workers collectively, then you simply don’t care about workers. This President says he is for workers. Then, he changes this rule. It comes down to this: Whose side are you on? Are you on the corporations’ side or American workers’ side? Do you fight for Wall Street or fight for the workers and fight for the dignity of work? Do you honor work? Do you respect workers? Do you pass legislation that supports workers and rewards work or do you pass legislation to take, literally, thousands of dollars out of the pockets of workers who should be getting overtime but, because of this new Trump rule, they lost their overtime.

The President promised to fight for American workers. He has broken that promise over and over. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. We don’t see that over here. We don’t see that in the majority leader’s office, and we sure don’t see that in the White House. I was against 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for my 254th “Time to Wake Up” speech. In the time I have been given these speeches I watched the shifting trajectory of climate denial. First, climate change was a hoax. Then, there wasn’t enough science. Then, the science is still uncertain. Then, solving this problem would hurt the economy. Then, it will magically save us, and now there is a new entrant in the climate denial lexicon: China. “China isn’t doing enough on carbon emissions,” goes the argument. So we shouldn’t do anything at all.

It is a talking point you hear all the time from the fossil fuel industry and its proxy of front groups working to block climate action here in Congress.

Now, China has done plenty to complain about. China has stolen our intellectual property, manipulated its currency, jailed its political dissenters, set unfair labor rules, and more. I have been front and center with those complaints about China. Yet, before we go after China as the climate denial lynchpin, China is still a party to the Paris climate accord, and China’s President doesn’t say stuff like “wind turbines cause cancer.” OK—a low bar, I concede.

Our President recently tweeted: Which country has the largest carbon emission reduction? AMERICA! Who has dumped the most carbon into the air? CHINA!

Actually, that is not quite true. We have still dumped more CO2 into the air than China because we have been at it longer, and we still dump a lot more than China per capita, but China’s 1 billion people do put out more carbon pollution than our 300 million. They overtook us as the world’s top national emitter in 2007. Last year, China accounted for about 28 percent of global CO2 emissions, and the U.S. accounted for 15 percent. Currently, China accounts for 13 percent of emissions, and the U.S. accounts for 25 percent, which is about twice as much. Americans’ per
capita carbon emissions are among the highest in the world. The average Chinese citizen—China is here—accounts for less than half the per capita emissions of the average American.

We actually don’t have lots to brag about domestically, but that is where it looks the worst for us. Forget the past. Look to the future at climate action. That is where China is blowing us out of the water.

As the Trump administration slavishly fronts for fossil fuel—and is even turning the agencies of our government over to this corrupting industry—China is leaning in hard on a green energy future. China is resetting its economy for a clean energy future. China began implementing a national cap-and-trade system—a price on carbon—for its power sector in 2018, which will go into full force across the country next year. Several provinces already run cap and trade locally. This year, China is launching a mandatory renewable electricity quota, requiring that 30 percent of its electricity be renewable by 2030, and its energy plan seeks 50 percent of total electric power generation from nonfossil sources by 2030.

China is also investing to dominate clean energy manufacturing and technology. In 2017, nearly half of the world’s new renewable energy investment took place in China—triple the investment made in the United States. China leads the world in renewable power generation, with three times as much capacity as any other nation. Almost 30 percent of the world’s renewable power capacity right now is in China, including the most solar, the most wind, and the most hydro. China dominates the global deployment of solar panels. It has several times greater installed solar generation capacity than the United States. In fact, we virtually lost solar panel manufacturing to China.

On this chart China is the yellow, and it shows China outdoing all of the other countries in total capacity. We are here compared to China there, and the gray is the general category for the rest of the world. China is even bigger than the rest of the world, not counting the United States, Japan, Germany, and India.

So that is China’s lead in total renewable electricity deployment, with more than double the installed capacity of its closest competitors and nearly a third of the total global renewable electricity capacity. Here is the world’s total. There is China at 404. Then you actually have to scale down the graphic to get over here to the United States at 180—180 to 404. If you count nuclear power as clean energy, there is China in development—more than in any other nation.

Of course, it is not all good news on climate out of China, not by any stretch. The Chinese continue to build more coal-fired powerplants than any other country, not just in China but around the world. However, the difficult truth for us is that China’s progress on climate change is real, and it is way more than ours. China is not doing this to help us; it is doing this to outdo us economically and politically. If we keep kicking our own renewable industries in the teeth here in America just to please Trump’s coal industry donors while China invests in these new technologies, we will be making a losing bet. China’s one-party government has put economic growth above all else. Chinese scientists see the same data that ours do. Chinese economists see the same economic risks that ours do. China sees the same threats and opportunities for their workers and their supply chains that ours do. Chinese cities see the same threat from sea level rise that ours do. Yet the Chinese Government has chosen a smarter path because it is not under the thumb of the fossil fuel industry. The Chinese are acting out of self-interest. They are acting on climate because they want their country and their economy to succeed. They do not want to be left behind in the future. Rather than compete, we are now helping them win—all to make some grubby political donors happy.

The Global Commission on the Economy and Climate reports that strong climate action could deliver at least $26 trillion in economic benefits worldwide through 2030 compared with business as usual—a $26 trillion relative benefit. Over the period, these actions would generate over 65 million new low-carbon jobs globally and avoid over 700,000 premature deaths from air pollution, by the way. Whoever acts swiftly will get the biggest share of these riches.

Last year, Stanford’s economists found that keeping global warming to 1.5-degrees Celsius as opposed to the riskier 2-degree safety limit would likely save more than $30 trillion in economic damages around the world by the end of this century—$20 trillion.

The world power that positions itself to reap the economic benefits of a carbon-neutral technology and that helps lead the world away from runaway climate calamities will garner tremendous economic, strategic, and diplomatic advantage. In particular, China recognizes the diplomatic advantage to acting on climate as the United States withholds from its own global position of international leadership.

The last century has been called the American century. We are fast handing over the next century to become the Chinese century. We are doing it to ourselves, and we are doing it for the worst of all possible reasons—to cater to and kowtow to a corrupt industry. Making sure that the next century is the American century, as well, is good reason as any for us to wake up and act on climate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, once again, I come to the floor to call for action in light of revelations that President Trump appears to have no problem in seeking the assistance of a foreign government for his own political gain. Today’s summary transcript reflects the totality of the conversation, but what it did release was shocking enough.

He clearly pressured the Ukrainian Government to investigate former Vice President Biden for political benefit. He mentioned the Attorney General of the United States or his personal lawyer six times, and in using the levers of State, the President sought to weaponize the Justice Department to pursue a personal political vendetta.

We now know that for more than 2 months, the President urged Ukraine to investigate a political opponent while holding $391 million in urgently needed security assistance that Congress appropriated to support U.S. national security interests. In fact, Congress approved this security assistance,
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2537; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RISCH. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, first of all, let me say I concur with the good Senator from New Jersey that we should follow regular order.

He, like myself, has spent decades of service in a legislative body, and we both know this system works when the committee system works.

Every legislative body is set up with a committee system. Now, why is that? One of the reasons is because people develop an expertise in a certain lane, and they can use that expertise on the committee.

Most importantly, the issues regarding a bill—whether it is good or bad or whether it should be amended or what—and how they happen to it—is best handled in the committee system, where people have an expertise in the area that the bill goes to.

This bill goes to the Foreign Relations Committee, which I chair—which my good friend from New Jersey previously chaired—and it will be handled in the regular order by that committee, but it is a bad way to do a piece of legislation to draw it, drop it, and then come to the floor and try to pass it unanimously.

This piece of legislation was brought to the committee yesterday, and it is a piece of legislation that certainly deserves consideration but not this way.

I have not had a chance to even read it, let alone study it, and that is true of virtually every Member of the majority party. I frankly don’t know whether the other members of the committee who serve in the minority party have had an opportunity to read it or to study it or, for that matter, to prepare amendments to it to make it better and to move it along.

So given that, the committee system is really important here. I don’t want...
to really go into the merits of all this. A lot of it is being debated out in the hallway right now with the national media and that sort of thing.

Look, what has happened over the last few days here is really a poster child for what has happened to the entire Trump Presidency. A fair amount—not all but a fair amount—of the national media and a fair amount of the minority party here have done everything they can to delegitimize this President, not the least of which is taking something that comes along and attaching to it some nefarious idea, some nefarious purpose.

Let me give you an example. My good friend said: What happened to standing up to Russia? This administration has imposed more sanctions on Russia than the entire 8 years of the previous administration. So what has happened to standing up to Russia? We continue to stand up to Russia.

I think my friend from New Jersey and I would be able to agree on the many sins Russia has committed starting way back, but if you go with fairly recent history, their invasion of Georgia and then their promise to back off and to get out of Georgia—they still occupy two of the regions in Georgia. Of course, the invasion and takeover of the Crimea, their cause of problems on the eastern border of Ukraine, their interference in Ukraine, their interference in our elections, their interference in European elections, and it goes on and on, poisoning people in London—I mean, that is about as far out as you can possibly get.

So we all need to stand together. We all need to stand up to Russia, and this administration has been doing it. They are going to continue to do it. I think virtually everybody here is urging them to do it, and we are going to continue to do it.

Looking at argument that there was some significant delay in moving funds to Ukraine is simply not well-taken, and the reasons for it, with all due respect to my friend, I think, are well known.

In fact, if you read the transcript of this telephone conversation, the President himself raises the important issue that he has raised with all of us from time to time, and that is that any time you see the United States getting on the short end of the stick with what he sees the United States getting on the short end of the stick with, it will take just a few minutes to read it, and it will not take long to figure out that the mischaracterization of this is off the wall.

It is absolutely amazing to me that people would take this conversation, which was a standard, ordinary, regular conversation that a head of state has with another head of state, and characterize it the way it is being characterized.

It was a congratulatory call, there was a lot of banter in it. My good friend knows—he has met with a lot of heads of state, as I have. Sometimes we even meet together with heads of state. It is common to have bipartisan meetings with heads of state.

I don’t know whether people think these things are scripted and that they are focused directly on issues, but there is always a lot of banter. The banter can be in the form of having conversations about sports. It can be talking about other things. Frequently, if one of the teams has done well or poorly, one party or the other will raise it and talk about it. These things are very informal, as this phone conversation was.

In my experience, one of the frequent issues that is discussed in these conversations is local politics—what is happening in your country, what is happening in my country—and then also about mutual issues with friendly countries or, for that matter, countries that are not friendly.

This call that the transcript was released on is very, very rare. If you are looking for a window to see what actually happens in these calls, this transcript is a really good characterization of what happens in these calls.

It is not a good thing to be releasing these calls. I think heads of state should be able to have these conversations—all of us should be able to have conversations with our counterparts, with a head of state, with Ministers in the other countries without having to be thinking about every word we say is going to wind up being analyzed and pulled apart and taken by your political enemies and badly misrepresented.

Look, don’t take my word for it. Don’t take Senator Menendez’s word for it. The transcript is all over the internet right now. It is going to be published in every major newspaper in America tomorrow. It takes just a few minutes to read it. Read it and take away for yourself the feelings you have about it.

The President of the United States is tasked with being the frontline of foreign policy. Yes, foreign policy is shared by both the first and second branch. It is one of those things the Founding Fathers did not resolve 100 percent for one branch or the other. Such as appointments for the second branch or such as appropriating for the first branch.

There is sufficient authority given to each branch of government, but the head of state, in this case, the President of the United States, is tasked with carrying on these relationships with other countries.

This phone conversation that he had is clearly, clearly, part of that. Don’t take my word for it. Everybody make up their own mind. It is rock and roll science. As you can see, the English is very straightforward. It can be understood. I think everybody will come away with their own belief.

If people hate Trump, they are going to see it as that and say that this is terrible, as a lot of people in this town have done. I think most ordinary, good, straight-thinking Americans are going to look at this and say: What is the big deal? It was a conversation between two people talking about various issues they were interested in, and it isn’t a problem.

In any event, in order to preserve the regular order, in order to preserve the jurisdiction and the hard work of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I understand we are supposed to be heading to a briefing on Iran. I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, and then I will cease, and I ask unanimous consent for my entire remarks to be included in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. No. 1, it is not unusual for—there have been many times when the urgency of the moment has had legislation come to the floor. I think this is one of those moments. But I do appreciate the Chairman’s suggesting that he will take up consideration of this issue, and that is something I think is incredibly important.

On Russia, I would just say the congressionally mandated sanctions, which the committee and the Congress passed, gave very little flexibility to the administration and have been the driver on sanctions on Russia. But
there is a lot that hasn’t been done that Russia has done subsequently, which we should be ultimately pursuing, and I look forward to the Chairman’s having a markup on DASAKA and other related legislation to actually continue to fight Russia.

Lastly, I would simply say that holding money from Ukraine doesn’t make other countries give money to Ukraine. That was money that was directed by the U.S. Congress, which was promoted, as well, by the State Department and the Department of Defense. They had no concerns about corruption as it relates to this money. They understood the importance of the security assistance.

Finally, on the question of the transcript, overwhelmingly, there wasn’t any banters there so much as there was a direct effort to get President Zelensky to use his powers to investigate former Vice President Biden’s son. That is crystal clear, and any plain reading will do it, and I do hope the American people will read the summary.

I yield the floor.

RECESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 3:30 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 2:47 p.m., recessed until 3:30 p.m. and was reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COTTON).

RESOLUTIONS TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES—Continued
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I consume.

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

UKRAINE
Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the Republican motion to instruct on paid family and medical leave.

Before I move to the issue at hand, I do want to address the very serious allegations against President Trump and the new information we are learning from the memo the White House released today.

It is deeply concerning to learn that President Trump asked Ukrainian President Zelensky to work with the United States to investigate Vice President Biden. Our democracy is at risk, and President Trump has betrayed our country. I support Speaker Pelosi in starting the impeachment inquiry she announced yesterday, and the revelations today make these investigations even more necessary.

PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE
Mr. President, I now have the opportunity that we have in the Senate today to serve the Nation by guaranteeing paid family and medical leave for 2 million Federal workers and their families through the Schatz motion.

Every other industrialized country in the world has some version of paid leave, which allows workers to take care of their loved ones when a medical emergency or birth occurs. Yet, the vast majority of our workforce in America lacks access to paid leave. That means far too many of our workers are unable to take paid time off if they need to care for a new child, a sick parent, or their spouse. Sadly, this includes 2 million of our Federal workers.

What my Republican colleagues are suggesting is that our workers should work overtime to compensate for family leave. Their motion would require workers to shift around their hours and take on more work to receive the paid time off they need in an emergency situation or when welcoming a new child.

Let me be very clear. This is not a benefit. It is a cynical plan that would erode our workers’ abilities to make ends meet and harm their access to real paid leave. It would hurt those who need this the most, including women, communities of color, and low-wage workers.

Most workers living paycheck to paycheck will not be able to take extra shifts to earn paid leave. Too many families across the country don’t even have $400 in savings for emergency expenses. Take Shelby Ramirez Martinez, for example. She found herself in the most untenable situation when her daughter and her father both had simultaneous surgeries scheduled.

Shelby is a mom of two, caregiver to her father, and a full-time student and security officer. She didn’t have access to paid leave, so she was forced to take 2 weeks off and forgo her pay. She couldn’t have planned for that by working overtime and sacrificing time with her daughter or with a flex savings account. What Shelby and all Americans need is the ability to extend time off for medical emergencies and births.

The Republican motion to instruct calls for employer tax credits that are handouts to large and rich companies like Google, which already provide paid leave and leaves taxpayers footing the bill. They are false incentives for small businesses that still will not be able to afford the leave.

My bill, the FAMILY Act, would provide 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave for all workers. It is the only comprehensive proposal that is accessible and affordable for all working Americans. It is modeled off of very successful State programs like California’s, ensuring that working Americans do not have to choose between their family and their paycheck.

It shouldn’t be so hard. So many workers around the world have new children, sick spouses, or elderly parents, and they need access to paid leave. Today, let’s stand together and reject fake paid leave by voting no on the Ernst motion to instruct, for people like Shelby and her family. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to urge adoption of two resolutions that are going to be considered by the U.S. Senate, instructing the conferees to the NDAA bill, which is the Defense authorization bill. One of those motions urges the conferees, or directs the conferees, to adopt bipartisan legislation introduced by Senator COTTON, who is now the Presiding Officer in the Chair, and me and others.

It is called the DETER Act. The idea is very simple, which is this: We want to say up front that our intelligence communities, or others in the administration, should inform Congress immediately if there has been interference in our elections. If the answer is yes, that would trigger immediate and stiff sanctions on whatever foreign government is acting to interfere in our elections.

We can spend a lot of money and resources on our election infrastructure and our election systems, and we should do that. We can urge all of the social media companies to improve their platforms and make it more difficult for foreign governments and adversaries to abuse those platforms to influence and impact our elections.

None of those measures actually impose a big cost on a foreign government
like Russia for interfering in our elections. All those things do is make it harder, and we should make it harder. In this case, the best defense is a good offense, meaning the best defense to having a foreign government interfering in our elections is to discourage and deter them from doing that in the first place.

Right now, what we have learned is there is no cost to Vladimir Putin and the Russians for interfering in our elections. In fact, they assess that they get a significant benefit from creating division within the United States. If you are Vladimir Putin and you are doing a cost benefit analysis—should I interfere in the U.S. elections or not?—you conclude: Hey, I am going to gain something by creating this kind of division and confusion within the United States. What we should be doing is saying in advance and up front to Vladimir Putin and Russia or any other foreign leader or government, if you catch us interfering in our elections, you will definitely pay a price in the form of sanctions against some of your financial institutions or key aspects of your economic sector. We need to spell that out in advance.

The resolution requires that Congress be notified after the election as to whether we have detected foreign interference. Next time, someone like Vladimir Putin will know in advance that if we catch them, there will be a price to pay, a penalty to pay. That will, of course, discourage the activity in the first place.

It doesn’t cost us a dime to do this. Yes, we should continue to spend money, as I said, to harden our systems at home and better defend ourselves. For goodness’ sake, we should at least take the position that we are going to let foreign powers know in advance, if we catch you—and by the way, we will catch you if you interfere in our elections—there will be an immediate and severe price to pay.

I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this resolution. It is appropriate that we are directing the conference to the National Defense Authorization Act to include this provision because, after all, the reason we invest in our defense is to protect our country and to protect our democracy. That bill should include a provision telling foreign powers: If you mess around and interfere in our Democratic elections, we will catch you—and by the way, we will catch you and by the way, we will catch you if you interfere in our elections—there will be an immediate and severe price to pay.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced: yeas 91, nays 4, as follows:

(Roll Call Vote No. 333 Leg.)

YEAS—91

Mr. Alexander
Mr. Baldwin
Mr. Barrosso
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Blackburn
Mr. Blumenthal
Mr. Boozman
Mr. Brown
Mr. Burr
Mr. Capito
Mr. Cardin
Mr. Carper
Mr. Casey
Mr. Cassidy
Mr. Coons
Mr. Cory
Mr. Cotton
Mr. Daines
Mr. Duckworth
Mr. Durbin
Mr. Ernst
Mr. Feinstein
Mr. Fischer
Mr. Gardner

Mr. CREPO
Mr. ENZI

Mr. Booker
Mr. Railsback

The resolution (S. Res. 330) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

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

VOTE ON S. RES. 331

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Jones resolution to instruct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Colleagues, today we are about to vote on a resolution that will correct a long-standing injustice that has been on the books for decades; one that has caused significant pain to military spouses who have given so
much for our country. It is an elimination of the military widow’s tax. It has been voted on in this body for over 18 years and has never gotten across the finish line. Now is the time. This is our time to make sure that we tell our veterans that we are supportive but we show it with our actions, not just with our words. I urge everyone please to vote to instruct the conference to eliminate the military widow’s tax.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I agree with the comments made by the Senator from Alabama. There is one problem with this, and that is, it is not paid for. I am supporting it. I am actually a cosponsor of the bill and was a cosponsor of the bill long before this year, but we are going to have to really get busy to figure out how to pay for this. It is very expensive. But I do encourage people to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the Jones resolution.

Mr. SASSÉ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

(Read Rollcall Vote No. 309 Leg.)

YEAS—94

Alexander Alexander
Baldwin Baldwin
Barrasso Barnette
Benning Benning
Blackburn Blackburn
Blumenthal Blumenthal
Blunt Blunt
Boozman Boozman
Braun Braun
Brown Brown
Cantwell Cantwell
Capito Capito
Capito Capito
Carper Carper
Casey Casey
Cassidy Cassidy
Collins Collins
Coons Coons
Correa Correa
Cortez Masto Cortez Masto
Cotton Cotton
Cramer Cramer
Crapo Crapo
Romney Romney
Rosen Rosen
Rounds Rounds
Sasse Sasse
Schatz Schatz
Schumer Schumer
Scott (FL) Scott (FL)
Scott (SC) Scott (SC)
Shahsen Shahsen
Booker Booker
Burr Burr
Not Voting—6

The resolution (S. Res. 332) was agreed to.

VOTE ON S. RES. 332

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Schatz resolution.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, this resolution urges the inclusion of the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act in the final conference agreement on the NDAA. This resolution provides 12 weeks of paid family leave for Federal employees in all situations already covered under the FMLA.

Too many of our Federal employees have to make the impossible choice of getting a paycheck or looking after a sick child, caring for an aging parent, or recovering from a health condition. As a result, many have been forced to leave their jobs and obtain other employment.

Paid family leave is not only the right thing to do for Federal workers, but it is the smart thing to do for our Federal workforce. This is the most practical and fiscally responsible way to provide family leave for Federal workers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time in opposition?

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Schatz resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “nay.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 48, as follows:

(Read Rollcall Vote No. 305 Leg.)

YEAS—47

Baldwin Baldwin
Bennet Benne
Bennet Benne
Brown Brown
Brown Brown
Bennet Benne
Bennet Benne
Boozman Boozman
Capito Capito
Capito Capito
Carper Carper
Casey Casey
Collins Collins
Coons Coons
Corder Corder
Cortez Masto Cortez Masto
Cotton Cotton
Cramer Cramer
Crapo Crapo
Romney Romney
Rosen Rosen
Rounds Rounds
Sasse Sasse
Schatz Schatz
Schumer Schumer
Scott (FL) Scott (FL)
Scott (SC) Scott (SC)
Shahsen Shahsen
Shaheen Shaheen
Shelby Shelby
Snowe Snowe
Van Hollen Van Hollen
Warner Warner
Wicker Wicker
Whitehouse Whitehouse
Young Young

The resolution (S. Res. 332) was rejected.

VOTE ON S. RES. 333

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Peters resolution to instruct the conferees to eliminate the prohibition against the use of firefighting foams containing PFAS chemicals.

The resolution (S. Res. 333) was rejected.

VOTE ON S. RES. 334

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, let me be frank. Today, our water and our health is at risk from highly fluorinated chemicals known as PFAS. These chemicals have been widely used commercially, and they are also concentrated in firefighting foams used by the Department of Defense. They are toxic, and they have been linked to serious health issues in those who are exposed to them.

High levels of PFAS contamination exist at the former Wurtsmith Air Force Base in Oscoda, MI, and at military sites all across our country. My resolution would retain the Senate language prohibiting the Department of Defense from using firefighting foams containing PFAS chemicals to the end of 2023.

PFAS-free foams are already widely used internationally by military services and at major hub airports, such as Heathrow and Dubai.

We must protect our troops, our firefighters, our communities, and our water.

I urge my colleagues to support my resolution.

I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 334) was agreed to.

[Concluded]
Joint Base Andrews in Maryland needed a new childcare facility, to replace one filled with mold and overcrowded rooms. Congress agreed. But the President took it away with his decision. Similarly, Fort Campbell, KY, lost a new school for military children. U.S. bases in Europe lost projects meant to reassure our allies and deter Putin’s Russia. U.S. bases in South Korea and Japan lost projects meant to deter North Korea and China. All of it and more was labeled a top priority by the Pentagon and cancelled by the President anyway. This puts our men and women at real risk.

The Air Force notes that without one of the cancelled projects its base would be, “vulnerable to hostile penetration in the midst of contingency operations and an increased terrorist threat.” Another cancelled project to upgrade a munitions side would make it difficult for U.S. fighter and bomber aircraft to operate properly.

Congress should reject the President’s phony declaration and reject the idea that Congress should throw good money after bad. Congress must re-assert its powers with these votes this week.

Mr. THUNE. All time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 335) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the resolutions to instruct on S. Res. 199, there be an executive session and vote on the resolutions to invoke cloture on the Hyten and Scalia nominations in the order filed; further, that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 335) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Ernst resolution instruct.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that Congress is working toward commonsense, effective family leave solutions. It is well past time we made paid parental leave a reality in this country. Affording all moms and dads the flexibility to spend time with their new baby is something Americans want to see happen.

We all recognize there are significant barriers for new, working parents to spend time with their baby during those critical and precious first few months. That is why the Senate is working on potential pathways for- 

At the heart of all of it, we simply cannot lose sight of the fact that we need solutions that work for all American families, not just those fortunate enough to have a government job. If we are serious about enacting paid family leave policies, instead of scoring political wins, we will support the resolution before us.
Families are the bedrock of our society. Let’s look for solutions that all Americans can embrace. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. The Senate from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because, as it is written, it really rewards only companies that are very wealthy and successful with additional tax credits to do something they are already doing. By that measure, it will leave most American workers without basic access to leave.

The other potential idea is about shifting hours and suggesting that workers have to work overtime to be able to have paid leave. Every parent in America, every person in America, will have a time when they have a family crisis—whether it is a dying parent, whether it is a sick spouse, whether it is a new child—and we are still the only industrialized country in the world that doesn’t have access to national paid leave. We should be able to come together around this commonsense solution that Senator SCHATZ has offered to create at least the first step to make sure our Federal workers aren’t disproportionately harmed because they can’t compete with the private sector.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. The question is on agreeing to the Ernst resolution.

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California, (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 307 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander
Barrasso
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Brown
Bryan
Capito
Collins
Cornyn

Linkford
Lee
McConnell
McSally
Moman
Markowski
Paul
Perdue

Risch
Romney
Round
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sinema
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tommy
Toomey
Wicker
Young

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 308 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Alexander
Barrasso
Blacksburg
Boxer
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Carper
Collins
Cory Booker
Daines
Durbin
Feinstein
FYIN
Graham
Guillen
Hassan
Heinrich
Hirono
Kaine
Menendez
Merkley
Moran
Murray
Perdue
Peters
Poliquin
Portman
Reed
Risch
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shaheen
Shelby
Smith
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Warner
Whitehouse
Young

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gen. John E. Hyten for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 154 and 601: to be General, shall be brought to a close.

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor.


The PRESIDENT PRO Temporal. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to...
be Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. THUNE, the following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN announced that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 309 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander
Barrasso
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Boozman
Brown
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Emi
Ernst

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Hassan

Bennet
Booker
Rubio
Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

THE PRESIDENTIAL REQUEST—H.R. 549

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to speak about my temporary protection request to H.R. 549, which grants temporary protected status, or TPS, for Venezuelans from Nicolas Maduro’s oppressive regime and reforms the broken TPS program.

I would like to thank my friends, Senator MARCO RUBIO and Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, who have been tireless advocates for the Venezuelan people as we fight for freedom in Latin America and across the globe. I am proud to have worked with Senator RUBIO, along with my colleague from Utah, Senator LEE, and other Republican Senators to offer protection for the Venezuelan people while making necessary reforms to TPS. The crisis in Venezuela is a defining human rights issue of our time. Maduro is starving his own people, and innocent children are dying. What is happening in Venezuela is pure genocide. We have to act, but we also need to be responsible. The courts have basically made a temporary program permanent, which is not sustainable.

My amendment protects the vulnerable Venezuelan population while making sure that human rights violators are clearly identified as ineligible to come to the United States. My bill grants TPS for Venezuelans right now. The amendment also makes much-needed reforms to our TPS program. The amendment grants TPS to Venezuelans for 18 months. It requires congressional approval for TPS extensions, no more than 18 months at a time. My amendment limits the ability of illegal aliens with no connection to the TPS designation to benefit from TPS. It ensures that human rights violators identified under the Magnitsky Act are not eligible for TPS status. It includes provisions distinguishing TPS status does not count as admission for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Under my amendment, TPS recipients cannot return to the TPS country during the period of designation. And finally, the amendment requires that current TPS designations will come up for congressional review 2 years after the enactment of this amendment.

We want those seeking refuge from war and oppressive regimes to have a safe haven in our country, but we need a system that works and that is truly temporary.

I am honored to work with my colleagues to get something done today to help Venezuelans and make some much-needed changes to our broken system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (English translation of the statement made Spanish is as follows:)

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. We need TPS now. I stand with the people of Venezuela, and I will continue to fight for freedom and democracy in Latin America. It is time for Maduro and his thugs to leave power.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 549. I ask unanimous consent that the Scott of Florida amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, every Member of the Senate knows that Venezuela’s illegitimate dictator, Nicolas Maduro, has created an unprecedented and harrowing humanitarian crisis in that country. Extreme food and medicine shortages, widespread criminal violence, and brutal state-sponsored repressions have forced over 4 million Venezuelans to flee their homeland. This number could be 8 million by the end of next year.

As Venezuelans flee their country, it is time for the United States to place itself fully on the side of the Venezuelan people.

Unfortunately, just this week we have seen news stories about the Trump administration deporting Venezuelans from Florida. It is unconscionable that anyone would be sent back to the catastrophic humanitarian conditions that exist in Venezuela. That is why, in February of this year, Senator DURBIN and I, along with Senators RUBIO, LEAHY, and BOOKER, introduced bipartisan legislation to provide TPS to Venezuelans living here in the United States. The House of Representatives has already passed a version of this bill back in July, with support from dozens of Republican Members.

However, rather than providing TPS for vulnerable Venezuelans in the United States, the junior Senator from Florida has brought up an amendment that seeks to overhaul existing TPS statute and make it easier for the Trump administration to strip status from vulnerable migrants who are legally in the United States.

Respectfully, the suggestions that the courts have made it impossible to end any TPS is just not based in fact. This debate is not about watering down our immigration laws. It is about using the laws that we have right now to provide protection and make some much-needed changes to our broken system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (English translation of the statement made Spanish is as follows:)

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. We need TPS now. I stand with the people of Venezuela, and I will continue to fight for freedom and democracy in Latin America. It is time for Maduro and his thugs to leave power.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 549. I ask unanimous consent that the Scott of Florida amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Since the Senator from Florida and I do agree on the need to provide TPS for Venezuelans, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee
be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 549, the bill that has already passed in the House, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Reserving the right to object, I object on half of my colleague, Senator RAND PAUL.

What I propose is a bill that grants TPS to Venezuelans right now. It also makes much-needed reforms to the TPS program and gives Congress real oversight.

I am very disappointed that my Democratic colleagues would block this commonsense compromise. Republicans support it. The sponsor of the House-passed bill supports it. I believe the President would sign it. It is clear that the Democrats actually don’t want anything done on this issue. Unfortunately, they decided to use the Venezuelan community as a political prop, instead of working with us to find a solution. I think that is shameful. Even though the Democrats stood up and blocked TPS for Venezuelans today, I will never stop fighting to support the Venezuelan community here.

My amendment is a solution that can be passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help us to get this done.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that Nicolas Maduro is killing his citizens. It is genocide. Every passing day, the situation on the ground grows worse. Hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans are fleeing the violence and starvation of Maduro’s socialist regime, and they need our help.

While extending TPS to Venezuelans is the right thing now, it is a temporary solution, and freedom-loving nations around the world need to do everything in our power to isolate Maduro in Venezuela and cut off the supply of money from Cuba to Caracas.

It is time to help Venezuelan families. It is time to get TPS reform done in this country. Temporary protected status was never meant to be endless. It was meant to help families in need. We need to get this program to work. We need to get TPS for Venezuelans today.

I look forward to working with all my colleagues to help all the families in Venezuela and finally get a real long-term solution to TPS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, very briefly, I regret that my colleague has gone down the road of questioning political motives here.

The reality is, in a bipartisan way, the Senator from Florida joined with us in February of this year to provide legislation that would provide TPS for Venezuelans and the United States. The House of Representatives, which has a Democratic majority—and he mentions the Democrats—passed a bill in July of this year that became law. It was a bipartisan effort in the House of Representatives.

At the end of the day, it doesn’t take undermining TPS—dramatically changing TPS—in order to give Venezuelans temporary protected status. That is something the President could do without having the House of Representatives or the Senate act, but he has chosen not to. There are those who want to try to create an excuse for the President, but he has chosen not to do it.

No. 1, the reality is, if we wanted to create TPS for Venezuelans, we could immediately do that right now by accepting my unanimous consent request because the House of Representatives passed it with broad, bipartisan support. We could do it right now. It would be on the way to the President, and then, of course, he would have to sign the legislation even though he could do it on his own.

I hope we can work toward the goal of actually giving the Venezuelans that opportunity who are living in the United States and seeking refuge from the violence, from the chaos that is Venezuela—is living in the United States, and highly auto enrolling companies automatically enroll you unless you choose not to enroll, which helps to get the participation rate way up, from about 75 percent up to 95 percent.

We have done some things that have helped, and because of that, I know that, if you provide more incentives for retirement, it will work.

I have been working on this issue for a number of years—actually, about 20 years—going back to my days in the House with now-Senator BEN CARDIN. We passed legislation to expand how much you can put into a retirement account—a 401(k), an IRA. We increased the amount. There are the catchup contributions that some people are familiar with. There is also what is known as the auto enrollment. Companies automatically enroll you unless you choose not to enroll, which helps to get the participation rate way up.

The House of Representatives, which has a Democratic majority—and he mentions the Democrats—passed a bill in July of this year that became law by the President. I hope my colleagues will support that bill.

I hope we can work toward the goal of giving the Venezuelans that opportunity who are living in the United States and seeking refuge from the violence, from the chaos that is Venezuela and highly auto enrolling companies automatically enroll you unless you choose not to enroll, which helps to get the participation rate way up, from about 75 percent up to 95 percent.

We have done some things that have helped, and because of that, I know that, if you provide more incentives for retirement, it will work.

I have been working on this issue for a number of years—actually, about 20 years—going back to my days in the House with now-Senator BEN CARDIN. We passed legislation to expand how much you can put into a retirement account—a 401(k), an IRA. We increased the amount. There are the catchup contributions that some people are familiar with. There is also what is known as the auto enrollment. Companies automatically enroll you unless you choose not to enroll, which helps to get the participation rate way up, from about 75 percent up to 95 percent.

We have done some things that have helped, and because of that, I know that, if you provide more incentives for retirement, it will work.

I am very disappointed that my Democratic colleagues would block this commonsense compromise. Republicans support it. The sponsor of the House-passed bill supports it. I believe the President would sign it. It is clear that the Democrats actually don’t want anything done on this issue. Unfortunately, they decided to use the Venezuelan community as a political prop, instead of working with us to find a solution. I think that is shameful. Even though the Democrats stood up and blocked TPS for Venezuelans today, I will never stop fighting to support the Venezuelan community here.

My amendment is a solution that can be passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help us to get this done.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that Nicolas Maduro is killing his citizens. It is genocide. Every passing day, the situation on the ground grows worse. Hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans are fleeing the violence and starvation of Maduro’s socialist regime, and they need our help.

While extending TPS to Venezuelans is the right thing now, it is a temporary solution, and freedom-loving nations around the world need to do everything in our power to isolate Maduro in Venezuela and cut off the supply of money from Cuba to Caracas.

It is time to help Venezuelan families. It is time to get TPS reform done in this country. Temporary protected status was never meant to be endless. It was meant to help families in need. We need to get this program to work. We need to get TPS for Venezuelans today.

I look forward to working with all my colleagues to help all the families in Venezuela and finally get a real long-term solution to TPS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, very briefly, I regret that my colleague has gone down the road of questioning political motives here.

The reality is, in a bipartisan way, the Senator from Florida joined with
what is called the subcommittee on retirement within the Committee on Finance. We are working on these proposals on a bipartisan basis, and we are making some progress. I am going to tell you about some of those bills now.

One of the Senate right now in the sense that it has already passed the House. It is called the SECURE Act. One is a larger bill that does more than the SECURE Act that has been introduced by Senator CARDIN and me. It is a small bill that I want to mention tonight that has been introduced separately, which is also in the SECURE Act. It is an urgent thing to pass because there are a bunch of people who are going to lose their retirement benefits unless we pass it very soon. Let me back up and give you some of the troubling facts about why we need to do something here.

First of all, fewer than half of the employees who are, again, at small businesses, who don’t have retirement options, don’t have more than 50 workers—have access to plans. The problem is really in our smaller businesses, and we know that. Larger business all tend to have 401(k)s. Many have defined contribution plans like a 401(k); they have defined benefit plans like pensions. They tend to have retirement options for workers, but many of the small businesses do not. Even when workers have access to plans, there are still only 31 percent who participate.

Amongst small businesses, there are fewer plans than there should be, but there are also fewer people participating. Only 22 percent of part-time workers are in plans. Now, increasingly in our economy, people have part-time jobs or may have a few part-time jobs, but they don’t have retirement plans in any of them.

By the way, when you look at this in terms of the folks who are not participating, Americans who aren’t working but who are not participating as you would want. Only 22 percent of low-income families are participating in retirement plans. Many of them don’t have the disposable income to be able to contribute, and we will talk about that in a second as to how to address that problem.

The final problem I want to mention does not have to do with the small businesses or part-time workers or low-income workers. It has to do with what we’ll call the baby boomers, the folks who are retiring. It is people who outlive their retirements. Let’s face it. We are living longer and healthier lives as Americans, and that is a good thing, but a lot of people didn’t or couldn’t plan for that. They may have thought, I have a nice, little nest egg here, and I have a 401(k), and I am going to retire at age 65. Yet, when they are in their late eighties or nineties, they realize there just wasn’t enough set aside. Here is an opportunity for us to address that as well.

Earlier this year, Senator CARDIN and I introduced legislation called the Retirement Security and Savings Act, and it addresses all of these problems that I mentioned. It has more than 50 reforms, actually, to help Americans achieve this goal of safe, secure retirements—peace of mind—after their working for years and letting people retire with dignity. It calls the important provisions that I want to mention tonight. I won’t go into all 50, but I will mention some of them.

First, to increase this low 22 percent coverage among low-income workers, it would still be called the saver’s credit. This has worked well, but it is not refundable now, which means, for a lot of people who are of low income, they can’t take advantage of it because they don’t have the income tax liability, particularly with the new tax bill, frankly. For a lot of people, it has actually lowered taxes so that they don’t have the ability to take a deduction, but they can use a credit. We changed the saver’s credit to expand it so that it is more usable, and we make it refundable to individuals, but, rather, refundable to a retirement account because you don’t want to just provide more funding out there that is not going to be used for this correct purpose of retirement. It is a big deal in your retirement account. In addition, it increases the credit amount so as to be available to a lot of low-income savers. This is really going to help get people to be able to save for retirement, again, who are working but saving.

The bill also addresses the problem of only 22 percent of part-time workers being in plans. It requires employers to allow part-time workers who have completed 2 years of service to participate in 401(k) plans. This is a big deal to add the AARP, as an example, and it is one reason it is strongly supporting this bill. By the way, this is also being supported by a whole group of businesses, nonprofits, and others. People love this idea. Senator RON WYDEN, by the way, who is the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Finance, is a big supporter of auto enrollment. It also provides an innovative tax credit to employers for a certain way to get more small businesses to offer these plans.

We also address the problem we have talked about with Americans living longer and healthier lives and being in danger of outliving their retirement plans. For those who are following this closely because they are getting close to retirement, they should pay attention here because this could be helpful. To help the folks who have accumulated retirement savings preserve those nest eggs—to help to preserve your hard-earned nest eggs—the bill actually changes what is called the required minimum distribution rules.

If you are in your late sixties or maybe turning 70, you may be shocked to have just found out that—guess what—you have to start distributing at least 401(k)s. This enables them to put that money into the match, and it helps to get them started on retirement. On average, the student loan debt now for someone who comes out of one of our 4-year colleges or universities is $27,000. That makes it tough for a lot of people to get started in life.

To get at this problem, we talked about a few small businesses having plans. Portman-Cardin increases the tax credits that small businesses receive for one’s starting a retirement plan. It is $500 now, and we take it up to $5,000. That is a tenfold increase that will really help small businesses, we are told. This is why they support the bill.

It also provides an innovative tax credit idea. Small businesses get a tax credit if they automatically enroll their employees in the plans at least every 3 years. What does this mean? We talked about auto enrollment earlier and that, if you have auto enrollment in your company, your participation rate goes up to 65 percent from about 75 percent. Why? It is that people come into the workforce and might not sign up for a 401(k), but if they are automatically signed up, they are not going to say no, right? This way, they will start to get a little of their payroll taxes and a little of their paychecks going toward retirement. They will find out that this works. They will start their nest eggs, and they will like them, so they will stick with them.

It is the same thing here. If at least every 3 years you have to automatically enroll your employees, what will happen? You will get people into these plans, and they will stay in these plans. This is going to be a big deal in small businesses, and we think it is worth giving them a tax credit for it. It is kind of an innovative idea.

For small businesses, our bill also reduces some of the burdensome and duplicative regulations that are associated with administering the plan because for a lot of small businesses, they don’t have lawyers or general counsel; they don’t have professionals who can help on this. Yet the HR people would sure like to have the ease of the administration of these plans. So we do that, which is important in order to get more of these small businesses to offer these plans.
My dad was a little surprised by that because he was still working at age 70 1/2 when you have to start doing that.

By the way, a lot of people back home are still working at age 70 1/2, and they want to keep their retirement nest eggs. They want to keep building it up because they hope they are going to live a long life, and they want make sure they have something in there, but instead, no, when you are 70 1/2, you have to start taking it out and paying taxes on it.

So we did change it from 70 1/2 to 75. We do it over a few years because it is an expensive provision, frankly, in this bill, but we pay for it through other means. The idea is you want to let people keep that money in their nest egg. By the way, if your nest egg is $100,000 or less, there is no minimum required distribution anymore under our bill.

So for people who, again, are 70 1/2 and are wondering, “Why do I have to start taking this money out? I have 65,000 bucks up all these years, and I am still working,” or “I don’t need to take it out for retirement,” let them keep it in that plan. If there is under $100,000 bucks in your account, keep it in going forward forever. If you have more than $100,000 bucks in there, then for that additional amount, you don’t have to start taking it out until you are 75, under our bill.

So this is going to really help the people to ensure that they can set aside money for retirement, and they know it is going to be there when they need it.

Our new Portman-Cardin retirement legislation has the potential to fundamentally reshape for the better how large numbers of Americans approach their retirement planning, and that is a good thing. I look forward to getting it passed through the Finance Committee and sent to the Senate floor for a vote.

As I said earlier, even before we can get this broader package done, we have a smaller bill that is sitting here in the Senate. It has already passed the House. It is called the SECURE Act. It actually passed the House almost unanimously—417 to 3. That rarely happens, and that shows you the kind of bipartisan support it has. It is not as comprehensive as the bill I just talked about, but it does have some good provisions.

It also helps long-term and part-time workers contribute to 401(k)s, which is good.

So we go further in our bill, but this SECURE Act is a good step in the right direction. I support it. I support bringing it up and passing it. It already passed the House.

I do think we ought to allow a couple of amendments on each side because this SECURE Act that passed the House has not been voted on, on this floor before. It came out of our committee back in 2016. I believe, so it has been a while. There hasn’t been any debate on it or deliberation. Why not allow a few amendments on it on each side?

Democrats probably have a few amendments they would like to offer. Republicans have a few they would like to offer. The point is, let’s get that bill up and get it passed. This bill has already passed the House. It also raises this minimum required distribution amount we have, but it goes from 70 1/2 to 75—which is good. It has already passed the Senate. It has already passed the House almost unanimously, and that shows you the kind of bipartisan support it has. It is not as controversial as the SECURE Act too.

Now, it gets a little complicated here, as retirement plans do sometimes. These are people who are in these defined benefit plans, pension plans, and they are in businesses that all have to shift from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution like a 401(k). These are businesses that have said: We are not going to have an additional pension anymore. We are going to go to a 401(k) where individuals control their money and individuals control their account.

Now, what happened in some of these businesses is they said: But if you are already in a defined benefit plan, you can stay in. We are going to freeze your defined benefit plan going forward so new employees can’t go into it, but you can stay in your plan, and I think that is fair. Let people who are in the plan who have paid in all these years continue to stay in that defined benefit plan as they retire.

The problem is, inadvertently, the rules with regard to pensions are tripping these people up because there is something called the nondiscrimination income testing. In other words, you can’t have too many of the benefits go, in a defined benefit plan, to people who are more on the high end of income. It has to be spread out.

Well, think about it. The people who are left in these plans are people who are older because the new employees have had to go to the defined contribution plan. So it is an older group of employees and, therefore, more highly compensated because they have been given raises over time, so they trigger the nondiscrimination test as they lose their benefits. They can’t continue to accrue benefits.

That is just wrong. These are people who have played by the rules, done everything right. Through no fault of their own but through this quirk in the law that deals with these 450,000 people who are going to lose their benefits, and they have been supportive of us doing this broader retirement savings package as well.

We can get this done. We want to do it in order. No. 1, let’s get the Retirement Security Preservation Act done. That is the 450,000 people, and let’s just do that by unanimous consent. Everybody agrees to it.

Let’s move to the SECURE Act, get that done. Again, that was passed in the House almost unanimously, and then let’s move on to this broader Portman-Cardin legislation we talked about tonight. It really deals with these issues of small businesses, the ones that are not supporting of dealing with this quirk in the law that deals with these 450,000 people who are going to lose their benefits, and they have been supportive of us doing this broader retirement savings package as well.

We can get these done. Let’s do it in order. No. 1, let’s get the Retirement Security Preservation Act done. That is the 450,000 people, and let’s just do that by unanimous consent. Everybody agrees to it.

Let’s move to the SECURE Act, get that done. Again, that was passed in the House almost unanimously, and then let’s move on to this broader Portman-Cardin legislation we talked about tonight. It really deals with these issues of small businesses, the ones that are not supporting of dealing with this quirk in the law that deals with these 450,000 people who are going to lose their benefits, and they have been supportive of us doing this broader retirement savings package as well.

We can get these done. Let’s do it in order. No. 1, let’s get the Retirement Security Preservation Act done. That is the 450,000 people, and let’s just do that by unanimous consent. Everybody agrees to it.

Let’s move to the SECURE Act, get that done. Again, that was passed in the House almost unanimously, and then let’s move on to this broader Portman-Cardin legislation we talked about tonight. It really deals with these issues of small businesses, the ones that are not supporting of dealing with this quirk in the law that deals with these 450,000 people who are going to lose their benefits, and they have been supportive of us doing this broader retirement savings package as well.

We can get these done. Let’s do it in order. No. 1, let’s get the Retirement Security Preservation Act done. That is the 450,000 people, and let’s just do that by unanimous consent. Everybody agrees to it.
issue of being sure that people aren’t outliving their retirement savings.

Again, of the 50-plus provisions in there, there is a lot that really helps the people I represent back in Ohio and folks all around the country. They deserve us in Congress to be focused on those kinds of issues. This is exactly what people expect us to do here, help them ensure they have peace of mind in their retirement. We are doing all we can to provide the incentives to make that happen.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CORNELIA DOZIER COOPER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, great works of artistic expression are so much more than something simply to look at or listen to. They are often a reflection of the artist, her community, and a unique culture. Kentuckian Cornelia Dozier cooper recognizes the encouraging effect of creative works, and she has spent her lifetime promoting them in eastern Kentucky. It is a privilege to recognize my dear friend Cornelia, who was recently selected to receive our Commonwealth’s highest artistic honor: the Milner Award. In tribute to her accomplishment and philanthropy, I would like to extend my sincere congratulations for this well-deserved honor.

Born in Madisonville, KY, Cornelia Dozier Cooper developed a passion for the arts at an early age. Supported by her parents and a fostering education, she grew her skills in both visual and musical arts. She was quickly recognized for her talent and studied English watercolor at the prestigious Oxford University. I have had the privilege to visit Cornelia’s home, where I admired her beautiful watercolors up close. Her own artistic works, in which she hopes to display the glory of God’s creation, were just the beginning of her contribution to Kentucky.

With her husband, Richard Cooper—brother to another outstanding Kentuckian, Senator John Sherman Coo-

per—Cornelia’s devotion to the arts extended far beyond her own brush and canvas. She sought to give her fellow Kentuckians the opportunity to create great works of art and to be inspired by them in their communities. Cornelia worked with several organizations, including the prestigious Kentucky Arts Council, promoting aspiring talents in her home of Pulaski County and throughout the Commonwealth. She also established the Cornelia Dozier Cooper Endowment Fund for the purpose of supporting a variety of eastern Kentucky artists. The endowment is funded, in part, by the proceeds from the sale of her own watercolors.

At a ceremony in the Kentucky Capitol Rotunda, surrounded by artistic works celebrating the Bluegrass State’s illustrious history, Cornelia received her Milner Award. Even at the age of 93 Cornelia still brings the same enthusiasm to promoting young artists. To many throughout Kentucky, she is a mentor and a creative inspiration. Her selfless philanthropy will certainly continue to encourage young artists to develop their talents and follow their passions. I am grateful to Cornelia for her friendship and her lifetime service to our Commonwealth. She has certainly earned this distinction.

I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating this remarkable Kentuckian, Cornelia Dozier Cooper.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JOSEPH DUNFORD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been honored to know and work with many of the leaders in our military. One of the absolute finest I have known is General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., the outgoing Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have known General Dunford for years, certainly in his current capacity, but before that as Commandant of the Marine Corps. As the father of a marine, I looked at Joe Dunford as the best the Corps could have and what we all want from the men and women serving and leading the Marine Corps.

General Dunford has had a long and distinguished career of service as a marine. He was deployed during Operation Iraqi Freedom, earned the nickname “Fighting Joe” while serving under James Mattis, and led the U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan. He is admired by the men and women who served under him and is known for his respect and care for civilians caught up in conflict.

Marcelle and I were honored to travel with him to Vermont in 2017, where he gave the commencement address at St. Michael’s College, 40 years after his own graduation at that same institution. He told the graduates about to step out into their futures, “have the moral courage to do what’s right, even when it’s tough. Commit to serving something bigger than yourself.” Like General Dunford, I am a graduate of St. Michaels, and Marcelle has an honorary degree from St. Michaels. Also like General Dunford, I did my graduate work at Georgetown.

I mention his background because he is not a man that would ever brag about all the things he has done. Rather, he speaks to the values that he believes America should follow. I listened to him, standing in his uniform, speaking to these young men and women who were graduating. You could hear a pin drop in the hall, except for the time when they listened to him interrupt his speech with standing ovations.

He has led by service his entire career. He thought always of the men and women under his command. He thought of their families. He thought of our future and the world we would leave to our grandchildren. His legacy will be measured by his presence on the battlefield, but perhaps more so by the capable leadership he has brought that will be felt for generations to come. That is true leadership of an exceptional and visionary leader.

General Dunford and his wife Ellyn are looking forward to their retirement, but I do hope that academic and public institutions will call on him for his expertise and his knowledge, especially his conscience.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post, entitled “Joseph Dunford’s steady hand in the turmoil of Trump’s Washington,” by David Ignatius be printed in the RECORD, as it so eloquently captures the general’s legacy and service to our Nation.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 2019]

JOSEPH DUNFORD’S STRADY HAND IN THE TURMOIL OF TRUMP’S WASHINGTON

(By David Ignatius)

Gen. Joseph F. Dunford Jr., the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who will retire this month, is the best chairman in recent decades—and they are hoping Gen. Mark Milley, his successor, will be the best the Corps could have and what we all want from the men and women serving and leading the Marine Corps.

He didn’t try to be Trump’s friend or confidant, and he stayed away from palace intrigue. The White House treated him with respect, and his fellow commanders came to regard him with something approaching awe: “the general who helped insulate national security policy from disruption and political pressure. His Pentagon colleagues say he will be remembered as a visionary leader. In the ceaseless turmoil of the Trump administration, Dunford has been a steady hand who helped insulate security policy from disruption and political pressure. His Pentagon colleagues say he will be keenly missed—several described him as the best chairman in recent decades—and they are hoping Gen. Mark Milley, his successor, can sustain the independence and cool judgment that defined Dunford’s tenure.

Dunford doesn’t like to remain apolitical or let military advice . . . make sure that our
men and women in uniform have the wherewithal to do their job.’” “Joe Dunford is a man for all seasons,” says Jim Mattis, the former defense secretary. “He has not one mind, not easily distracted; he quantifies things, but he brings in the nonquantifiable. Still waters run deep in him. You simply can’t shake his faith in his fundamental values.”

Mattis cites two combat anecdotes to explain the world’s unfappable style. In March 2003, on the eve of the invasion of Iraq, Mattis told Dunford that because of a last-minute change in plans, his regiment had to move out in five hours, rather than at dawn the next morning. “He just took it in stride,” says Mattis.

A few days later, Dunford’s unit had fought its way to the Tigris River, with the loss of some marines, and was ready to seize a strategic bridge. Mattis told him he had to fall back until conditions were safer for the assault. Dunford obeyed that painful retreat order without hesitation, Mattis says.

During the job, one son of a Marine who fought at Choiseul Reservoir during the Korean War, he grew up in Quincy, Mass., a working-class suburb of Boston. Colleagues say he retained those grounded values throughout a rapidly rising career.

Gen. Frank McKenzie, head of the Central Command and former Marine, remembers that Dunford faced a delicate problem as a young lieutenant colonel on the staff of the Marine commandant. He had to manage relations between the brigade’s replacement and protection officer. He promptly removed the officer, to the consternation of some politically powerful friends.

Dunford’s dream was probably to become Marine commandant himself, and after he was appointed to that position in 2014, friends say it was his military post. When President Barack Obama nominated him chairmain in 2015, “he took the job with a Catholic sense of guilt” to do his duty, says one friend.

On Dunford’s desk as chairman, he placed the acronym of a venerated predecessor. Gen. Omar Bradley, who cautioned his staff that they didn’t have the “luxury” of focusing on just one theater but needed to think globally. Dunford has prodded the different service branches to do just that—move toward integrated global strategy, rather than separate fiefdoms.

Dunford built a powerful joint staff to coordinate policy, directed by strong officers such as McKenzie and Adm. Michael Gilday, to bring bounded values through a rapidly rising career.

On Dunford’s desk as chairman, he placed the acronym of a venerated predecessor. Gen. Omar Bradley, who cautioned his staff that they didn’t have the “luxury” of focusing on just one theater but needed to think globally. Dunford has prodded the different service branches to do just that—move toward integrated global strategy, rather than separate fiefdoms.
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to pursuing an education at the U.S. Military Academy, to earning the rank of Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, to becoming the leader of our Nation and the free world, Ike continually strove for the best. Like so many of his generation, he achieved a great deal for himself and our country, but didn’t seek personal credit for his accomplishments. Eisenhower’s determination, leadership, and honorable character are the reasons he remains respected around the world to this day. In fact, just 2 years ago in 2017, historians with expertise on Presidential rankings revised previous figures to now include Eisenhower among the top five of all U.S. Presidents. Although there are numerous examples of Ike’s international respect, one particular instance can be drawn from his 1945 Guildhall Address. After Eisenhower received the key to the city of London upon leading the Allies to victory in World War II, he said, “No petty differences in the world of trade, traditions, or national pride should ever blind us to our identities in priceless values. If we keep our eyes on this guidepost, then no difficulties along the path of mutual co-operation can ever be insurmountable. Moreover, when this truth has permeated to the remotest hamlet and heart of all people, then indeed may we beat our swords into plowshares and all nations can enjoy the fullness of the earth.”

Today, we are surrounded by Eisenhower’s enduring leadership and ideas. The effects of his creative innovation and his focus on the future gave us the Interstate Highway System, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Saint Lawrence Seaway, NASA, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now known as the Department of Health and Human Services, to name just a few. Ike also supported legislation that welcomed Alaska and Hawaii into the Union; eradicated segregation in our Armed Forces; and deployed the Army’s 101st Airborne to Central High School in Little Rock, AR, ensuring that the law of educational integration was followed by all States. As the chairman of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, I am pleased to announce that the completion of the Eisenhower Memorial, commemorating and memorializing the general and President, is on budget and on schedule. A dedication ceremony is slated for May 8, 2020, the 75th Anniversary of the Allied Victory in Europe, V-E Day, during World War II. It is truly exciting to realize that, in about 7 months, our Nation will dedicate a Presidential memorial in Washington, DC, celebrating the life and legacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I ask you to join me in honoring Eisenhower’s 129th birthday. Ike not only championed the free world as an exceptional military strategist, but also led our country to times of prosperity serving as a visionary guardian of the country’s well-being. Hailing from America’s heartland and devoting his life to the pursuit of liberty, Ike left behind an extraordinary legacy that created a better, more peaceful world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MARCA BRISTO

• Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come before the Senate today to honor the life of Marca Bristo: a trailblazer, an activist, a mother and—to me and so many others—a hero. She passed away this month at the age of 66, after spending the last four decades on the frontlines of the disability rights movement.

With every day that passed and every life she fought on, Marca redefined the word resilience. It was thanks in large part to her decision to get out of her wheelchair and claw up the steps of the Capitol Building to help pass the Americans with Disabilities Act that I can roll through its corridors to cast my vote in its Chamber three decades later.

She climbed up those steps to tear down the barriers that had been holding us back. She got onto her hands and knees so the rest of us could rise, working tirelessly to turn the ADA from a dream to a law that enshrines the basic civil rights that those of us with disabilities rely on to live our daily lives.

And countless others am devastated that we lost her so soon, but I am also deeply grateful to have known her, deeply thankful that, in one of the toughest times of my life, when I was still adjusting to life in a wheelchair after being wounded in Iraq, she decided to reach out. Through her kind words and her wisdom, she led me on. When I was at my lowest point, her resilience, her strength and her grit, she quickly went from stranger to mentor to dear friend.

Marca was raised on a farm in upstate New York before moving to Chicago and earning her nursing degree at Rush University, but less than a year after becoming a nurse, a diving accident left her paralyzed from the chest down. She lost her home because she could no longer access it. She lost her job because there were no labor protections for people with disabilities. She lost her health insurance because her injuries and care were too expensive. But she didn’t lose her resolve, and our country is far, far better because of that and because she believed that, even if you get knocked down, it doesn’t mean you are knocked out.

Marca’s entire life changed the day of her accident. Suddenly, she looked around and saw a world hostile to her, hostile to all who couldn’t walk or see, couldn’t speak or hear. In Marca’s spirit for change, she decided to reach out. Through her kind words and her wisdom, she led me on. When I was at my lowest point, her resilience, her strength and her grit, she quickly went from stranger to mentor to dear friend.

Marca is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific software and hardware elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Qatar can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Qatar.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 129th birthday of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Eisenhower was a fellow Kansan, a strong trailblazer, and an exceptional American. His lifetime traversed many important eras in our Nation. Ike was born as the American Frontier came to an end, and passed away only a few months before the United States stepped foot on the Moon, beginning an exploration into the new frontier of space.

Born in Denison, TX, on October 14, 1890, and raised in Abilene, KS, Eisenhower was humble yet confident. He always worked hard for what he wanted. From his early years of working 12-hour shifts at a creamery,
one that overlooked or ignored their needs, making it impossible for many to work or even to get to work, impossible to go to school or to lead the normal lives they deserved.

She saw discrimination, and she refused to call it anything else, refusing to stay silent. Disability issues weren’t just relegated to the doctor’s office, weren’t just treated as medical matters, but were recognized as civil rights.

So she spoke out. She chained herself to public buses to demand wheelchair lifts. She fought for fair housing and founded Access Living, which she built into one of the leading disability rights groups in the country. She wheeled herself to the front of the Capitol Building, got down out of her chair and, one stair at a time, crawled up its 83 steps, demanding that Congress give Americans with disabilities the basic rights the Constitution promised. She set up camp outside GOP offices to fight cuts to Medicare, letting herself get arrested because that is what it took.

In the process, she reframed how this country thought about our rights. As she famously said, “My wheelchair wasn’t too wide for the doors, the doors were too narrow for my wheelchair.” Through all her work over all these decades, she didn’t just widen the doors. She opened ones that had previously been closed to all of us who happen to be in a chair.

No one used to think about how we couldn’t get from sidewalk to street when there wasn’t a curb cut. No one used to question the fact that we couldn’t climb onto the bus or get down to the subway.

Marca changed all that. She refused to accept a status quo that didn’t accept all of us. She saw us, she fought for us, and she made our voices heard.

Her work, her friendship, her activism meant so much to me. It is the reason I will keep fighting to-...
(FRL No. 9999–87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2643. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Nicotinamide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9999–72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2644. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2645. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2646. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Transition Assistance Program (TAP) for Military Personnel” (RIN0070–AK80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 18, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2647. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS)” (Case 2019–D010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 18, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2648. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Steven M. Shepro, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2649. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran as declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2650. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; New Hampshire; Redesignation of the Central New Hampshire Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area” (FRL No. 9999–84–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2651. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Georgia; 2008 8-hour Ozone Interstate Transport” (FRL No. 9999–74–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2652. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Illinois; State Board and Infrastructure SIP Requirements” (FRL No. 9999–78–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2653. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Maintenance Plan for 1997 Ozone NAAQS” (FRL No. 9999–68–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2654. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jeffer son County Existing and New VOC Storage Vessels Rule Changes” (FRL No. 10000–26–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2655. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; New VOC Storage Vessels Rule Changes” (FRL No. 10000–33–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2656. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Title V Operation Permit Program; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule” (FRL No. 10000–39–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2657. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Title V Operation Permit Program; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule” (FRL No. 10000–15–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2658. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Removal of Control of VOC Emissions from Traffic Coverings” (FRL No. 9999–74–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2659. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Rescission of Information on Sales of Fuels to be Provided and Maintained and Certain Coals to be Washed” (FRL No. 9999–73–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2660. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Maintenance Plan for 1997 Ozone NAAQS” (FRL No. 9999–68–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2661. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles” (FRL No. 9999–03–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2662. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Texas; Infrastructure for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 9999–17–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2663. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Title V Operation Permit Program; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule” (FRL No. 10000–39–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2664. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Title V Operation Permit Program; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule” (FRL No. 10000–15–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2660. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Requests and Maintenance Plans for Delaware County and Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Areas’’ (FRL No. 10000–27–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2667. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Approval of Air Quality Improvement Plan; New Mexico Plan, 112(1) Plan; Missouri Operating Permits’’ (FRL No. 10000–14–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2670. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Clean Data Determination; Salt Lake City, Utah 2006 Fine Particulate Matter Standards Nonattainment Area’’ (FRL No. 9999–66–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2697. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’; Recodification of Pre-Existing Rules’’ (FRL No. 10000–73–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2699. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions’’ (FRL No. 10000–08–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2756. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of organizational, technical, and nongovernmental services to the Republic of Korea to support the assembly, inspection, test and production of a T700/701K engine for end use on the Korean Helicopter Program in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18–093–1) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.


EC–2674. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board’s request for fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2675. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting proposed legislation relative to major medical facility construction projects and major medical facility leases for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:


By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:


By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 2545. An original bill to amend titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to lower prescription drug prices in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, to improve transparency related to pharmaceutical prices and transactions, to lower patients’ out-of-pocket costs, and to ensure accountability to taxpayers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–120).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ‘‘Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2020’’ (Rept. No. 116–121).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2099. A bill to redesignate the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve in the State of North Dakota as the White Horse Hill National Game Preserve.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH, for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

Nominations: Adrian Zuckerman.

Post: Ambassador to Romania.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform the Committee of the extent of the contribution made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, donee:


Children and Spouses: Natalie A. Zuckerman, daughter: none.

Parents: Emil C. Zuckerman, Aura B. Zuckerman, Divorced, None.

Grandparents: Deceased. None.

Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

Adam Seth Boehler, of Louisiana, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

Mr. RISCH, Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Melissa McInnis and ending with Marcella Garcia, which nominations were referred by the Senate and approved in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019.

By Mr. BARRASSO, for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY:
S. 2542. A bill to amend titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to lower prescription drug prices in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, to improve transparency related to pharmaceutical prices and transactions, to lower patients’ out-of-pocket costs, and to ensure accountability to taxpayers, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. RUHLO):
S. 2544. A bill to provide tax relief for the victims of Hurricane Florence, Hurricane Michael, California wildfires; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):
S. 2545. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a program to make grants to States to inform Medicaid enrollees and SNAP participants of potential eligibility for the Lifeline program of the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KING):
S. 2546. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exception process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. young, and Ms. CORTZEL MANZUTO):
S. 2547. A bill to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People’s Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MURKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARRREN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAIKE, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. SHAH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. DURBIN):
S. 2548. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. KAIN):
S. 2549. A bill to allow nonprofit child care providers to participate in the loan programs of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
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S. 338. A resolution designating the week of September 23 through September 27, 2019, as “Malnutrition Awareness Week”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. young, Mr. JONES, and Ms. COLLINS):
S. 339. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retiree Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy and engagement, and ensuring the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. CAPITO):
S. Res. 340. A resolution designating the week of September 23 through September 27, 2019, as “Community School Coordinators Appreciation Week”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):
S. Res. 341. A resolution designating September 2019 as “National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. HYDE-JONES) from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant ship captains of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 211

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to amend title VII of the Omnibus Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes.
At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt) were added as co-sponsors of S. 261, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Peters) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 366, a bill to shorten monopoly periods for prescription drugs that are the subjects of sudden price hikes.

At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 474, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases.

At the request of Ms. Baldwin, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts) were added as co-sponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Carper, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) were added as co-sponsors 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.

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 665, a bill to impose additional restrictions on tobacco flavors for use in e-cigarettes.

At the request of Mr. Brown, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) were added as co-sponsors of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

At the request of Mr. Isakson, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. King), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Scott) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) were added as co-sponsors of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill’s Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1048, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Reducing Youth Use of E-Cigarettes Initiative.

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1142, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) was added as a co-sponsor 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. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

At the request of Mr. Schatz, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1413, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense, to establish an initiative on Camp Justice, the capacity of military criminal investigative organizations to prevent child sexual exploitation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Tillis, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhoffe) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1564, a bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission and certain Federal agencies to carry out a study relating to accounting standards, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Carper) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall) were added as co-sponsors 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.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. Hirono), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1602, a bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitive- ness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Murkowski, her name was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1602, supra.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, his name was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1678, a bill to express United States support for Taiwan’s diplomatic alliances around the world.

At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1723, a bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account.

At the request of Mr. Wyden, his name was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1750, a bill to establish the Clean School Bus Grant Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Kennedy, the name of the Senator from New York...
(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1782, a bill to add suicide prevention resources to school identification cards.

S. 1822
At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a co-sponsor 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. 1880
At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1880, a bill to support the provision of treatment family care services, and for other purposes.

S. 2026
At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HENRICH) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2026, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 2085
At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2103
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETESEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2103, a bill to improve access to affordable insulin.

S. 2372
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAFIQUA) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as co-sponsors of S. 2372, a bill to enhance global engagement to combat marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. 2381
At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2381, a bill to promote botanical research and botanical sciences capacity, and for other purposes.

S. 2399
At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2399, a bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide that the licensing of a mark for use by a related company may not be construed as establishing an employment relationship between the owner of the mark, or an authorizing person, and either that related company or the employees of that related company, and for other purposes.

S. 2461
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2461, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. RES. 73
At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 73, a resolution calling on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to immediately release Saudi Women’s Rights activists and respect the fundamental rights of all Saudi citizens.

S. RES. 226
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 226, a resolution reaffirming the strong partnership between Tunisia and the United States and supporting the people of Tunisia in their continued pursuit of democratic reforms.

S. RES. 252
At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolutiondesignating 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.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 232, supra.

S. RES. 277
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 277, a resolution remembering the 25th Anniversary of the bombing of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and recommitting to efforts to uphold justice for the 85 victims of the attacks.

S. RES. 313
At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 313, a resolution designating the week of September 22 through September 28, 2019, as “Gold Star Families Remembrance Week”.

S. RES. 318
At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 318, a resolution to support the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and the Sixth Replenishment.

S. RES. 330
Resolved, that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to require the appropriate official of the executive branch, after each Federal election, to promptly submit to Congress a determination as to whether the Government of the Russian Federation, or any other foreign government, has interfered in such election and a detailed assessment of any such interference that identifies, to the maximum extent practicable, the individual responsible for the interference, and to promptly impose sanctions on any foreign government that has been determined to have interfered in a Federal election, including specified individuals and entities within the territory of that government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 331—INSTRUCTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE ON THE BILL S. 1790 (116TH CONGRESS) TO REQUIRE CERTAIN MEASURES TO ADDRESS FEDERAL ELECTION INTERFERENCE BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS
Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 331
Resolved, that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions of S. 2118 (116th Congress) (relating to the prohibition of United States persons from dealing in certain information and communications technology or services from foreign adversaries and requiring the approval of Congress to terminate certain export controls in effect with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.)

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 331
Resolved, that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions of S. 2118 (116th Congress) (relating to the prohibition of United States persons from dealing in certain information and communications technology or services from foreign adversaries and requiring the approval of Congress to terminate certain export controls in effect with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.).
SENATE RESOLUTION 332—INSTRUCTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE ON THE CONFERENCE ON THE BILL S. 1790 (116TH CONGRESS) TO INSIST UPON THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SECTION 630A OF THE HOUSE AMENDMENT (RELATING TO THE REPEAL OF A REQUIREMENT OF REDUCTION OF SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN SURVIVOR ANNUITIES BY AMOUNTS OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION)

Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RISCH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 630a of the House amendment (relating to the repeal of a requirement of reduction of Survivor Benefit Plan survivor annuities by amounts of dependency and indemnity compensation).

SENATE RESOLUTION 333—INSTRUCTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE ON THE BILL S. 1790 (116TH CONGRESS) TO INSIST UPON THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SUBTITLE B OF TITLE XI OF THE HOUSE AMENDMENT (RELATING TO PAID FAMILY LEAVE FOR FEDERAL PERSONNEL)

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DICKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WAREN, and Mr. BROKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in subtitle B of title XI of the House amendment (relating to paid family leave for Federal personnel).

SENATE RESOLUTION 334—INSTRUCTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE ON THE BILL S. 1790 (116TH CONGRESS) TO INSIST UPON THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SECTION 316 OF THE HOUSE AMENDMENT (RELATING TO THE USE OF PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES FOR LAND-BASED APPLICATIONS OF FIREFIGHTING FOAM)

Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) are instructed to insist upon the provisions of section 316 of the Senate bill (relating to a prohibition on the use of perfluoralkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances for land-based applications of firefighting foam).

SENATE RESOLUTION 335—INSTRUCTING THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE ON THE BILL S. 1790 (116TH CONGRESS) TO INSIST UPON THE MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE TO INSIST UPON THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SECTION 2906 OF THE SENATE BILL (RELATING TO REPLENISHMENT OF CERTAIN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FUNDS)

Ms. MCSALLY submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill S. 1790 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 2906 of the Senate bill (relating to replenishment of certain military construction funds).


Ms. ERNST submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 be instructed to insist upon the members of the conference to consider potential commonsense solutions regarding family and medical leave, including voluntary compensatory time programs and incentives through the tax code.

SENATE RESOLUTION 337—EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT THE FIRES IN THE AMAZON RAINFOREST

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. SHEPARD, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Amazon rainforest is the largest rainforest in the world;
Whereas almost 60 percent of the Amazon rainforest exists within the borders of Brazil;
Whereas the Amazon rainforest accounts for 25 percent of the carbon that global forests absorb each year and has as much as 140,000,000,000 tons of carbon sequestered in the ground;
Whereas the ecosystem of the Amazon rainforest is home to over 2,000 species of animals, meaning that 1 in 10 known species of animals is endemic to the region;
Whereas 70 percent of the gross domestic product of South America is generated in areas that receive rainfall or water from the Amazon rainforest, and the trees of the Amazon rainforest influence rainfall patterns as far away as the United States;
Whereas the National Institute for Space Research of Brazil (referred to in this pre-amble as the “INPE”) reported that, between January and September of 2019, there were 87,257 fires in Brazil, including 62,034 fires in the Legal Amazonia, more than double the number of fires that occurred during the entire 2018 calendar year;
Whereas the INPE reported that the Amazon rainforest shrunk 1,330 square miles in the first 6 months of 2019, a 40 percent increase in deforestation from 2018;
Whereas public recognition of the fact that, from January 2019 to June 2019, the number of enforcement actions taken by the Government of Brazil aimed at curbing illegal deforestation declined by 20 percent;
Whereas fires and illegal deforestation in the Amazon rainforest impact the benefits that the Amazon rainforest has on regional and global climate stability;
Whereas fires and illegal deforestation in the Amazon rainforest pose a danger to indigenous communities;
Whereas a recent poll conducted by the Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and Statistics found that 96 percent of the people of Brazil partially or completely agreed with the statement that “President [Jair] Bolsonaro and the Federal government should increase inspection measures to prevent illegal deforestation in the Amazon”;
Whereas the United States was the first country to recognize the independence of Brazil in 1822 and has long respected and championed the sovereignty of Brazil;
Whereas the people of the United States have historic, cultural, and familial ties to the people of Brazil; and
Whereas the United States and Brazil share a common interest in the sustainable management of the natural resources of the Amazon rainforest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) expresses bipartisan concern about the fires and increased illegal deforestation in the Amazon rainforest;
(2) recognizes that the fires and illegal deforestation in the Amazon rainforest affect the whole world;
(3) supports the proactive delivery of financial and technical assistance from the United States to the Government of Brazil and to Brazilian nongovernmental organizations to mitigate the fires and curb illegal deforestation;
(4) supports the reinstatement of protections for indigenous communities stewarding the Amazon rainforest; and
(5) supports the efforts of the Government of Brazil to increase sustainable development of the Amazon rainforest by strengthening environmental enforcement and ending illegal deforestation.
SENATE RESOLUTION 338—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 23 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 27, 2019, AS ‘MALNUTRITION AWARENESS WEEK’

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 338

Whereas malnutrition is the condition that occurs when a person does not get enough nutrients;
Whereas malnutrition is a significant problem in the United States and around the world, crossing all age, racial, class, gender, and geographic lines;
Whereas, in the United States, infants, older adults, people with chronic diseases, and other vulnerable populations are particularly at risk for malnutrition;
Whereas disease-associated malnutrition costs the United States more than $15,000,000 each year;
Whereas approximately 1/4 of individuals in the United States have eating patterns of vegetables, fruits, dairy, and oils that are below the recommended dietary guidelines;
Whereas many vulnerable individuals in the United States do not get the daily recommended amount of lean proteins;
Whereas approximately 6,000,000 children in the United States live in food insecure homes;
Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics has found that failure to provide key nutrients during early childhood may result in lifelong deficits in brain function;
Whereas disease-associated malnutrition affects between 30 and 50 percent of patients admitted to hospitals;
Whereas the medical costs of hospitalized patients with malnutrition can be 300 percent more than the medical costs of properly nourished patients;
Whereas more than 1/2 of older adults living in the community are at risk for malnutrition; and
Whereas the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition created Malnutrition Awareness Week to raise awareness and promote prevention of malnutrition:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 23 through September 27, 2019, as ‘Malnutrition Awareness Week’;
(2) recognizes registered dietitian nutritionists and other nutrition professionals, health care providers, social workers, advocates, caregivers, and other professionals and agencies for their efforts to advance awareness and prevention of malnutrition;
(3) recognizes the importance of existing Federal nutrition programs for their role in combating malnutrition and supports continuing resources to prevent and treat malnutrition; and
(4) recognizes the need to reauthorize the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) and the child nutrition programs of the Department of Agriculture to provide critical nutrition assistance to vulnerable populations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 339—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY WEEK, INCLUDING Raising Public Awareness of the Various Tax-Preferred Retirement Vehicles, Increasing Personal Financial Literacy, and Engaging the People of the United States on the Keys to Success in Achieving and Maintaining Retirement Security Throughout Their Lifetimes

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JONES, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension:

S. Res. 339

Whereas people in the United States are living longer and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;
Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;
Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States—

(1) 40.6 percent of households in which the head of household is between the ages of 35 and 44 are likely to run out of money in retirement; and
(2) the amount that workers have saved for retirement is on the amount that those workers need to adequately fund their retirement years;
Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important so that those workers understand the need to save for retirement;
Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;
Whereas many Americans do not—

(1) be aware of the various options in saving for retirement; or
(2) have focus on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement and successfully achieving retirement security;
Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans as an aid to retirement savings, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;
Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;
Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles;
Whereas people in the United States are living longer and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;
Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;
Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States—

(1) 40.6 percent of households in which the head of household is between the ages of 35 and 44 are likely to run out of money in retirement; and
(2) the amount that workers have saved for retirement is on the amount that those workers need to adequately fund their retirement years;
Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important so that those workers understand the need to save for retirement;
Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;
Whereas many Americans do not—

(1) be aware of the various options in saving for retirement; or
(2) have focus on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement and successfully achieving retirement security;
Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans as an aid to retirement savings, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;
Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;
Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles;
Whereas effectively and sustainably withdrawing retirement resources throughout the retirement period is as important and crucial as saving and accumulating funds for retirement; and
Whereas the week of October 20 through October 26, 2019, has been designated as ‘National Retirement Security Week’:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;
(2) acknowledges the need to raise public awareness of a variety of tax-preferred retirement vehicles that are used by many people in the United States but could be used by more; and
(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Retirement Security Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States, thereby enhancing the retirement security of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 340—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 23 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 27, 2019, AS ‘COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATORS APPRECIATION WEEK’

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 340

Whereas community schools marshal, align, and unite the assets, resources, and capacity of schools and communities for the success of students, families, and communities;
Whereas community schools are an effective, evidence-based, and equity-driven strategy for school improvement included under section 4225 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7275), as added by section 4601 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114-95; 129 Stat. 2020);
Whereas community schools that provide well-designed, expanded learning opportunities have positive academic and nonacademic outcomes, including improvements in student attendance, behavior, and academic achievement;
Whereas community schools have the potential of closing racial and economic achievement gaps, as indicated in a 2017 report;
Whereas community schools provide a strong social return on investment, with one study citing a social return of between $10 to $15 for every dollar invested over a 3-year period;
Whereas community school coordinators are essential to building successful community schools and creating, strengthening, and maintaining the bridges between community schools and the community;
Whereas community school coordinators facilitate and provide leadership for the collaborative process and development of a continuous system of supports and opportunities for children, families, and others within a school’s community that allow all students to learn and the community to thrive;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 23 through September 27, 2019, as ‘Community School Coordinators Appreciation Week’; and
(2) recognizes, raises awareness of, and celebrates the
SENATE RESOLUTION 341—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2019 AS ‘NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH’

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 341

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers; Whereas ovarian cancer is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States; Whereas, in 2019 in the United States, approximately 22,530 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed and 13,980 women will die of ovarian cancer; Whereas more than 1/2 of the women diagnosed with ovarian cancer will die within 5 years of that diagnosis; Whereas, while the mammogram can detect breast cancer and the Pap smear can detect cervical cancer, there is no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer; Whereas the lack of an early detection test means that approximately 80 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage; Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, but approximately 20 percent of women who are diagnosed with ovarian cancer harbor predisposing genetic mutations in ovarian cancer, which places them at even higher risk; Whereas scientists and physicians have uncovered that the BRCA genes that some women inherit from their parents, which may make those women as much as 35 times more likely to develop ovarian cancer; Whereas the familial history of a woman has been found to play an important role in accurately assessing the risk of that woman of developing ovarian cancer, and medical experts believe that family history should be taken into consideration during the annual well-woman visit of any woman; Whereas many experts in health prevention and personalized genetic testing for young women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer; Whereas women who know that they are at high risk of breast and ovarian cancer may undertake prophylactic measures to help reduce the risk of developing those diseases; Whereas clinical trials are fundamental to the discovery of new and better therapies in the fight against ovarian cancer and can offer some patients their best hope for treatment; Whereas the Society of Gynecologic Oncology recommends that all women who are diagnosed with ovarian cancer receive counseling and genetic testing; Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases; Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis; and Whereas, each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer Research Alliance and community partners hold hundreds of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 23 through September 29, 2019, as ‘Community School Coordinators Appreciation Week’; (2) thanks community school coordinators for the work they do to serve students, families, and communities; and (3) encourages students, parents, school administrators, and public officials to participate in events that celebrate Community School Coordinators Appreciation Week.

SENATE RESOLUTION 342—EXPRESSING THE NEED FOR IMMEDIATE CLIMATE ACTION IN RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE ENTITLED ‘SPECIAL REPORT ON THE OCEAN AND CYROSHERE IN A CHANGING CLIMATE’

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. Res. 342

Whereas every person on the planet benefits from a healthy ocean and a stable cryosphere; Whereas the ocean covers more than 70 percent of the surface of the Earth; Whereas the cryosphere includes the frozen components of the system of the Earth, including snow, glaciers, ice sheets, ice shelves, icebergs, sea ice, and permafrost; Whereas glaciers, ice sheets, and permanent snow hold approximately 69 percent of the freshwater on Earth; Whereas the ocean generates the oxygen that humans breathe, regulates the climate and weather patterns, supplies food, is a source of cultural value, supports tourism and trade, and is an untapped renewable energy resource; Whereas the ocean contributes an estimated $1.500,000,000,000 in values added to the global economy, including a United States fishing industry valued at $212,000,000,000, which is a critical economic driver in the United States; Whereas the ocean and cryosphere support biodiversity and regulate the global exchange of water, energy, and carbon; Whereas the ocean, cryosphere, and atmosphere together contribute to climate change mitigation by storing carbon; Whereas widespread thaw and degradation of permafrost is projected to occur this century and is anticipated to release tens to hundreds of billions of tons of carbon dioxide and methane into the atmosphere; Whereas the United States is already facing the consequences of inaction on climate change; Whereas communities of color, indigenous communities, and low-income communities often face the disproportionate effects of inaction on climate change; Whereas reducing greenhouse gas emissions, transitioning to clean energy economy, and investing in climate adaptation efforts can support good-paying jobs; Whereas, in 2018, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a special report entitled ‘Global Warming of 1.5°C’, which found that to limit...
global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, net global greenhouse gas emissions must be re-
duced to 45 percent below 2010 levels by 2030 and
100 percent below 2010 levels, or net zero, by 2050; and
Whereas, as Congress enacts policies to put the
United States on a path to net-zero emis-
sions, there is an opportunity and need for the
ocean to be part of the climate solution: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and accepts the findings of the
report of the United Nations Intergov-
ernmental Panel on Climate Change entitled
“Special Report on the Ocean and
Cryosphere in a Changing Climate”;
(2) commits to supporting ocean-centric
solutions to the climate crisis in conjunction
with policies to reduce greenhouse gas emis-
sions; and
(3) affirms that immediate action is needed
to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to pro-
tect the health of the ocean and the stability of the
cryosphere.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED
SA 942. Mr. PAUL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the
bill H.R. 4378, making continuing appropri-
ations for fiscal year 2020, and for other pur-
poses; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS
SA 942. Mr. PAUL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the
bill H.R. 4378, making continuing appropri-
ations for fiscal year 2020, and for other pur-
poses; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the appropriate place in division A. add the follow-
ing:

SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN RATE FOR OPER-
ATIONS.
The rate for operations provided by section 101 is hereby reduced by 2 percent.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET
Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have
11 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Sen-
ate. They have the approval of the Ma-
jority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Sen-
ate, the following committees are au-
thorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND
FORESTRY
The Committee on Agriculture, Nut-
rition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS
The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION
The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is author-
ized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES
The Committee on Energy and Nat-
ural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on
Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS
The Committee on Environment and
Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on
Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 9:15 a.m., to conduct a business hearing and the following nominations: Aurelia Swift, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and Katherine Andrea Lemos, of Cali-
fornia, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, and to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, and 8 General Services Administration resolutions.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the ses-
sion of the Senate on Wednesday, Sep-
tember 25, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to con-
duct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
The Committee on Homeland Secu-
rity and Governmental Affairs is au-
thorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
The Committee on the Judiciary is
authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, Sep-
tember 25, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., to con-
duct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS
The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is
authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, Sep-
tember 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING
The Special Committee on Aging is
authorized to meet during the session of

ORDER OF PROCEDURE
Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that following leader
remarks on Thursday, September 26, the Senate proceed to the consider-
ation of H.R. 4378; that the only amend-
ment in order be the Paul amendment
No. 942; that the time until 12:15 p.m.
be equally divided in the usual form;
that at 12:15 p.m., the Senate vote in
relation to the Paul amendment; and
that following disposition of the
amendment, the bill, as amended, if
amended, be read a third time and the
Senate vote on passage of the bill, as
amended, if amended, with 60 affirm-
ative votes required for passage.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of H.R. 4378,
the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Hyten
nomination, with the time until 1:30 p.m. equally divided between the lead-
ers or their designees; that at 1:30 p.m.,
the postclosure time expires; the Hyten and Scalia nominations be consid-
ered expired and the Senate vote on the
nomination in the order listed; and that if
confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the
table and the President be immediately
notified of the Senate’s action.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 26, 2019
Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that when the Sen-
ate completes its business today, it ad-
journ until 10 a.m., Thursday, Sep-
tember 26; further, that following the
prayer and pledge, the morning hour be
deemed expired, the Journal of pro-
cedings be approved to date, the time
for the two leaders be reserved for their
use later in the day, morning business
be closed, and the Senate proceed to the
consideration of H.R. 4378 under the
previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW
Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if
there is no further business to come be-
fore the Senate, I ask unanimous con-
sent that the Senate adjourn under the
previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate,
at 7:23 p.m., adjourned until Thursday,
September 26, 2019, at 10 a.m.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SHORT-TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Federal Employee Short-Term Disability Insurance Act of 2019, which would help provide financial relief for federal employees who have a short-term injury or disability, become pregnant, or develop a pregnancy-related illness. This bill would offer federal employees short-term disability insurance at no cost to the federal government. Employees would be responsible for 100 percent of the premiums and be able to receive disability insurance benefits for up to one year, which would replace a portion of their lost income due to a non-work-related injury or illness or pregnancy. These benefits would be particularly advantageous to ensure that our federal employees, who do not yet enjoy paid maternity leave, are able to utilize the 12 weeks of unpaid maternity leave permitted by federal law while continuing to pay their bills, buy groceries and make their mortgage, car and other loan payments without depleting their retirement or other savings accounts. Too many federal employees do not take advantage of the full amount of federal unpaid maternity leave they and their newborn need because they have no way to replace the lost income.

I decided to investigate how we could provide short-term disability insurance for federal employees after learning that many of them already buy short-term disability insurance as individuals in the private market at high individual rates. Although federal employees have good health insurance, federal health benefits do not replace lost income if employees are unable to work. Moreover, while federal employees may have available sick or annual leave days, they may not have enough such days to pay the bills if they have to be out of work for an extended period, such as following surgery. Although there are long-term disability options for federal employees who become permanently disabled, federal employees do not qualify for such benefits until they have worked for the federal government for at least 18 months. My bill does no more than put federal employees in the same position as many individuals in the private sector.

Mr. McADAMS. Madam Speaker, Utah native Marriner S. Eccles is one of the giants in the history of America's free enterprise banking system and the father of the modern Federal Reserve.

He was born in Logan, Utah in 1890 and as a child, worked in several of his father's businesses. He created a family holding company, the Eccles Investment Company, in 1916 to manage various enterprises. By the mid-1920s, he, his brother George and others had organized the First Security Corporation, believed to be the first multibank holding company. Before entering public service, he successfully prevented the collapse of the family bank in 1931. In 1933, Congress invited him to give his analysis of the Great Depression. He delivered a five-point program to fix the economy that formed the basis of the New Deal.

When Marriner Eccles was named Chair of the Federal Reserve in 1934, he was just 44 years old at the time. Many believe Marriner S. Eccles is the only thing standing between the U.S. and disaster.

Former U.S. Labor Secretary Robert Reich has stated that any list of the most influential individuals on America's thinking in the post-war era must include Marriner S. Eccles. Historians note that one reason America was able to win World War II, which took a great deal of money, is the advice President Franklin D. Roosevelt received from Marriner Eccles.

Eccles was known as someone who thought deeply about problems and then acted without concern for the political consequences. When Congress passed the Banking Act of 1935, which sought to clarify the powers and responsibilities of the Reserve Board in matters of national monetary policy, and to increase the autonomy of regional Reserve Banks, he said, "The function of banking and money is per-
Honor and recognize the Central Accomack members of American Legion Post 29 on the 100th birthday of Post 29. The post is one of the oldest in the country and the largest in the state of Georgia, with 971 legion members and more than 1,300 members overall.

Post 29 is named in honor of Sgt. William H. Orr, a soldier from Marietta, Georgia, who died during WWI. Sgt. Orr worked as a salesman for the Dixie Culbert Metal Company in Atlanta when he was drafted, and honorably served in the Army Company A, 325th Infantry, 82nd Division. He was killed in action on October 14, 1918, in the battle of Argonne Forest in France, and is buried in Mars Hill Cemetery near Acworth, Georgia. The American Legion was originally founded in Paris, France in 1919, after WWI, by veterans, to support veterans and communities. Today, the Legion is the largest wartime veterans organization, with more than 13,000 posts and nearly two million members worldwide. The American Legion organization is committed to helping American veterans from all wars, mentoring youth, promoting patriotism, serving communities, and advocating for strong national security, among other service related activities.

Given the organization’s longevity and service, it is hard to put into words the impact the organization has had on our veterans and communities; so I will repeat these words, directly from American Legion Horace Orr Post 29 in Marietta, which put it best, “We are veterans serving veterans. Please join us.”

On behalf of Georgia’s 11th Congressional District and the United States Congress, and as a fellow legionnaire, I congratulate the members of American Legion Post 29 on the celebration of your 100th year.

Honor the 50th Anniversary of Priesthood for Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople

HON. DARIN LaHOOD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Mr. LaHOOD. Madam Speaker, I would like to honor Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople for his 50th anniversary of Priesthood.

His All Holiness was ordained as a priest on October 19, 1969. Since that day, he has never ceased to make strides in religious studies and world peace. His service to our global society has had a positive impact on many lives.

His All Holiness was elected the 270th Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch on October 22, 1991. Countless nations and academic institutions have given His All Holiness awards for his work. In 1997, he recognized his efforts in both religious understanding and peace, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew received the Congressional Gold Medal.

I am grateful for all the good that His All Holiness does for Americans, and those around the world. Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew serves as a reminder to us all that the positive efforts of just one person can be beneficial to countless lives of others.
CELEBRATING NORMAN WISEMAN ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Norman Wiseman, a great Hoosier celebrating his 80th birthday. Norman was born on September 25, 1939, in Ridge Farm, Illinois, as the youngest of three brothers. At a young age, Norman moved with his family to northern Indiana, where he attended Madison High School and fell in love with his late wife, Sonja Gall. They graduated in 1958 and got married a year later on Valentine's Day. Through a lot of hard work, dedication, and compassion for one another, Norman and Sonja built a beautiful life together full of love, laughter, and happiness. They had children, started a business, grew a garden every summer, and even raised honey bees. Norman has always been active in the community and has taught his family the cherished lessons of kindness, integrity, and faith.

Though his business, Wiseman Plumbing, is Norman's passion, his greatest accomplishments are the positive contributions he has made to the lives of those around him and his family. He remained steadfast and committed as his business thrived, and he continues to work years after he closed up his shop. When he's not working, he loves connecting with people and spending time around the community. At church he is known as "Norman the Doctor," greeting churchgoers each Sunday.

His wife Dee and his five children, four grandchildren, and first great-grandchild, David, are life's true blessings for Norman. All who know him are undoubtedly touched by his friendliness and spirit, and I am humbled to call him a friend.

Madam Speaker, Norman Wiseman sets a profound example as a good father, loving grandfather, avid businessman, and caring friend. On behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I wish Norman a very happy birthday and many more years of continued health and happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LOCAL 781 CHAPTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise today to recognize and celebrate the seventy-five years of the Local 781 chapter of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF). For seventy-five years, Local 781 firefighters in Independence, Missouri, have proudly served and protected their community. Supporting one of the oldest municipalities in Jackson County, Missouri, the contributions of Local 781 are enshrined in the complex history of the Independence Fire Department and steeped in tradition, dedication and bravery. In 1843, as the prospering village flourished, so did a growing need to protect what they had established, leading to the emergence of the Independence Fire Department.

Consisting of volunteer fire fighters, the Independence Fire Department originally fought fires in the community with buckets as their only equipment. For 175 years, the Independence Fire Department has upheld the same tenacious, innovative spirit. It has evolved and grown to meet the everchanging needs of the community it serves, and today encompasses ten fire stations, over 150 personnel, an area of seventy-eight square miles, and an institution that boldly protects and serves the community.

The men and women employed by the Independence Fire Department have been proudly and faithfully represented by the Local 781 chapter of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) since the formation of the local chapter in 1944, empowering them to maintain the same selfless sacrifice in the protection of countless lives.

Moreover, the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) represents more than 295,000 full-time professional firefighters and paramedics who protect eighty-five percent of the nation's population. This endeavor is assisted by the nearly 3,100 affiliates and their members in every state across the United States and Canada. The IAFF not only represents firefighters and paramedics but also includes state employees, federal workers, and fire and emergency medical personnel employed at certain industrial facilities.

As leaders, advocates, and champions for its members, the International Association of Fire Fighters has played a pivotal role in every advance in fire and emergency services in the 20th century. From the introduction of shift schedules early in the last century to the enactment of SAFER in 2003, which helps bolster access to careers in essential emergency response, ensuring better work conditions for these responders, and providing established professional standards for fire service. The IAFF has consistently been there to fight for responders and improvements to public safety.

Today, the International Association of Fire Fighters continues to spearhead policy that ensures that its members and places emphasis on their ability to safely execute their duties. The growth and success of this institution is reflective of its member-driven initiatives and commitment to be an organization for firefighters, by firefighters.

Madam Speaker, please join me and all of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District in celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of Local 781 chapter of the International Association of Fire Fighters. Let us join in recognizing the bravery of its members, both past and present, who nobly serve the community of Independence, Missouri.

CELEBRATING THE PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY OF PASTOR EDDIE WILLIAMS

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Eddie Williams for his thirteen years of service to the congregation at Lakeridge Village Ministries Church of God in Christ.

Lakeridge Village Ministries was founded on the principle of uplifting people from all walks of life in spirituality and that the gift of spirituality is not limited to clergy. Pastor Williams has sought to lead his flock under that guidance, fostering a strong sense of community and caring for the most vulnerable. In addition to his work in ministry, Pastor Williams has sought to expand resources and options for people suffering from the pain of addiction and mental illness. His work at Lakeridge Village has accomplished so much in fighting the stigma around mental health issues and connecting those struggling with substance abuse to the assistance they need. In short Pastor Williams has performed outstanding service to the community through his ministry and charitable work.

Please join me in tribute to Pastor Eddie Williams in celebration of his thirteen years in spiritual service to Lakeridge Village Ministries Church of God in Christ.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ATAXIA AWARENESS DAY

HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Ataxia Awareness Day, and to honor the courage of the one hundred and fifty thousand Americans living with Ataxia, a neurodegenerative disease that affects the ability to coordinate movement. Those with Ataxia may have difficulty walking, speaking, and executing fine motor skills, and for some may lead to early death.

I would also like to honor the contributions of the National Ataxia Foundation, which is dedicated to improving the lives of those impacted by Ataxia including those with the disease, and their caregivers through support, education, and research.

I applaud their commitment and advocacy at the State and Federal levels to raise awareness of this disease and urge my colleagues to learn more about it and laud the efforts being taken to break down the isolation barriers and misconceptions around Ataxia.

I especially want to thank my constituent, Ms. Kim Brown for reaching out to me and my office to raise awareness of Ataxia and support research efforts to benefit those in my district and across the nation who live with this condition.

Today I stand in solidarity with all Americans battling Ataxia, and the dedicated scientists, health care workers, and caregivers who support them. I look forward to the day when this devastating condition can be cured.

HONORING SENIOR SPECIAL AGENT LAZARO “LARRY” COSME

HON. DENVER RIGGLEMAN
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Senior Special Agent Lazaro
“Larry” Cosme who is retiring from his post as the National President of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association after 27 years of service. Special Agent Cosme has honorably served our country working as the top Immigration and Customs Enforcement officer for both Washington, D.C. and Virginia. He is a hero we can all be proud of.

The 27 years Special Agent Cosme has spent in law enforcement have been a gift to our nation and our communities. As the National President of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association Larry Cosme stood up for American police officers and fought to make sure they were properly trained and properly equipped for the difficult tasks they face. I am grateful for the work he has done and am proud to call him a 5th District Constituent.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Senior Special Agent Cosme and wish him a happy and restful retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I missed one vote on September 24, 2019 as I was hosting the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation in my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 541.

CONGRATULATING DR. DAVID RUIZ ON RECEIVING THE BRAVO AWARD

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Dr. David Ruiz, on receiving the prestigious Bravo Award from the Hispanic Metropolitan Chamber for his outstanding work to help improve the health of the Latino community in Southwest Washington.

Before moving to the Pacific Northwest, David was born and raised in Tucson, Arizona. His career has been defined by many stages, first as an original member of the first youth mariachi in the United States and then as a professional musician. After moving to Southwest Washington and joining PeaceHealth Southwest Medical Center in 1994, David founded the Family Medicine Residency program at Family Medicine of Southwest Washington and has served as the director of the program for over 25 years. David also continues to dedicate his time to our communities by serving on several boards and committees that impact the health care of Southwest Washington residents.

Through David’s tireless efforts, he has helped improve the health and well-being of so many, notably many Spanish-speaking residents of Southwest Washington. I want to commend David for his unwavering dedication to our community; there is no one more deserving of this award.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 26, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5673–S5712

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and thirteen resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2543–2549, and S. Res. 330–342.

Measures Reported:


S. 1245, to improve energy performance in Federal buildings, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 116–117)

S. 1685, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for the research, development, and demonstration of commercially viable technologies for the capture of carbon dioxide produced during the generation of natural gas-generated power, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–118)


S. 2543, to amend titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to lower prescription drug prices in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, to improve transparency related to pharmaceutical prices and transactions, to lower patients’ out-of-pocket costs, and to ensure accountability to taxpayers. (S. Rept. No. 116–120)

S. 2099, to redesignate the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve in the State of North Dakota as the White Horse Hill National Game Preserve.

S. 2260, to provide for the improvement of domestic infrastructure in order to prevent marine debris, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Measures Passed:

National Emergency Declaration: Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 54, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, and the resolution was then passed in a roll call vote, 54 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 302).

Federal Election Interference: Senate agreed to S. Res. 330, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to require certain measures to address Federal election interference by foreign governments.

Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.: By 91 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 303), Senate agreed to S. Res. 331, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions of S. 2118 (116th Congress) (relating to the prohibition of United States persons from dealing in certain information and communications technology or services from foreign adversaries and requiring the approval of Congress to terminate certain export controls in effect with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.).

Survivor Benefit Plan: By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. 304), Senate agreed to S. Res. 332, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the conference on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 630A of the House amendment (relating to the repeal of a requirement of reduction of Survivor Benefit Plan survivor annuities by amounts of dependency and indemnity compensation).

Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl: Senate agreed to S. Res. 334, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 316 of the Senate bill (relating to a prohibition on the use of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances for land-based applications of firefighting foam).

Replenishment of Certain Military Construction Funds: By 52 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 306), Senate agreed to S. Res. 335, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions contained in section 316 of the Senate bill (relating to the prohibition of United States persons from dealing in certain information and communications technology or services from foreign adversaries and requiring the approval of Congress to terminate certain export controls in effect with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.).
Congress) to insist upon the members of the conference to include the provisions contained in section 2906 of the Senate bill (relating to replenishment of certain military construction funds).

Pages S5681–91, S5691–94

*Family and Medical Leave:* By 55 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 307), Senate agreed to S. Res. 336, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the members of the conference to consider potential commonsense solutions regarding family and medical leave, including voluntary compensatory time programs and incentives through the tax code.

Pages S5681–91, S5691–95

Measures Failed:

*Paid Family Leave for Federal Personnel:* By 47 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 305), Senate failed to agree to S. Res. 333, instructing the managers on the part of the Senate on the bill S. 1790 (116th Congress) to insist upon the provisions contained in subtitle B of title XI of the House amendment (relating to paid family leave for Federal personnel).

Pages S5681–91, S5691–93

*Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019—Agreement:* A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, September 26, 2019, Senate begin consideration of H.R. 4378, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2020, that the only amendment in order be Paul Amendment No. 942, and the time until 12:15 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and that at 12:15 p.m., Senate vote on or in relation to Paul Amendment No. 942, and that following disposition of the amendment, Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage. Page S5712

*Scalia Nomination—Cloture:* Senate began consideration of the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor. Pages S5674, S5695–96

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S5674

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. EX. 309), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Pages S5695–96

*Hyten Nomination—Cloture:* By 73 yeas to 21 nays (Vote No. EX. 308), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Gen. John E. Hyten for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 154 and 601: to be General. Page S5695

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Thursday, September 26, 2019, following disposition of H.R. 4378, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, with the time until 1:30 p.m., equally divided between the Leaders, or their designees, and that at 1:30 p.m., the post-closure time on the nominations of Gen. John E. Hyten, and Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor, be considered expired and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed.

Pages S5695–96

*Messages from the House:* Pages S5703

*Measures Referred:* Pages S5703

*Executive Communications:* Pages S5703–05

*Executive Reports of Committees:* Pages S5705–06

*Additional Cosponsors:* Pages S5706–08

*Additional Statements:* Pages S5702–03

*Amendments Submitted:* Page S5712

*Authorities for Committees to Meet:* Pages S5712

*Record Votes:* Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—309) Pages S5681, S5692, S5694, S5695, S5696

*Adjournment:* Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:23 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, September 26, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5712.)

**Committee Meetings**

(Committees not listed did not meet)

**LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PERSPECTIVES**

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine perspectives on the livestock and poultry sectors, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Houston, East Tennessee Livestock Center, Sweetwater, on behalf of the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association; Ron Kardel, West Liberty Foods, Walcott, Iowa, on behalf of the National Turkey Federation; Jayson L. Lusk, Purdue University Department of Agricultural Economics, West Lafayette, Indiana; Burton Pfister, Roselawn Legacy Hampshires, Bismarck, North Dakota, on behalf of the American Sheep Industry Association; Trent Thiele, Iowa Pork Producers Association, Elma, on behalf of the National Pork Producers Council; and Shane Eaton, Eaton Charolais, Lindsay, Montana, on behalf of the United States Cattlemen’s Association.
FACILITATING FASTER PAYMENTS
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine facilitating faster payments in the United States, after receiving testimony from Esther George, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Missouri, on behalf of the Federal Reserve System; Robert Hunter, The Clearing House Payments Company, Robert A. Steen, Bridge Community Bank, on behalf of the Independent Community Bankers of America, and George Selgin, Cato Institute Center for Monetary and Financial Alternatives, all of Washington, D.C.; and Sheila C. Bair, former Chair of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Independence, Kansas.

FISHERY FAILURES
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine fishery failures, focusing on improving the disaster declaration and relief process, after receiving testimony from Chris Oliver, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Joe Spraggins, Mississippi Department of Marine Resources, Biloxi; Rachel Baker, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau; Robert Spottswood, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Key West; and Ron Warren, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
   S. 334, to authorize the construction of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System and study of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System in the States of Montana and North Dakota;
   S. 607, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to address insufficient compensation of employees and other personnel of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, with an amendment;
   S. 860, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify the terms of the Jackson Gulch rehabilitation project in Colorado, with an amendment;
   S. 990, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program First Increment Extension for threatened and endangered species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin;
   S. 1570, to provide flexibility to allow greater aquifer recharge, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 1602, to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 1751, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, with an amendment;
   S. 1821, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to provide for research on, and the development and deployment of, marine energy, with an amendment;
   S. 1882, to make available the continued use of Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program project use power by the Kinsey Irrigation Company and the Sidney Water Users Irrigation District, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 1931, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers;
   S. 2044, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Aging Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 2094 and H.R. 2114, bills to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 2095, to provide for certain programs and developments in the Department of Energy concerning the cybersecurity and vulnerabilities of, and physical threat to, the electric grid;
   S. 2137, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry;
   S. 2300, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
   S. 2332, to provide for the modernization of the electric grid;
   S. 2333, to provide for enhanced energy grid security;
   S. 2334, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the 21st Century Energy Workforce Advisory Board;
S. 2335, to accelerate smart building development; and
H.R. 1420, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 2260, to provide for the improvement of domestic infrastructure in order to prevent marine debris, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 2099, to redesignate the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve in the State of North Dakota as the White Horse Hill National Game Preserve;
The nominations of Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and Katherine Andrea Lemos, of California, to be a Member and to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board; and
- 8 General Services Administration resolutions.

U.S. POLICY IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in Mexico and Central America, focusing on ensuring effective policies to address the crisis at the border, after receiving testimony from Kirsten D. Madison, Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, and Michael Kozak, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, both of the Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 1590, to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime;
- S. 1678, to express United States support for Taiwan’s diplomatic alliances around the world, with an amendment;
- S. 1838, to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, with an amendment;
- S. 2372, to enhance global engagement to combat marine debris, with an amendment;
- S. Res. 183, reaffirming the vital role of the United States-Japan alliance in promoting peace, stability, and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;
- S. Res. 236, reaffirming the strong partnership between Tunisia and the United States and supporting the people of Tunisia in their continued pursuit of democratic reforms;
- S. Res. 277, remembering the 25th Anniversary of the bombing of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and recommitting to efforts to uphold justice for the 85 victims of the attacks;
- S. Res. 318, to support the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and the Sixth Replenishment, with an amendment;
The nominations of Adam Seth Boehler, of Louisiana, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Romania, Department of State; and
- A routine list in the Foreign Service.

COUNTERING DOMESTIC TERRORISM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine countering domestic terrorism, focusing on the evolving threat, after receiving testimony from William Braniff, University of Maryland National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, College Park; Clint Watts, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Robert Chesney, University of Texas Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Austin; and George Selim, Anti-Defamation League, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Danielle J. Hunsaker, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Jodi W. Dishman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, who was introduced by Senator Lankford, Sarah E. Pitlyk, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, who was introduced by Senator Blunt, and Daniel Mack Traynor, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, who was introduced by Senator Hoeven, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

TOXIC EXPOSURE

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine toxic exposure, focusing on examining the Department of Veterans Affairs’s presumptive disability decision-making process, after receiving testimony from Patricia R. Hastings, Chief Consultant, Post Deployment Health Services, and
Drew Helmer, Director, War Related Illness and Injury Study Center, both of the Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Terry Rauch, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), Health Readiness Policy and Oversight; David A. Butler, Director, Office of Military and Veterans Health, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Shane L. Liermann, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.; and Robert F. Miller, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee.

PROMOTING HEALTHY AGING

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine promoting healthy aging, focusing on living your best life long into your golden years, after receiving testimony from Rudolph Tanzi, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts; Susan Hughes, University of Illinois Center for Research on Health and Aging, Chicago; Diane Dickerson, Bangor Regional YMCA, Bangor, Maine; and Brian L. Long, Pennsylvania Link to Aging and Disability Resources, Lancaster.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 4484–4498; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 589, 590, 592–595 were introduced.

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 591, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) relating to a national emergency declared by the President of February 15, 2019 (H. Rept. 116–218).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Beatty to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:32 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. J.D. Greear, The Summit Church, Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina.

Recess: The House recessed at 1:50 p.m. and reconvened at 2:40 p.m.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure—Communication: Read a letter from Chairman DeFazio wherein he transmitted copies of six resolutions included in the General Services Administration’s Capital Investment and Leasing Programs. The resolutions were adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2019.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Secure And Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019: H.R. 1595, amended, to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 321 yeas to 103 nays, Roll No. 544.


Rejected the Green (TN) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 207 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 545.

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–27, modified by the amendment printed in H. Rept. 116–217, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill.

H. Res. 577, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2203) and (H.R. 3525) and the resolution (H. Res. 576) was agreed to, as amended, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 543, after the Scanlon amendment was agreed to by voice vote, after the previous question was ordered on the amendment and the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 542.
Question of Privilege: Representative McCarthy rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the Hoyer motion to table H. Res. 590, raising a question of the privileges of the House, by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 547.

Pages H7976–77

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community: The House agreed to H. Res. 576, as amended, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, by a yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas with none voting “nay” and two answering “present”, Roll No. 548. Pages H7921–28, H7977–78

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendments to the text and preamble specified in section 11 are adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered as read. Page H7919

H. Res. 577, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2203) and (H.R. 3525) and the resolution (H. Res. 576) was agreed to, as amended, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 543, after the Scanlon amendment was agreed to by voice vote, after the previous question was ordered on the amendment and the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 542. Pages H7913–20

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Kelly (MS) wherein he resigned from the Committee on Small Business. Page H7978

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Ratcliffe wherein he resigned from the Committee on Homeland Security. Page H7978

Senate Referral: S.J. Res. 54 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 appears on pages H7913 and H7934.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7919–20, H7920, H7973–74, H7975–76, H7976, H7977, and H7978. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:38 p.m.
Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration.

STATUS OF THE B61–12 LIFE EXTENSION AND W88 ALTERATION–370 PROGRAMS
Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “Status of the B61–12 Life Extension and W88 Alteration–370 Programs”. Testimony was heard from Charles P. Verdon, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administrator; Vice Admiral Johnny Wolfe, Director, Strategic Systems Programs, U.S. Navy; and Lieutenant General Richard Clark, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration, U.S. Air Force.

AMERICA’S INFRASTRUCTURE: TODAY’S GAPS, TOMORROW’S OPPORTUNITIES, AND THE NEED FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENT
Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “America’s Infrastructure: Today’s Gaps, Tomorrow’s Opportunities, and the Need for Federal Investment”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE
Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2474, the “Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2019”. H.R. 2474 was ordered reported, as amended.

SOUNDING THE ALARM: THE PUBLIC HEALTH THREATS OF E CIGARETTES
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Sounding the Alarm: The Public Health Threats of E-Cigarettes”. Testimony was heard from Norman E. Sharpless, M.D., Acting Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration; Anne Schuchat, M.D., Principal Deputy Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Joneigh Khaldun, M.D., Chief Deputy Director for Health and Chief Medical Executive, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services; Elizabeth Cuervo Tilson, M.D., State Health Director and Chief Medical Officer, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services; Lee Norman, M.D., Secretary, Kansas Department of Health and Environment; and Monica Bharel, M.D., Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

MAKING PRESCRIPTION DRUGS MORE AFFORDABLE: LEGISLATION TO NEGOTIATE A BETTER DEAL FOR AMERICANS
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Making Prescription Drugs More Affordable: Legislation to Negotiate a Better Deal for Americans”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROMOTING FINANCIAL STABILITY: ASSESSING THREATS TO THE U.S. FINANCIAL SYSTEM
Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled “Promoting Financial Stability: Assessing Threats to the U.S. Financial System”. Testimony was heard from Dino Falaschetti, Director, Office of Financial Research, U.S. Department of the Treasury; and Lael Brainard, Governor, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

PROTECTING SENIORS: A REVIEW OF THE FHA’S HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGE (HECM) PROGRAM
Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled “Protecting Seniors: A Review of the FHA’s Home Equity Conversion Mortgage (HECM) Program”. Testimony was heard from Alicia Puente Cackley, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 543, recognizing Hong Kong’s bilateral relationship with the United States, condemning the interference of the People’s Republic of China in Hong Kong’s affairs, and supporting the people of Hong Kong’s right to protest; H.R. 3289, the “Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”; H. Res. 517, supporting the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), malaria, and its Sixth Replenishment; H. Res. 387, condemning continued violence against civilians by armed groups in the Central African Republic and supporting efforts to achieve a lasting political solution to the conflict; H. Res. 552, calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence of wrongdoing or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan; H.R. 4270, the “PROTECT Hong Kong Act”; and H. Res. 521, commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of
Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., executive. H. Res. 543, H.R. 3289, H.R. 4270, and H. Res. 387 were ordered reported, as amended. H. Res. 517, H. Res. 552, and H. Res. 521 were ordered reported, without amendment.

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF CUTTING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO CENTRAL AMERICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Impact of Cutting Foreign Assistance to Central America”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1975, the “Cybersecurity Advisory Committee Authorization Act of 2019”; H.R. 4432, the “Protecting Critical Infrastructure Against Drones and Emerging Threats Act”. H.R. 4432 and H.R. 1975 were ordered reported, as amended.

PROTECTING AMERICA FROM ASSAULT WEAPONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Protecting America from Assault Weapons”. Testimony was heard from Nan Whaley, Mayor, Dayton, Ohio; RaShall Brackney, Chief of Police, Charlottesville, Virginia; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 729, the “Tribal Coastal Resilience Act”; H.R. 925, the “North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act”; H.R. 1472, to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park; H.R. 1487, the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act”; H.R. 1492, the “Yucca House National Monument Boundary Revision Act”; H.R. 1747, the “National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships Act”; H.R. 2185, the “District of Columbia Flood Prevention Act of 2019”; H.R. 3115, the “Living Shorelines Act of 2019”; H.R. 3541, the “Coastal State Climate Preparedness Act of 2019”; and H.R. 3596, the “Keep America’s Waterfronts Working Act”. H.R. 729, H.R. 925, H.R. 1472, H.R. 2185, and H.R. 3541 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1487, H.R. 1492, H.R. 1747, H.R. 3115, and H.R. 3596 were ordered reported, as amended.

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS: PROTECTING TRIBAL COMMUNITIES FROM THE EFFECTS OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing entitled “Advance Appropriations: Protecting Tribal Communities from the Effects of a Government Shutdown”. Testimony was heard from Representatives McCollum and Young; Jason Freihage, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Principal Deputy Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

NEXTGEN FEDS: RECRUITING THE NEXT GENERATION OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “NextGen Feds: Recruiting the Next Generation of Public Servants”. Testimony was heard from Representative Carolyn B. Maloney of New York; Robert Goldenkoff, Director of Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on S.J. Res. 54, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a closed rule providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 54, Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. Finally, the rule provides one motion to commit.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4373, the “Engineering Biology Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 4372, the “MSI STEM Achievement Act”; and H.R. 4355, the “Identifying Outputs of Generative Adversarial Networks Act”. H.R. 4373, H.R. 4372, and H.R. 4355 were ordered reported, as amended.
MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4406, the “Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act of 2019”; H.R. 4405, the “Women’s Business Centers Improvements Act of 2019”; H.R. 4407, the “SCORE for Small Business Act of 2019”; H.R. 4387, to establish Growth Accelerator Fund Competition within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. H.R. 4406, H.R. 4405, H.R. 4407, and H.R. 4387 were ordered reported, without amendment.

LANDLORD AND TENANT: THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S OVERSIGHT OF THE TRUMP INTERNATIONAL HOTEL LEASE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Landlord and Tenant: The Trump Administration’s Oversight of the Trump International Hotel Lease”. Testimony was heard from Daniel Mathews, Public Buildings Commissioner, General Services Administration; Carol F. Ochoa, Inspector General, General Services Administration; Michael A. Foster, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

COAST GUARD AND PORT INFRASTRUCTURE: BUILT TO LAST?

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “Coast Guard and Port Infrastructure: Built to Last?”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Nathan Moore, Assistant Commandant for Engineering and Logistics, U.S. Coast Guard; Nathan Anderson, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice, General Accountability Office; Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection, Office of the Governor, Virginia; and public witnesses.

MISSION CRITICAL: CARE IN THE COMMUNITY UPDATE

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “MISSION Critical: Care in the Community Update”. Testimony was heard from Richard Stone, Executive in Charge, Veterans’ Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup an original bill making appropriations for Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, an original bill making appropriations for State, Foreign Operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, an original bill making appropriations for Commerce, Justice, Science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, an original bill making appropriations for Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and an original bill making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine the Hong Kong emergency, focusing on securing freedom, autonomy, and human rights, 10:45 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2132, to promote security and provide justice for United States victims of international terrorism, S. 2511, to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide the Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States and Supreme Court Police with the authority to protect the Chief Justice of the United States, any Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and other individuals in any location, and the nominations of Halil Suleyman Ozerden, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David B. Barlow, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, John Fitzgerald Kness, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, R. Austin Huffaker, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, Lee Philip Rudlosky, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Justin Reed Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Steven J. Menashi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Karen Spencer Marston, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Richard Earnest Myers II, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Anurag Singhal, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Kenneth Charles Canterbury, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and David M. DeVillers, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, both of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 11 a.m., SH–219.

Full Committee, closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.
House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, hearing entitled “The National Forest System: Restoring our Forest Infrastructure”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.


Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled “Misclassification of Employees: Examining the Costs to Workers, Businesses, and the Economy”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, markup on H.R. 1603, the “Alan Reinstein Ban Asbestos Now Act of 2019”; H.R. 535, the “PFAS Action Act of 2019”; H.R. 2377, the “Protect Drinking Water from PFAS Act of 2019”; H.R. 2533, the “Providing Financial Assistance for Safe Drinking Water Act”; H.R. 2566, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to revise the Safer Choice Standard to provide for a Safer Choice label for pots, pans, and cooking utensils that do not contain PFAS, and for other purposes; H.R. 2570, the “PFAS User Fee Act of 2019”; H.R. 2577, the “PFAS Right-To-Know Act”; H.R. 2591, the “PFAS Waste Incineration Ban Act of 2019”; H.R. 2596, the “Protecting Communities from New PFAS Act”; H.R. 2600, the “Toxic PFAS Control Act”; H.R. 2605, the “PROTECT Act of 2019”; H.R. 2608, the “PFAS Testing Act of 2019”; H.R. 2626, the “PFAS Accountability Act of 2019”; H.R. 2638, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environment Protection Agency to issue guidance on minimizing the use of firefighting foam containing PFAS, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2699, the “Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2019”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining Legislation to Protect Consumers and Small Business Owners from Abusive Debt Collection Practices”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.


Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee; and Full Committee of the House Committee on Natural Resources, joint hearing entitled “Sustaining U.S. Pacific Insular Relationships”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation, hearing entitled “U.S. Nonproliferation Policy and the FY 2020 Budget”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, hearing entitled “The Expansion and Troubling Use of ICE Detention”, 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Community Responses to Gun Violence in our Cities”, 12 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Department of the Interior’s Failure to Cooperate with Congressional Oversight Requests”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Understanding, Forecasting, and Communicating Extreme Weather in a Changing Climate”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing entitled “Online Imposters and Disinformation”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.


Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “A Work in Progress: Implementation of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, hearing entitled “The Future of VA Scheduling: Implementing a Commercial Off the Shelf Scheduling Solution at the Department of Veterans Affairs”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “The Public Health Consequences and Costs of Gun Violence”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Whistleblower Disclosure”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Promoting Civility and Building a More Collaborative Congress”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, September 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4378, Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019. At 12:15 p.m., Senate will vote on or in relation to Paul Amendment No. 942 to H.R. 4378 and passage of the bill.

At 1:30 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations of Gen. John E. Hyten for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Thursday, September 26

House Chamber
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