



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2019

No. 185

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Msgr. Anthony J. Marcaccio, of St. Pius X, from Greensboro, NC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Blessed are You Lord, God of all creation. You are the giver of every good gift, of life and liberty, of peace and prosperity, of wisdom, understanding, and right judgment.

We ask that in Your divine mercy, You would bless our Republic and especially the work of our Senators, that they may discern "all that is true, all that is honorable, all that is right, all that is excellent and worthy of praise" for our Nation.

In this moment, make us mindful of all that has brought us together as a country, and how it far surpasses that which can divide us, so in all things deliberated and done here, we may be preserved as one Nation under God. Amen and Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The President Pro Tempore.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam 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.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, a whole bunch of us Midwest biofuel Senators sent a cover letter with our comments to President Trump. Those comments were in regard to the biofuel rules that are out for public comment.

The President has been a supporter of biofuels and the EPA shouldn't undercut President Trump's support of RFS. I urge the EPA and Administrator Wheeler to adjust the proposed supplemental rule to account for actual waived gallons, using hard data from past practices, to send an unambiguous signal to the marketplace.

I am glad to have the opportunity to comment, and I encourage all farmers, biofuel producers, and anybody else interested in supporting the RFS to make their comments. Those comments should be along the lines of what was agreed to in the Oval Office on September 12, which the EPA regulations don't reflect properly.

So tell the EPA that you want the September 12 agreement agreed to. Go to regulations.gov or to the Iowa Farm Bureau or Iowa Corn websites before the deadline on November 27 to tell the EPA to stand behind the President's Oval Office agreement.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, my colleagues are well familiar with my repeated calls for bipartisan progress in funding the Federal Government. For more than 2 months, as the appropriations process idled at partisan roadblocks, I pointed out just how straightforward this entire process could have been. With the road map ne-

gotiated in July by the President and the Speaker, and approved by each of the congressional leaders, we had the necessary commitments to move forward in good faith and avoid partisan riders that would stall the entire effort, but, of course, that didn't happen.

But failing to secure funding for the Federal Government before the end of the year is not an option. Chairman SHELBY continues to lead efforts to settle on subcommittee allocations that can earn bipartisan support. Today, these efforts are ongoing, and with our deadline to prevent a funding lapse rapidly approaching, I am encouraged that the House will apparently be voting today on a continuing resolution to keep the Government funded until December 20, while talks continue. These talks must continue because it is vital that we work in good faith to fund important priorities for the coming year, but what is needed in the near term is to keep the Government open for the next several weeks while this work goes on.

This is not rocket science. The House needs to send us the short-term funding bill which the Senate can pass and which the President will sign. That is the way to keep the government open while our important discussions continue to make progress toward closing out the appropriations process and getting full-year bills to the floor.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, for weeks Republicans have been trying to move forward significant bipartisan legislation for the American people. Senate Republicans are trying to get our Democratic colleagues to let us consider defense funding. House Republicans have tried to get Speaker PELOSI to finally allow a vote on the USMCA, and in both Chambers we have been asking Democrats to stop slow-walking the conference committee for the critical Defense bill, the NDAA.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6631

Alas, our Democratic colleagues have not been willing to budge on any of those things. As a result, while the Senate waits for the House to send us short-term funding legislation, we will spend our time on the personnel business.

Yesterday, we advanced the nomination of Justice Robert Luck, of Florida, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit, with the support of a bipartisan majority.

Justice Luck brings an impressive and well-rounded legal record, including a clerkship on the Eleventh Circuit, service in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida, and years spent ruling from the State bench.

Today, we will also advance the nomination of Justice Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, also to serve on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. A graduate of Columbia University School of Law, Justice Lagoa has spent years practicing law, serving as a Federal prosecutor, and ruling from both the State appellate bench and the Florida Supreme Court.

I look forward to confirming both of these impressive nominees, along with Adrian Zuckerman, the President's nominee to serve as our Nation's Ambassador to Romania.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on a final matter, I spoke yesterday about the courageous people of Hong Kong who are standing up to Beijing and speaking up for their freedoms. But Hongkongers are not alone in bravely speaking up at this time. The Middle East continues to be swept by widespread and cross-sectarian demonstrations.

In Lebanon, in Iraq, and in Iran, millions are demanding a better future, greater justice, less corruption, and more democracy from their governments. These protests expand three countries. Each is unique, but one common thread connects them: Iran.

For years, Iran has systematically sought to undermine the territorial integrity and manipulate the politics of countries all across the Middle East. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Lebanon and Iraq, where Iranian proxies have challenged the very sovereignty of the state.

In Lebanon, Iran backs Hezbollah, the terrorist group that has become a dominant political player. Hezbollah has become a state within a state. Its weapons and fighters do not work to defend the Lebanese state but to embroil it in Syria's civil war and imperil its security by threatening Israel with precision rockets.

In Iraq, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps has spent years sponsoring Shia militias and proxies that are more loyal to Tehran than to Baghdad or to the people of Iraq.

In both of these countries, Tehran has used and promoted the use of force

to acquire power and to acquire influence. A few weeks ago, the leader of Iran's terrorist Quds Force reportedly flew to Iraq for secret meetings to guide Iraqi leaders through the protests there.

Here is what this Iranian thug told the Iraqis: "We in Iran know how to deal with protests." Enough said.

Well, a violent crackdown on peaceful protesters is not going to resolve anything. What Iraqi and Lebanese leaders must do is stop listening to the poisonous advice of Iranian tyrants, who are losing their own grip on their own people, and start addressing their own citizens' demands for transparency and reform.

Iraq and Lebanon should give their people what they want—less corruption, less malign foreign influence, more opportunity, and the rule of law.

That is the path forward for Iraq and Lebanon. Commit to prosperity and pluralism at home, combat corruption and injustice within all sects and confessions, protect the sovereignty of your country, pursue peace with your neighbors, and enjoy support from the United States as well.

I would note that in contrast to Hezbollah's thugs, Lebanon's Armed Forces by most accounts continue to be one of Lebanon's few institutions of national unity. The LAF has respected the rights of protesters, protected them from violence, and sought to de-escalate tensions on the street.

I know the U.S. military believes its training and partnership with the LAF is paying off, helping it to be a more professional and responsible security force.

So while these events transpire in Iraq and Lebanon, the Iranian people themselves are also engaging in their own demonstrations. Iran used to be a moderate, open, and prosperous society. It could be again. Now tens of thousands of Iranian people themselves are raising their voices in righteous anger at what has become of their living conditions and their country. The Iranian people are feeling the pain inflicted by the brutality, selfishness, and extremism of their ruling class.

The regime seems to be doing all it can to put a stop to this. Reports over the weekend indicated an enormous, unprecedented internet blackout aimed at keeping Iranians in the dark and suggests Iranian leaders are threatening yet another violent crackdown against their own citizens.

But Iran's leaders know exactly what must be done to alter the course of their once-great country and unlock a better future for its citizens. Iran needs to stop pursuing nuclear weapons and long-range missile capabilities, stop supporting terror and cyber offensives, stop causing bloodshed to weaken its neighbors, and stop the horrific mistreatment of its own people.

There is an entire civilized world full of diverse nations that get by just fine—just fine—without engaging in any of these rogue state activities. Iran

engages in all of them. Iranian leaders will either listen to their own citizens and start behaving like a normal nation or they will be treated more and more like the backward pariahs they have become.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HONG KONG

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few days and weeks, reports about the democratic protests in Hong Kong have grown more and more troubling. The authorities in Hong Kong have cracked down violently on some of the protesters, firing hundreds of rounds of tear gas at a local university and even using lethal force in a few tragic situations. As many have observed, some of the pictures coming out of Hong Kong are reminiscent of a war zone.

Yesterday, the Chinese Communist Party dealt another blow to Hong Kong's special status, criticizing the ruling by the territory's High Court that reversed the Hong Kong Government's ban on masks. The Communist Party declared that only the Chinese legislature has the right to decide whether Hong Kong's laws are consistent with the Hong Kong basic law and that no other authority has the right to make these judgments. That assertion by the Chinese Communist Party is a direct assault on Hong Kong's judicial independence. Make no mistake about it, this Communist Party is cruel and relentless in cracking down on any dissent in every part of China. What they are doing to the Uighurs at the other end of the Chinese country—far away from Hong Kong—is just brutal and awful.

We in the United States stand in solidarity with the democratic protesters, who have every right to assemble and petition their government for the rights of the citizens of Hong Kong. The administration and the President himself should voice their support for the protesters in Hong Kong, which would send an important message to the Chinese Communist Party not to get involved or in any way escalate the situation. Secretary Pompeo's call for calm yesterday is weak tea—not close to enough. Beyond the Presidential statement, there are actions we can take here in Congress because, frankly, I have been very disappointed that the President, in this dramatic situation

with Hong Kong, does not do what Democratic or Republican Presidents have done in the past in standing up for human rights and democracy. He has not done that. He doesn't seem to care. As we know, he seems more eager to please dictators than to please those who are fighting for democracy.

Congress can act. We have a bipartisan bill in the Senate that has many cosponsors, including the senior Senators from Florida and New Jersey and from Maryland as well, that would reaffirm our steadfast support for Hong Kong's autonomy, democracy, and respect for human rights. It would amend the Hong Kong Policy Act in order to give us the tools to safeguard and protect Hong Kong's democracy and autonomy and hold accountable those responsible for the abuse of the human rights of the people of Hong Kong.

There is no objection to this bill on the Democratic side of the aisle. We believe the Senate should pass it. If there are objections on the Republicans' side, let's take a few days and work through the bill on the floor. We haven't done much legislation. Here is a place at which we can come together in a bipartisan way. So, if there are no objections, great. Let's pass it this afternoon. I believe the Senator from Florida will make a unanimous consent request in that regard. If there are objections, I urge the Republican leader, who has spoken out and defended the protests, to take a few days. Let someone try to invoke cloture—it will fail miserably—and let's vote on this. Then, maybe, the House will pass it. That would be something, I think, that would happen and with the President as well.

In addition, the Senator from Oregon, along with some others, has a bill that U.S. companies shouldn't sell lethal types of equipment to the Hong Kong police that have been used on the protesters. I would hope we could find a way to work that proposal into this bill or, maybe, we could make a unanimous consent request alongside it.

Nonetheless, we should pass the bipartisan bill in the Senate, reconcile it with similar legislation in the House, and quickly send it to the President's desk. It would be the strongest action Congress could take immediately to demonstrate Americans' support for the protests in Hong Kong. It would send a strong and clear message to the ruling party in Beijing. It would make a real difference.

The words on the floor the Republican leader mentioned yesterday were good but were not sufficient. Again, I urge him to move on this legislation, if we can, by unanimous consent. If not, let's have a debate on the floor so the handful of Senators who might try to block it are thwarted, and the bill will move forward.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this morning, during the House's im-

peachment inquiry, the American people will hear more important testimony from LTC Alexander Vindman, of the National Security Council, and from Jennifer Williams, an adviser to the Vice President.

Regrettably, some Republicans, including one in this Chamber, have tried, without evidence or substantiation, to undermine, to call into question, and to smear the credibility of the witnesses, including of Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—a Purple Heart recipient who has spent his life in service to our country. The attacks on the witnesses are painful and wrong. They are reminiscent of the actions of a brutal country, not of the democratic Republic that we are.

I hope everyone will treat these witnesses with respect and listen to their testimony with an open mind. Whether they agree or disagree with their testimony, it is unbecoming of any Senator to smear these patriots. The House has a responsibility to seek the truth and uncover all of the facts, and if it comes to it, the Senate has a responsibility to examine the evidence and render impartial judgment.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on infrastructure, as the impeachment inquiry continues, the Democrats in both Chambers continue to do the work of the American people. Just last week, my colleagues in the House discussed a proposal for a very significant investment in infrastructure. At the very beginning of the Trump administration, the Senate Democrats proposed a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan that would create 15 million jobs.

At our meeting at the White House, I mentioned this to President Trump and asked him to join us in either supporting our bill or in working to modify it in a way that he might be able to support it. At the time, after promising over and over again in his campaign that he would pursue a major overhaul of our Nation's infrastructure, we had hoped President Trump would have worked with us on specific legislation. Unfortunately and typically, after 3 years into the Trump administration, instead of working with the Democrats, President Trump has done next to nothing. Earlier this year, the President walked out of a meeting on infrastructure that was held between him, Speaker PELOSI, me, and some other Congressmen and Senators. We haven't heard from him on the issue since.

Meanwhile, Leader MCCONNELL has turned the Senate into a legislative graveyard and seems uninterested in any bipartisan, bicameral legislation. It is so typical of this administration—of President Trump. He campaigns on infrastructure and has commercials running right now that say the Democrats are not doing anything on infrastructure when he is the one who is doing nothing. He has an amazing

penchant for looking at his own faults and then of pointing the finger at others and saying those faults are theirs. It is glaring on infrastructure.

The idea that the House impeachment inquiry is some sort of distraction from other issues is plain wrong.

President Trump, we are doing nothing here in the Senate. Come talk to us about infrastructure, and we can get something done.

The Democrats in the House and the Democrats in the Senate are willing to work with our Republican colleagues right now. We have over 200 House-passed bills we could consider here on the floor and have plenty of bipartisan Senate bills besides—from bills to lower the cost of prescription drugs to election security, to the Violence Against Women Act. We would like to work on a large infrastructure bill as well. It is entirely up to President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL to decide if we are going to make progress on a topic like infrastructure or if the Senate, under MCCONNELL's leadership, will continue to be a graveyard for commonsense ideas to help so many millions of Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Luck, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, our most fundamental responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our Nation's defense, and a big part of that is ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the resources

they need to defend our country. That means, of course, that we have to ensure that our military receives adequate funding to meet today's priorities and to prepare for the threats of tomorrow. It also means we need to ensure that our military receives timely funding.

Our military doesn't just need sufficient funding to cover defense priorities; it also needs to receive that money on time, on a predictable schedule. That means passing the Defense appropriations bill before the end of each fiscal year instead of forcing the military to rely on temporary funding measures that leave the military in doubt about funding levels and unable to start important new projects.

Right now, we are almost 2 full months into the 2020 fiscal year. We should have passed the Defense appropriations bill by the end of September, but we didn't because, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues were unable to resist the chance to pick yet another fight with the President. This wasn't supposed to happen. At the end of the summer, the congressional leaders of both parties and the President reached an agreement on funding levels for 2020 and 2021. The leaders also agreed on a number of guidelines for appropriations bills, including a ban on poison pills intended to derail appropriations legislation. The idea behind this agreement was to pave the way for the timely passage of appropriations bills and to prevent the kind of situation we are in right now—almost 2 months behind on passing defense and other funding. Unfortunately, the Democrats chose to renege on this agreement.

The Senate Democrats are currently holding up defense funding by insisting on the type of poison pills they promised to forgo just a few months ago. The leader has attempted to bring up the Defense appropriations bill twice, and both times the Senate Democrats have filibustered the legislation. It is deeply disappointing. I understand that my Democratic colleagues are looking for any opportunity to pick a fight with the President, but funding for our men and women in uniform should not be subjected to the Democrats' partisan whims.

Thanks to the Democrats, right now, our military is operating under a continuing resolution that leaves the military short of the funding it needs for the 2020 fiscal year. That has real consequences. In addition to leaving the military underfunded, a continuing resolution prevents the military from starting key projects that will help to ensure our men and women in uniform will be prepared to meet the threats of the future. The Pentagon can't start new procurement projects. New research and development initiatives that keep us a step ahead of our adversaries are put on hold. All told, under a continuing resolution, the military's purchasing power is reduced by, roughly, \$5 billion each quarter.

To put that in perspective, that is the equivalent of losing out on about 56 Joint Strike Fighter planes, depending on the variant, every 3 months. That \$5 billion the Pentagon is going without is urgently needed funding for critical military priorities. The longer the Pentagon goes without this funding, the greater the consequences for our military preparedness.

Playing politics with our national defense is unacceptable. We owe our men and women in uniform timely, reliable, and adequate defense funding, and we owe every man, woman, and child in the United States the same thing. The safety of every person in this country depends on the strength of our military. I hope that at least some of my Democratic colleagues will see their way to joining the Republicans in getting this year's Defense appropriations bill to the President's desk. It is time to get our men and women in uniform the funding that they need and that they deserve.

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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

E-CIGARETTES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on September 11, President Donald Trump held a press conference with the First Lady in the Oval Office. He announced that his administration would finally be taking bold action to combat our Nation's youth vaping epidemic. The epidemic is what the Food and Drug Administration characterized as the vaping that is going on in schools across America today—not just high schools, where 27 percent of the students are currently vaping, but middle schools and grade schools as well.

Seated next to the President on September 11 in the Oval Office was the First Lady. On the other side was the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Alex Azar. Directly across from the President was then-Acting Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Ned Sharpless.

At the press conference, President Trump stated:

We have a problem in this country . . . and it is called "vaping"—especially vaping as it pertains to innocent children. . . . And we're going to have to do something about it.

Then Secretary Azar said:

An entire generation of children risk becoming addicted to nicotine. . . . So with the President's support, the Food and Drug Administration intends to finalize a guidance document that would . . . require that all flavors other than tobacco flavor would be removed from the market.

This would include mint and menthol flavoring, as well as candy flavors, bubblegum flavor, fruit flavor, and alcohol flavor.

Explaining why this action was necessary, the Acting FDA Commissioner, Dr. Sharpless, said:

Flavored e-cigarette products drive childhood use.

Secretary Azar and Acting Commissioner Sharpless committed to finalizing this guidance, in their own words, within "a couple of weeks." Yet here we are more than 2 months later with no e-cigarette flavor ban in place.

What is worse, now there are reports that President Trump has decided to reverse himself, to break the promise he made to American families, as a direct result of lobbying from big tobacco and big vape companies. We know whom this President is hearing from. He is hearing from JUUL, the company primarily responsible for today's youth vaping epidemic. He is hearing from Altria, the big tobacco company that just bought a major stake in JUUL. He is hearing from the Vaping Technology Association, a lobbying organization that represents vaping shops nationwide. It makes sense that these companies would want the President to reverse himself, to break his word to American families, because they make profits on the backs of our kids, just like Big Tobacco did for so many years.

Today, almost 30 percent of all high school-aged children are vaping. That is more than 5 million kids. Where did they come up with these numbers? From this administration's report to the American people. Four percent of adults are vaping and up to 30 percent of high school kids. When they show these pictures of adults walking around with buttons that say "We vape and we vote," it is a tiny sliver of America. The kids should be wearing buttons that say "We vape, and our health is at risk."

Over the last 2 years of Donald Trump's Presidency, the number of children vaping has increased by 135 percent. More than 1 in 4 high school kids are using e-cigarettes, and more than 1 in 10 middle school children are following their example. Kids are using these products because of the cool, sleek designs of devices like JUUL and because of the flavors designed to appeal to just kids. Listen to them: cotton candy, unicorn milk, cool mint, mom's sugar cookie, and, of course, menthol.

According to the Food and Drug Administration, more than 80 percent of children who vape started with flavored e-cigarettes. Does anyone believe that these vaping flavors are actually intended for a 50-year-old chain smoker looking to quit cigarettes—flavors like Farley's Gnarly Sauce, Bubble Purp by Chubby Bubble, Blue Razz by Candy King, and Cotton Candy by Zonk? Do you honestly think a 50-year-old trying to break a tobacco cigarette habit is going to buy Cotton Candy by Zonk flavoring?

Every single one of these products is on the market today without review or authorization from the Food and Drug

Administration. That is because under President Trump, the FDA decided to delay regulation of these products for years. And while the FDA dithers, children get addicted. As a result, it is the Wild Wild West out there with respect to unapproved, unregulated, dangerous, and addictive vaping products, and it is our kids who are paying the price.

Despite what Big Vape says, these products are not safe. In recent months, we have seen thousands of illnesses and 42 deaths associated with vaping, including four in Illinois.

Two weeks ago, a woman came up to me and said: You don't know me. I am a nurse. And she gave me the name of the hospital. She said: I just want to tell you, I was there when that 22-year-old man died last week from vaping. He had been in our hospital for months waiting for a lung transplant because of the damage he had done to his lungs by vaping. He couldn't find a donor, and he died.

There are other known dangers associated with e-cigarettes and nicotine. Nicotine is a toxic, highly addictive substance that raises blood pressure and spikes adrenaline, increasing the risk of heart disease. Nicotine can have short- and long-term negative health impacts on the developing brain. Kids who use e-cigarettes are more likely to transition to tobacco cigarettes, and those kill 480,000 Americans each year. There is hardly a family in this country who hasn't been touched by tobacco-related death and disease.

A Dartmouth study shows that e-cigarette use leads to 81 new smokers for every 1 smoker who quits. Don't buy the pitch from JUUL that you ought to be vaping so that you can get off of tobacco cigarettes. It is running just the opposite—kids starting on vaping and converting to tobacco cigarettes.

What do we know about e-cigarettes? They are predominately used by our children. Flavors play a major role in hooking kids on nicotine. Nicotine use harms the developing brain, and kids who vape are more likely than their peers to transition to tobacco cigarettes.

Now let's consider what we don't know about e-cigarettes. We don't know whether they are safe. We don't know whether they actually help adult smokers quit. We often don't know what the ingredients are in those devices.

E-cigarette flavors need to come off the market unless or until they can prove they have a public health benefit—and good luck to that.

The President of the United States, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the head of the Food and Drug Administration all told us on September 11 that they were on the side of kids and families and public health, and they promised us they were going to do something about it. Today, I am sending the President a letter asking him to keep his word, to ban e-cigarette flavors, which threaten our kids with a lifetime of nicotine addiction, illness, and, sadly, even death.

Along with families nationwide, I am hoping the President cares more about children than he does about the lobbying pressure from big tobacco and big vape companies. Just because they can buy an ad on FOX TV does not mean they are right.

For goodness' sake, Mr. President, stick with your promise of September 11. Protect our kids from this vaping epidemic.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 19, 2019.

HON. DONALD J. TRUMP,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As President of the United States, you have a responsibility to put the health and safety of our people—especially our nation's children—above all else. On September 11, 2019, you were poised to do just that, announcing a long-overdue plan from the Oval Office to quickly ban all non-tobacco flavored e-cigarettes, including flavors such as cotton candy, sugar cookie, fruit medley, cool mint, and menthol. Sitting alongside the First Lady, Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary, and then-Acting Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Commissioner, it had all the trappings of a made-for-television event you seem to relish.

Along with all major public health, education, and parent organizations, I praised this move because e-cigarettes—and their accompanying kid-friendly flavors—are reversing decades of hard-fought progress our nation has made in reducing youth smoking rates. And now, along with all major public health, education, and parent organizations, I have watched in horror over the past two months as you have seemingly caved to Big Tobacco and Big Vape lobbying pressure, breaking your promise to address our nation's youth vaping epidemic.

Here is what we know about e-cigarettes:

We know that, in the past two years of your presidency, our nation has experienced a 135 percent increase in youth use of e-cigarettes.

We know that five million children are now vaping, including more than one in four high-school students and more than one in ten middle-school students.

We know that nearly 30 percent of children under the age of 18 are now vaping, compared with less than 4 percent of adults.

We know that JUUL has fueled this youth public health "epidemic," as it has been defined by every major federal health official in your Administration.

We know that e-cigarette flavors—including mint and menthol—are why children first try and become addicted to e-cigarettes.

We know that more than 2,000 Americans have recently been sickened as a result of vaping. We also know that, to date, 42 people have died—including four in my state.

We know that not a single e-cigarette product available for purchase today is on the market with authorization from the FDA.

Finally, we know that your Administration has completely abdicated its duty to protect the public health by repeatedly delaying and refusing to regulate any of these dangerous and addictive products.

Here is what we do not know about e-cigarettes:

We do not know the short- or long-term health impacts of using these products, espe-

cially in children (though we do know that use of nicotine in the developing brain has many negative and long-term health consequences).

We do not always know what ingredients—beyond nicotine—are in e-cigarettes and the accompanying flavors, nor do we know the short- or long-term health impact of the use of those ingredients. We do not if e-cigarettes and flavors actually help adult smokers quit cigarettes (though we do know that e-cigarette use leads to 80 new smokers for every one smoker who reports quitting).

We do not conclusively know why so many people who vape are getting sick and dying.

We do not have answers to these questions because the tobacco and vaping industries—shrouded in secrecy and deception—have refused to conduct the much-needed clinical trials and studies, instead preferring to keep the health consequences a secret. Perhaps even more concerning is that your FDA—the federal agency responsible for regulating tobacco products—has not required them to do so.

More than two months ago, when you announced the impending e-cigarette flavor ban, you stated, "We have a problem in our country . . . It's a problem nobody really thought about too much a few years ago, and it's called 'vaping'—especially vaping as it pertains to innocent children . . . And we're going to have to do something about it . . . We're looking at very strong rules and regulations."

You further stated, "Vaping has become a very big business, as I understand it—like a giant business in a very short period of time. But we can't allow people to get sick, and we can't have our youth be so affected."

During your September Oval Office press conference with the First Lady, you made big promises that you now appear to be breaking. Children and families nationwide are still hoping that you will reverse course and quickly implement an e-cigarette flavor ban that protects our next generation from a lifetime of nicotine addiction, illness, and death.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. DURBIN,
U.S. Senator.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 20 million Americans have health insurance, including more than 1 million in my State of Illinois. Why is it so important? Let me tell you the story of Stefanie from Oak Park, IL. Recently, Stefanie wrote about her son, who has a history of mental health and substance abuse issues. Because of the Affordable Care Act, her son will be able to stay on her health insurance plan until he reaches the age of 26.

The Affordable Care Act also required that all health plans cover mental health and addiction treatment. It is hard to imagine that people were selling health insurance in America that did not cover mental health and addiction.

Two Senators on the floor of the Senate—Paul Wellstone, who stood right over there, and Pete Domenici, who stood there—teamed up to require that every health insurance plan in America cover mental illness. It is so obvious. It is an issue many families face. But health insurance plans were excluding it. Why did these two Senators who were wildly different politically decide they would team up for this? Paul

Wellstone had a brother and Senator Domenici had a son who were struggling with mental illness, and they didn't have protection in their health insurance, so the Senators fought to include it.

Thank goodness they did. Because of that health law, insurance companies cannot discriminate against Stefanie's son because of his medical history. Her son just graduated college. She is thankful he can stay on her company's policy until he gets a job, and she is thankful her premiums are not higher due to her son's health needs. Stefanie is afraid that if these protections go away because of a court case that is currently pending or the actions of the Republican majority in this Senate, her son will be uninsurable or face enormous medical bills that he will be unable to pay. Stefanie wrote to me, and she said that if the Affordable Care Act were to be eliminated, they are "contemplating leaving this country to seek manageable health care."

Democrats are fighting to keep healthcare protections for people like Stefanie and her son. Because of the Affordable Care Act, people with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage or charged higher premiums. Is there anyone among us who doesn't know someone with a pre-existing condition? I have one. This protects 5 million people in Illinois who have a preexisting condition.

Insurance companies are no longer allowed to impose annual or lifetime caps on benefits or to deny coverage for mental health, substance abuse treatment, prescription drugs, or hospitalizations, and young people are allowed to stay on their parents' plan until they reach age 26.

Despite the Republican and Trump administration's continued efforts to repeal these protections both in Congress and in the courts, health insurance under the Affordable Care Act is open for business. If you are interested and want to know the policies available, healthcare.gov is the website to visit.

Open enrollment for 2020 health plans began on November 1 and ends on December 15. If you can, sign up. It is a protection that you hope you will never need, but if you need it, it is good to have it.

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. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, beginning with Russia's interference in our 2016

national elections, to the recent withdrawal of U.S. troops from Syria, President Trump has made multiple statements and decisions that serve only to benefit Vladimir Putin's agenda to undermine democracy and expand Russia's influence around the world.

Taken together, these actions aren't just a threat to U.S. national security, but they also undercut and diminish some of the core tenets and values of American democracy and global leadership. The U.S. Senate, as part of a co-equal branch of government, must recognize this threat and act as a body to ensure our institutions at home and interests abroad are protected. Thus far, we have not lived up to this solemn responsibility.

Let me start with a seminal news article from the Washington Post, just recently. White House reporter Anne Gearan, in her October 15, 2019, article, catalogs how the Trump administration has allowed Russia to assert dominance globally. The headline reads: "Trump's moves in Ukraine and Syria have a common denominator: Both help Russia."

Anne Gearan writes as follows, and I will quote in pertinent part.

... President Trump has taken action that has had the effect of helping the authoritarian leader of Russia.

... [The President's] actions in Syria and Ukraine add to the list of policy moves and public statements that have boosted Russia during his presidency, whether that was their central purpose or not, confounding critics who have warned that he has taken too soft a stance toward a nation led by a strongman hostile to the United States.

Anne Gearan goes on to discuss how President Trump's withdrawal of U.S. troops from Syria has allowed Russia to assert a more dominant role in the region. She also discusses how the President's intimidation of Ukraine's recently elected President Zelensky has become the subject of a domestic impeachment inquiry and distracted from actual engagement and support to Ukraine as it continues to grapple with Russian aggression.

Anne Gearan also notes:

[President] Trump has publicly questioned the usefulness of NATO—the post-World War II military alliance established as a bulwark against first the Soviet Union and now Russia—as well as the utility of the European Union, a political and economic alliance Putin would love to weaken.

This is all written by Anne Gearan.

These actions have led to a growing consensus among the national security community that the President is not serving the national interest. Let me move to a second part of this.

Sadly, President Trump's recent actions with regard to Syria and Ukraine are, unfortunately, not isolated. President Trump has been consistent in taking actions that favor Russia. As early as April of 2016, then-candidate Donald Trump vowed to pursue closer ties to Russia if elected to the Presidency. Even before he took office, by way of Twitter and other platforms he was signaling to Vladimir Putin his def-

erence to a Putin-driven U.S.-Russia dynamic.

From there, the American people have only learned more about the Trump campaign's ties to Russia and Russia's interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

The intelligence community's unclassified report concluded:

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.

The interference with our election process by a hostile government was an attack on our democracy and a threat to our national security carried out by Russian operatives at the direction of Vladimir Putin himself.

Since Special Counsel Robert Mueller's appointment as special counsel to investigate Russia's attack, 34 indictments have been returned in connection with the investigation, including indictments against Russian individuals and Russian companies, as well as former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort and deputy campaign manager Rick Gates, who were charged with "conspiracy against the United States." Special Counsel Mueller also secured guilty pleas from other campaign advisers, including George Papadopoulos and Michael Flynn.

Despite this ample evidence of wrongdoing, the President attempted to impede the Russia probe at every step of the way. The U.S. intelligence community, the Senate Intelligence Committee, and Robert Mueller and his team of investigators have done a great service to our Nation in investigating the Trump campaign's ties to Russia and Russian interference in our election. The findings further confirm that President Trump not only benefitted from Russian interference but, as Anne Gearan wrote in the October 15 Washington Post story, President Trump "has also disputed, at times, the U.S. intelligence community's conclusion that Russia interfered in the 2016 election to boost his candidacy, and he only reluctantly signed a bill imposing sanctions on Russia for the transgression after weeks of resisting the measure, which he called, 'seriously flawed.'"

Anne Gearan is referencing the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, known by the acronym CAATSA, or C-A-A-T-S-A. That is legislation that I supported, and it passed both Houses of Congress with bipartisan support to impose sanctions on U.S. adversaries, including Russia, for its incursions into Ukraine and Syria and interference in our elections.

I believe it is likely that if CAATSA did not clearly prohibit it, President Trump would have removed preexisting Russia sanctions by now.

So the evidence is clear. By interfering in our national elections and

elevating Donald Trump's prospects for success as a candidate, Vladimir Putin was assuring that a personal ally would be installed in the White House and that that particular ally would clear the way for Putin to advance his foreign policy goals around the world.

Let me move to a second—or, I should say, a third—part of this. If it isn't bad enough that the President is himself undermining our intelligence community's findings, he has deployed Attorney General William Barr to try and discredit those findings—those findings by our intelligence community with regard to interactions with allies.

William Barr has been traveling the world chasing conspiracy theories and investigating President Trump's complaints about the origins of the government's investigation into Russian election interference. Specifically, the Attorney General is examining whether U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies acted properly when they examined possible ties between the Trump campaign and Russia, which ultimately led to Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. We have learned that this probe is now a criminal investigation, suggesting that it is focused on the unfounded allegations pushed by the President's allies about how the Russia probe was started.

Considering that Special Counsel Mueller, the intelligence community, and the bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee all confirmed in great detail that Russia interfered in the 2016 election, it is entirely unclear what legal or factual predicate Attorney General Barr is even relying on to justify this criminal investigation into the origins of the government's investigation into Russia's election interference.

Attorney General Barr is pursuing these efforts, despite the fact that Italy's Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte stated that Italy's intelligence services played no role in the Russian investigation. It appears that Attorney General Barr is using the Justice Department to chase unsubstantiated conspiracy theories that could benefit the President politically and also undermine Special Counsel Robert Mueller's Russia investigation.

The Attorney General has also demonstrated eagerness to prejudge his own investigation by already telling lawmakers in April that he believed that "spying did occur" by the FBI on the Trump campaign. So the President has dispatched a top U.S. law enforcement official around the world to pursue a biased investigation into an effort to undermine our intelligence agencies and to undermine the work of a special counsel who was appointed by the very same Justice Department that Attorney General Barr leads, with the primary goal—the primary goal—being to clear Vladimir Putin's government of wrongdoing. It is hard to comprehend or adequately articulate how disturbing that is.

Let me move to another part of the evidence with regard to how the President deals with President Putin and his government—the Helsinki summit. President Trump's dangerous deference to Vladimir Putin was most evident at the July 2018 summit in Helsinki. Putin and President Trump had a 2-hour one-on-one meeting, followed by an unprecedented press conference.

President Trump appears to overwhelmingly favor one-on-one, closed-door, direct communications with Putin on a regular basis. I have to ask at least two questions, among many we could ask. Question No. 1 is, What is he hiding? No. 2 is, Why not have experienced U.S. personnel present at such bilateral meetings?

Even more disturbing were the President's statements following the Trump-Putin meeting. Here is a brief summary of what happened at that meeting:

President Trump praised Putin and his leadership.

No. 2, he repeatedly sided with Putin over our intelligence community, asserting that Russia did not, in fact, interfere in the 2016 elections. The President repeatedly siding with Putin over our intelligence community was a grave offense by the President that made our Nation less safe—in my judgment, for sure less safe. It was one of the worst moments in any American Presidency.

No. 3 in my brief summary of that public meeting in Helsinki is that Mr. Putin was silent the whole time when this was happening.

President Trump's rambling comments over several minutes reflect not only the President's disturbing desire to flatter and to show support for Putin but also his complete failure—in that instance, his complete failure—to advance U.S. interests.

Let me move to the impeachment that is underway regarding Ukraine.

The transcript of the now-infamous July 25 phone call with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky that is the subject of the current impeachment inquiry also reflects the President's failure to prioritize U.S. national security interests when it comes to Russia.

Going back to Anne Gearan and the Washington Post story of October 15 of this year, she wrote: "During that call, Trump did not mention longstanding U.S. policy goals for Ukraine, including standing up to Russian pressure, and he may have tarred and weakened Zelensky and his winning anti-corruption platform by dragging him into domestic U.S. politics."

Such major omissions send a clear signal to Putin that he could expand his aggression in Ukraine beyond Crimea and to the Ukrainian people and also the message to the Ukrainian people that Zelensky is not going to be the strong leader with U.S. backing that Ukraine needs at this time.

We have already seen the impact of President Trump's abandonment of

Ukraine amid this impeachment scandal. In early October, President Zelensky was effectively backed into a corner to sign Ukraine on to the so-called Steinmeier Formula, which sets the path toward elections in the Donbass region of eastern Ukraine and eventual negotiations with Russia over the future of Russian-occupied territories. He did this without achieving previously imposed preconditions of Russian troop withdrawal and security for the elections.

Zelensky was effectively shamed into pursuing this Steinmeier Formula after President Trump urged him to negotiate with Putin—with Putin—several times on camera during the United Nations General Assembly meetings in September. As Anne Gearan puts it, "The result: A country that was looking for strong U.S. backing, amid worries that Russia could seek to move its aggression beyond the annexation of Crimea, has been left to wonder about the Trump administration's commitment to its national interests."

Let me move to Syria. President Trump's latest moves in Syria only further amplify the alarm over this President's affinity for Vladimir Putin.

In early October, President Trump announced the abrupt withdrawal of U.S. troops from Syria, clearing the way for Turkey to pursue a military operation against Kurdish allies of the United States in northern Syria. Following an initial U.S.-brokered ceasefire, Turkish and Russian authorities have agreed to a more permanent status, sharing control of Syria's northern border.

Turkish and Russian forces are not only occupying Kurdish-held areas but also further expanding Russia's role in Syria and committing war crimes against Kurdish civilians, according to the United Nations.

Russia has already occupied U.S. military camps in the region, and Turkish President Erdogan's deepening relationship with Vladimir Putin—as evidenced by Turkey's purchase of the Russian S-400 missile system—only undercuts U.S. influence in Syria, all but guaranteeing that U.S. interests will not be represented in a future Syrian political settlement.

President Trump's decision serves to benefit Vladimir Putin. Prior to withdrawal, the United States was Russia's only military equal in Syria, but Russia is now the primary and, according to some analysts, the sole power broker in Syria.

In the vacuum left by the United States, Putin will be able to return control of the country to Bashar al-Assad, exercise increased control over Turkey—a NATO ally—and return to Russia's Cold War-era dominance in the Middle East.

As Georgetown University Russia specialist Andrew Bennett put it, "[W]hat is clear is that Russia and the [Bashar al-] Assad regime that it backs have been the big winners in Trump's abrupt retreat. . . . Now, suddenly

Putin is back in the driver's seat in Syria, with leverage over all sides."

Mr. President, it is even worse than that. Let me recount some recent news with regard to actions by Vladimir Putin.

President Trump's transgression goes beyond simply allowing Russia to fill a vacuum. On October 13, just 2 days before Anne Gearan's Washington Post story, the New York Times reported that "the Russian Air Force has repeatedly bombed hospitals in Syria in order to crush the last pockets of resistance to President Bashar al-Assad."

The Times published evidence in that story that the Russians bombed four Syrian hospitals in a 12-hour period in May of this year. During the assault, the Kafr Nabl Surgical Hospital in Idlib Province was struck four times in 30 minutes. Let me say that again. A hospital was struck four times in 30 minutes. Dozens of hospitals and clinics in Idlib Province have been struck since, and Syrian medical workers live in constant fear of the next strike.

Russia continues to act with impunity. Not only did it bomb another hospital in Idlib last week, Russia is using its sway at the United Nations Security Council—where U.S. leadership has diminished significantly under this administration—to limit the scope and the impact of a U.N. inquiry into these bombings.

Such atrocities go beyond the pale of violating the Geneva Conventions and the laws of war; they demonstrate just how ruthless Putin and his regime are and the lengths they are willing to go to assert Russia's influence in the Middle East. The tragedy is, this administration is allowing it to happen. Under this administration, we have seen U.S. leadership erode and multilateral institutions deteriorate to the point where the U.N. is powerless to hold Russia accountable for these atrocities.

I cannot emphasize enough that this administration is not only failing the American people with regard to our relationship with Russia and national security interests, but it is also making us less safe by allowing unspeakable atrocities to occur against innocent civilians—all on our watch.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, I will be brief because I know I only have about 5 minutes before we have to move on, but I want to turn to some brief comments about the courageous public servants whom we have watched and will continue to watch testify before the House Intelligence Committee both last week and again this week in the impeachment inquiry.

We have heard from George Kent, Ambassador Taylor, Ambassador Yovanovitch, and today, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman and others, and my remarks go out to do justice to all those who will testify for their courage. I want to make some brief comments.

These individuals and so many others are putting their careers and reputa-

tions on the line to testify publicly in defense of U.S. national security, moral leadership, and our democratic institutions. It is outrageous—and that is an understatement—that they have been subjected to partisan attacks—public servants who have sacrificed so much for our Nation. In the case of the diplomats, the diplomats have been attacked without any support or defense from Secretary of State Pompeo or other senior Department of State officials.

We should all be inspired by these and countless other public servants who work to protect and serve the United States every day. When I reflect upon their service to our country and their integrity, I am reminded of just one line from "America the Beautiful": "O beautiful for patriot dream, That sees beyond the years." One of the dreams of a patriot, of course, is to see beyond our own circumstances, to dream about a better future by upholding our institutions and by serving the rule of law, our democracy, and our Constitution.

I will skip over all of the information we already know about the service of these Ambassadors and just conclude with some comments about what happened today.

Today, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, before questioning by the committee Members, was going through his experience. I will go through it briefly: infantry officer, foreign area officer specializing in European and Eurasian political military affairs, political military affairs officer, serving on the National Security Council, and serving our country in combat and paying the price of being wounded in combat.

At the end of his statement today, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman talked about his father. He said:

His courageous decision [to come to this country] inspired a deep sense of gratitude in my brothers and myself and instilled in us a sense of duty and service. All three of us served or are currently serving in the military. Our collective military service is a special part of our family's story in America.

He went on to say:

I am grateful for my father's brave act of hope 40 years ago and for the privilege of being an American citizen and public servant, where I can live free of fear for mine and my family's safety.

He contrasted that with what happens in Russia. I think it is a good reminder for all of us.

Let me conclude with these thoughts. It is appalling to see individuals such as Lieutenant Colonel Vindman who dedicated their entire lives to the safety and security of the United States be smeared by the President and by his attack dogs who are more concerned about tweets and FOX News headlines than protecting our Nation's domestic foundations.

Nothing the President has said or done in his nearly 3 years as President convinces me he has any understanding of public service. Looking beyond the current impeachment inquiry, this ad-

ministration's blatant disregard and disrespect for career diplomats has had a grave impact on the State Department and our National Security Agency's ability to recruit the next generation of talented, committed public servants who promote U.S. interests abroad.

I will not allow this administration's continuing assault on our diplomats to undermine, devalue, or dishonor their service or the service of future patriots who choose to make a career of serving and protecting our Nation.

The Ambassadors and officials who testified last week, as well as today—others, including Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—have lived honorable and dutiful lives in service to the United States of America. We owe them our deepest gratitude and appreciation for their integrity and commitment to American values. These are real American heroes who, despite the President's bullying and harassment, have stood up in defense of our democratic institutions and the values the Founders fought for to guide our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about the wind production tax credit. This is a subject that I've talked about before. The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, will, I believe, come soon to talk on the same subject.

The wind production tax credit is so generous with taxpayers' money that wind developers can actually give away their electricity for free and still make a profit. Let me say that again. I am talking today about the wind production tax credit, which is a tax subsidy—taxpayer dollars—given to wind developers, and it is so generous that the developers can actually, in some cases, give away their electricity for free and still make a profit.

That wind production tax credit has been extended 11 times. It has been on the books for more than 25 years. This was a tax credit that was supposed to jump-start a new industry—that's 25 years of jump-starting. Four years ago, Congress agreed to end it. We thought that was it. In doing so, Congress asked taxpayers to provide another \$24 billion, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, to extend the wind production tax credit—\$24 billion more in subsidies for another 5 years and gradually phase out the credit. That is what we thought we did 4 years ago. We would spend \$24 billion more in exchange for phasing out and ending the wind production tax credit. This is on top of the nearly \$10 billion taxpayers paid between 2008 and 2015 and the billions more the taxpayers have paid since the wind production tax credit was created in 1992. That was supposed to be the end of the wind production tax credit 4 years ago. Remember, it

was supposed to jump-start a new industry. President Obama's Energy Secretary said years ago that wind is already a mature industry. That was during the Obama administration.

Now some Members of Congress are trying to break the agreement of 4 years ago to end the wind production tax credit. Earlier this summer, the House Ways and Means Committee reported legislation that extends that credit through the end of 2020. This huge amount of money is not the only thing wrong with that proposal.

First, the wind production tax credit undercuts reliable electricity like nuclear power. This is called negative pricing, which is when wind developers have such a big subsidy that they can give away their electricity and still make money. If you are a wind developer, for every kilowatt hour of electricity one of these 40-story-high wind structures produces, the taxpayers will pay you up to 2.3 cents, which in some markets is more than the cost of the wholesale value of each kilowatt hour of electricity. Negative pricing such as this distorts the marketplace. It puts at risk more reliable forms of energy such as nuclear power, which produces 60 percent of all the carbon-free electricity in the United States. In contrast, wind produces about 19 percent of all the carbon-free electricity in the United States. I think it is important to produce carbon-free electricity. I believe climate change is a problem and that humans are a cause of the problem.

Why would we undercut the production of nuclear power—which is 60 percent of our carbon-free electricity—by the negative pricing of this big, expensive wind production tax credit? With nuclear power available, expecting a country the size of the United States to operate on windmills is the energy equivalent of going to war in sail boats.

Second, in my view, windmills destroy the environment rather than save it. You could run these 40-story structures from Georgia to Maine to produce electricity, scarring the entire eastern landscape or you could produce the same amount of electricity with eight nuclear power plants. If you did run these giant structures from Georgia to Maine, you would still need natural gas or nuclear power to produce electricity when the wind is not blowing, which is most of the time.

There is a much better way to spend the dollars that are available for clean energy. Instead of subsidizing wind developers, the United States could use that money to double the nearly \$6.6 billion that the Federal Government spends on basic energy research to make truly bold breakthroughs that will help us provide cleaner, cheaper energy and raise family incomes.

Earlier this year, I came to the Senate floor and called for a New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy, a 5-year project with 10 grand challenges that will use American research and tech-

nology to put our country and the world firmly on a path toward cleaner, cheaper energy. Specifically, I encouraged funding breakthroughs in advanced nuclear reactors, natural gas, carbon capture, better batteries, greener buildings, electric vehicles, cheaper solar, fusion, advanced computing, and doubling energy research funding. All of that is a better use of funding than more funding for wind developers, which is so generous that in some cases they can give away their electricity and still make a profit. Let wind energy go where we said it should go in 2015; let it go unsubsidized into the free market. That is where we thought we sent it 4 years ago, and that is where it should go.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from Tennessee in explaining why we ought to allow this deal to stand—the deal that was struck some years ago to phase out these incredibly inefficient subsidies.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his leadership on this issue. As you know, this is a very large tax subsidy. The government is already set to spend about \$67 billion in energy tax subsidies just over the next 5 years, and we should be very clear about this: These subsidies lead to a lower standard of living. When we choose to take an inefficient form of energy and throw a lot of money at it, it just lowers the standard of living. We have less resources available for all the other things we could be doing with that money.

As my colleague from Tennessee mentioned, the wind production tax credit began in 1992 for the very straightforward, simple reason that it couldn't compete. It is completely economically uncompetitive. The idea is, we will have this temporary subsidy to enable the wind production to reach an economy of scale, reach a maturity in the industry that would allow it to compete, and the consensus at the time was that ought to be achieved by about 1999. After about 7 years of taxpayer subsidies, the industry should be on its feet, should be competitive, and there would be technological improvements and everything would be fine. That was 20 years ago. We have been subsidizing it ever since.

We extended this program 11 times. The wind component of all of our energy subsidies is about \$25 billion over a 5-year period, and they still can't compete. The reason it can't compete is because it is just extremely expensive to build the electricity-generating capacity if it is a windmill. It is much more expensive than alternative forms of energy. The cost of building wind capacity versus natural gas, for instance, is pretty stark. It costs less than \$1,000 per kilowatt of capacity for a natural gas-fired powerplant. It costs over \$1,600 per kilowatt for wind production.

Obviously, after the production is done, windmills don't require ongoing

fuel. Amazingly enough, that savings is not enough to ever recoup the huge amount of capital you have to lay out upfront to build this very, very expensive technology. You don't have to take my word for it. Warren Buffett had something to say about this. He knows something about investments. He knows something about economic efficiency. Warren Buffett said:

We get a tax credit if we build a lot of wind farms. That is the only reason to build them. They don't make sense without the tax credit.

That is the reality we have. It is compounded by the fact, of course, that wind energy is inherently unreliable. This will come as no surprise to my colleagues. You don't generate electricity from a windmill unless the wind is blowing. Unfortunately, it is just a fact of nature that wind generation tends to peak in the middle of the night and early morning hours when our energy needs are at their lowest.

It is very hard to store electricity, so we end up with this bizarre situation that the Senator from Tennessee alluded to, where sometimes the wind farms are generating tremendous amounts of electricity, when no one needs electricity, because there is a wind storm in the middle of the night, but because they are so heavily subsidized by taxpayers, the wind farm companies are willing to pay the electric grid operator to take their electricity. Normally, you sell your electricity. They actually will pay money to have the electrical grid take their electricity. This is extremely disruptive for the conventional sources of electricity, whether it is nuclear or gas or coal, because they have to be there all the time to adjust for the wild fluctuations that come from wind-generated electricity. It is very hard for them to have a vehicle business model when occasionally the product they produce has a negative value. It is just bizarre.

I want to stress another element of this, which is the original rationale. The original rationale was that this was a new industry. It was going to need some help getting on its feet and getting established, and after some period of time, it would be able to compete on its own. This is no longer even remotely the case. In fact, there is a tremendous amount of wind-generated electricity in America because these subsidies have been so big for so long.

In 1999, we had only 4½ billion kilowatt hours of electricity generated from wind. In 2018, we had 275 billion kilowatt hours—a 6,000-percent increase in two decades. It is now 7 percent of all U.S. electricity generation because these subsidies are so expensive.

I think it was, in part, because of the enormous growth of this industry and the maturity of it—the decades-long history—that Congress finally decided back in 2015 that we would phase out these subsidies. We wouldn't do it immediately, but we would phase them

out by 2019. So 20 years after the subsidies were supposed to end, we are now on a glide path to phasing this out and having these taxpayer subsidies expire at the end of this year.

At the time the Wind Energy Association looked at this in 2015, they said: "Growth in the wind industry is expected to remain strong when the PTC is fully phased out." PTC is the production tax credit. That is what we are talking about. Lo and behold, we get to the end of 2019, or nearly so, and, sure enough, some folks in Congress are saying: Well, let's not stick to that deal. Let's continue this subsidy even longer. So we had a markup in the Ways and Means Committee of the other Chamber to add yet another year's extension to the wind tax credit that will cost another \$2 billion.

I just don't think we should break the deal that we had in 2015. This is an inefficient use of taxpayers' money. This makes our economy less efficient. This lowers our standard of living and is disruptive to the ongoing base sources of electricity that we need across the country.

The last point I want to make is that it is not as though we have an energy shortage in this country. It is not as though we are going to have to turn to hostile foreign sources to get the energy to replace if we don't continue heavily subsidizing wind production. The fact is we have staggering amounts of natural gas—enough natural gas to serve our electricity generation needs for the indefinite future. In 2017, the United States became a net exporter of natural gas. It is a huge, growing source of electricity generation that is clean, that is reliable, and that is incredibly abundant. We came to the right conclusion some years ago. Now is our opportunity to stick to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Texas.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, history has taught us that the closer you get to election day, the harder it gets to pass legislation here in the Congress. It is hard, anyway, by design. You have to pass a bill through committees in the House and in the Senate. Both bodies have to pass a bill if they are different. They have to reconcile those in a conference committee. Then, you have to negotiate with the White House in order to get the President's signature. So, by design, it is hard to pass legislation, but it shouldn't be this hard.

With less than a year to go before the 2020 election, we are racing against the clock. We started this year with bipartisan ambitions to address healthcare costs, to bolster international trade, and to get the appropriations process back on track and avoid unnecessary government shutdowns. Yet, somewhere along the way, politics hijacked the process.

Our colleagues across the aisle decided that no matter how critical legislation may be, foiling President Trump

was even more important. They are so outraged by the President and so consumed by his every word and every tweet that they have brought the work of this body to a screeching halt in an effort to remove him from office less than a year before the next general election. It seems they have no desire whatsoever to pass legislation that would benefit the American people, let alone any urgency to get things moving. The only thing our Democratic colleagues seem to care about is stopping the President from getting anything that could be construed as a win.

Over in the House, the Democrats have put legislating on the back burner and are spending their days trying to nullify the results of the 2016 election. They are slow-walking negotiations on the National Defense Authorization Act, which has passed every year without fail since 1961. Their negotiations with the administration over the USMCA—that is the successor to NAFTA, which helped to benefit the employment of roughly 13 million Americans—have kept farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers in limbo for months. Along with the necessary funding to help to make up for the lack of funds in the highway trust fund, they have also complicated efforts to get a long-term highway bill reauthorization passed.

Despite the partisan frenzy in the House, I have always believed the Senate should do its best to stay above the fray, but the minority leader has proven me wrong. In fact, last week, I came to the floor to ask unanimous consent to pass a bill that Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, of Connecticut, a Democrat, and I, a Republican, introduced together. Incredibly, this bill passed unanimously out of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Our legislation is designed to do what all here in Washington say they want to do, which is to reduce drug prices—in this case, by stopping drug makers from gaming the patent system. Our bill strikes a delicate balance of protecting innovation, which is very, very important—we must not lose sight of that—while it increases competition, and you know competition helps to bring down prices. As an added bonus, it would lower Federal spending by more than a half a billion dollars over 10 years. That is not even talking about what it would do in the non-governmental sector for savings.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have done what you are expected to do here in a legislative body, which is to work hard to build consensus and come up with a bill that could gain bipartisan support. By any measure, we have succeeded in doing that, as it has a dozen bipartisan cosponsors. As I mentioned, when this legislation was reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary—a committee that, notably, can be pretty contentious at times—the committee passed it unanimously. Every Republican and every Democrat voted for it.

I had hoped that would have been some indication that this bill would

have quickly passed the full Senate when brought to the Senate floor. Apparently, the minority leader, the Senator from New York, had other plans in mind, because when I, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL, came to the floor last week to try to get this legislation passed, he objected—hence, the Schumer graveyard.

On November 18, 2019, when referring to S. 1416, regarding the lowering of drug prices, Senator SCHUMER said: "Democrats are happy and eager to work on those issues."

One thing I have learned around here is that it is not just what people say but what they do that counts, and he objected to this virtually unanimously supported bill, on a bipartisan basis, to lower drug prices. He actually called it a good bill. He said it was well-intentioned, but he said there were other ideas that had to be included before he would lift his objection. So he doesn't have any objection to our bill. He understands it is a good bill but that it may not be as comprehensive as he would like.

Another thing I have learned in my time in the Senate is that if you demand everything and are not willing to compromise, you are going to end up with nothing. Apparently, that is what the Democratic leader is happy with, including for his constituents in New York, by the way, who will have to pay more money out-of-pocket as a result of his objection to this commonsense bill.

I would hope that he would talk to his own Members who have cosponsored this bill. Most notably, the Democratic whip, Senator DURBIN, of Illinois, has cosponsored the bill as well as Senator MURRAY, of Washington, who is the ranking member on the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. They are both cosponsors of this bill that the Democratic leader objected to.

While all Senators have said they want to address rising drug prices, Senator SCHUMER has the distinction of being the only Senator to have actually blocked a bill that would do exactly that. Why would he do that? He claims—I think, mistakenly so—that passing my bill would somehow render the Senate incapable of passing any other drug pricing legislation. That is, obviously, ridiculous and untrue.

I happen to sit not only on the Committee on the Judiciary but on the Committee on Finance. There is a significant bipartisan Committee on Finance bill, together with the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee's bill, that has been produced by Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY. Both of those contain many good ideas. I wish we had the time and the bandwidth to debate and vote on those on the Senate floor and in the House. But for the fact that our House colleagues are so obsessed with impeachment and seem incapable of doing anything else, I think we could do that.

Of course, even though the Democratic leader himself is the reason this

bill did not pass last week, it hasn't stopped him from complaining about the lack of progress on other legislation. Yesterday evening, for example, he came to the floor and said: "Democrats are happy and eager to work on those issues." I would suggest, when he says they "are happy and eager to work on those issues," that it is just happy talk, not our actually rolling up our sleeves and working together to get the work of the American people done, which is the reason I thought we were here.

The Democratic leader went on to say that the Senate Democrats are waiting with bated breath for the Republican leader to put any of these bills on the floor and for any Republican to speak out and demand they go on the floor. Yet, when I asked for this bill to be passed on the floor, it was not a Republican who blocked it. It was the same person who said he would be happy and eager to work on those issues. Again, what people say in Washington, DC, is not what they actually do sometimes. I suggest it is important to see what people do, not just listen to what they say.

Sadly, this isn't the only time the Democratic leader has blocked progress on bipartisan priorities. It is just the latest. Here are some other tombstones in the Schumer graveyard.

Over the summer, our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations had the foresight to prepare for the funding fight that we expected this fall. That was a normal part of the process. They negotiated a spending caps agreement to make the appropriations process much more straightforward in both Chambers of Congress, and the House and the Senate approved the terms. We agreed to that top-line funding level both for defense and nondefense spending. There was also a promise not to derail the process with poison pills in the form of policy riders. We got all of it done with plenty of time to spare.

After we voted on that, there was reason for hope and optimism in that, somehow, we had made it much easier for us to do the Nation's business when it had come to the spending bills. While there was still a lot of work to do, we thought this put us on a strong footing to get funding bills passed before the end of the fiscal year. Yet here we are today, on November 19—a long time from those votes in August—and we still don't have those spending bills passed.

Our Democratic colleagues have, on two instances, actually objected to even debating the Defense appropriations bill, which provides a pay raise for our troops. They will not even talk about it. They will not offer amendments. They just blocked it. They just stopped it dead in its tracks. You would have thought everybody would have learned not to play politics with the appropriations bills. Our Democratic colleagues have held up government funding due to a disagreement that is equal to about 0.3 percent of the

discretionary spending budget, and they are trying to reopen the very budget agreement that they agreed to last summer that has become law.

They blocked vital education funding, which would have provided more than \$71 billion to the Department of Education. This spending bill would bolster a number of the grant programs that our students and our schools rely on, and it would promote college access and affordability to help more prospective college students. That same funding bill would have invested nearly \$4 billion in our fight against the opioid epidemic, supported workforce training programs, and strengthened our nationwide mental health system.

Could the majority leader put aside politics just long enough to let this funding bill, which would do so much good, pass? Well, apparently not.

If you think that is bad, it just gets worse. Our most fundamental responsibility in Congress is to provide for the common defense. Before we can worry about anything else, we need the safety and security that our military provides to fight, if necessary, our Nation's wars and to defend our democracy. Actually, the strength of our military is directly related to our ability to live in peace because when our adversaries see us as tentative or weak or withdrawing or unwilling to fund our military training and readiness, they view that as a sign of weakness, which itself can be a provocation, which, again, ignores our most basic job as Members of the Congress.

There have always been disagreements about exact dollar figures; we are not talking about that. But the top-line figures were agreed upon last summer, so I thought we were ready to fund our military on time.

Well, shame on me for being an optimist or at least optimistic enough to believe that people would keep their commitments, keep their word, and we would somehow head down this path to funding the U.S. Government.

Here we are, with one continuing resolution expiring in 3 days' time. I believe the House will vote on an additional continuing resolution that will take us to December 20, and then the Senate will have to do that just to keep the lights on here in Washington, DC—just to make sure that government actually functions.

None of this is necessary, and all of it is directly related to hyperpartisan conflict, which we all understand, but it simply is getting in the way of our ability to do our business.

The one that strikes me as the most indefensible, beyond the prescription drug objection, is blocking funding for our troops. We depend on an all-volunteer military, and obviously many of our military members are not just single; they have families who depend on them and on the funding that Congress provides. But our colleagues blocked it two different times—again, voting against the motion to proceed to the bill which, in plain English, is just saying that they didn't even want to start

talking about or amending the underlying bill, which each Senator would have the opportunity to do if they would allow us to begin that process, which they blocked.

Well, the Democratic leader loves to talk about the legislative graveyard here in the Senate. What he really means is that he wants to control the agenda, even in his seat as the minority leader. Well, he knows the rules of the Senate don't permit the minority to control the agenda. That is why it is so important that Senator McCONNELL is where he is and that Republicans have a majority.

We are not saying that you have to do it our way or the highway. We are saying: Let's engage in the legislative process. Let's take up legislation on the floor of the Senate and let Senators offer their amendments, their suggestions, and then let's vote on them. But let's not just stop things dead in their tracks because of partisan politics or because somebody doesn't want somebody who happens to be on the ballot in 2020 to get a "win." That is really beneath the dignity of the Senate or any Senator. It is less than what the American people have a right to expect of us.

I would ask the Democratic leader again: Please don't head down this path by creating a graveyard of your own for bipartisan legislation that could and should become law. It is not my way or the highway. We have to work on this together, and we are willing to do our part.

Let's work on bills that strengthen our military, lower drug prices, help students, assist in the fight against the opioid crisis, and so much, much more.

I think it is a shame that our Democratic colleagues seem to be unable to compartmentalize their feelings about the President from the urgent need for them to do the jobs they were elected to do here in the Congress. They have been given countless opportunities to engage with us on a bipartisan basis to pass meaningful legislation that would make the American people's lives better. Again, that is why I think we are here, but they refuse to do anything that could be construed as giving somebody a victory because of political considerations. While Senator SCHUMER continues to kill bipartisan bill after bipartisan bill—really, because of it—the work of this Congress has become paralyzed.

We are not going to give up, though. We will keep fighting to ensure that the American people are not the ultimate victims of our Democratic colleagues' war against this President—again, less than a year before the election. Why can't they channel all of their anger, all of their energy into the election rather than invoking the impeachment process? This would be the fourth time that has been initiated in American history, and it has never been successful in getting a Senate conviction and a removal of any President in American history. Our Democratic colleagues know they are likely

headed to the same conclusion here, but they nonetheless want to occupy all of our time and all of our attention on something that they know, ultimately, will likely be futile, will be unsuccessful, and in the meantime leave the American people on the sideline and not care or do anything that would help make their lives just a little bit easier and our country just a little bit stronger.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

Mr. LEE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Luck nomination?

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 64, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 358 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Whitehouse
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murphy	
Feinstein	Paul	

NAYS—31

Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Kaine
Brown	Durbin	King
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markey
Cardin	Hassan	Menendez
Casey	Heinrich	Merkley

Murray	Shaheen	Van Hollen
Peters	Smith	Warner
Rosen	Stabenow	Wyden
Schatz	Tester	
Schumer	Udall	

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Rick Scott, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Marco Rubio, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Cornyn, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, John Boozman, Tim Scott, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 359 Ex.]

YEAS—80

Alexander	Cassidy	Feinstein
Baldwin	Collins	Fischer
Barrasso	Coons	Gardner
Blackburn	Cornyn	Graham
Blumenthal	Cotton	Grassley
Blunt	Cramer	Hassan
Boozman	Crapo	Hawley
Braun	Cruz	Heinrich
Burr	Daines	Hoeven
Capito	Duckworth	Hyde-Smith
Cardin	Durbin	Inhofe
Carper	Enzi	Isakson
Casey	Ernst	Johnson

Jones	Paul	Shelby
Kaine	Perdue	Sinema
Kennedy	Peters	Smith
King	Portman	Sullivan
Lankford	Reed	Tester
Leahy	Risch	Thune
Lee	Roberts	Tillis
Manchin	Romney	Toomey
McConnell	Rounds	Udall
McSally	Rubio	Warner
Menendez	Sasse	Whitehouse
Moran	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Murkowski	Scott (SC)	Young
Murphy	Shaheen	

NAYS—15

Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Rosen	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

FCC AND C-BAND AUCTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I want to spend a very few minutes today to say thanks. I want to thank Chairman Ajit Pai and his colleagues at the Federal Communications Commission. The Chairman announced yesterday that he was going to put 5G technology and the American taxpayer first by holding a public auction, as opposed to a private auction, of what we call the C-band. It was a courageous decision that he made against a lot of pressure.

Allow me, for just a few minutes, to explain why that is important. We have all heard about 5G, which stands for fifth generation. It is a brandnew wireless technology. It means incredibly fast internet and cell phone calls. It means the ability to deliver as much as 100 times more data through wireless technology than we can do today.

We will notice it in our iPads; we will notice it in our computers; but we will notice it also in our cell phones.

As you know, a cell phone is really a sophisticated walkie-talkie. I will use the cell phone as an example to explain 5G. A cell phone is just a very sophisticated, much more complicated walkie-talkie. How does a walkie-talkie work? How does a cell phone work? Radio waves. The scientific term is "electromagnetic radiation."

A radio wave is just what it says, a wave that goes from my cell phone, say, to the President's cell phone through an antenna, a transmitter, and a receiver. A radio wave and the air through which it travels and the right to send a radio wave is a sovereign asset. It belongs to the American people. The American people own that

radio wave and the right to send it. Our FCC gets to decide who gets to use those radio waves and who has the right to send those radio waves.

There is a particular type of radio wave that is absolutely perfect for 5G. It is between 180 megahertz and 300 megahertz. Why are these radio waves so perfect for 5G? Well, because they strike a balance. First, the radio waves in that spectrum, as it is called, can go a fairly long distance, and they can carry huge amounts of data. That is going to make driverless cars possible. We have heard about those—the internet of things. That is going to make remote surgery possible, where a doctor who is in one place physically and through the internet, using a robot, can perform surgery on someone 1,000 miles away. 5G going through these special radio waves is going to make all that possible. It is going to change our lives.

Right now, those radio waves—I will call them the C-band spectrum—as I said, are owned by the American people. They are being used by three satellite companies—two from Luxembourg and one from Canada—and some other companies. They are satellite companies. They don't own those radio waves. They don't even have a license to use those radio waves. They didn't pay anything to get to use those radio waves. The FCC said they could use them. It is sort of like a month-to-month lease or rental agreement where you don't have to pay any rent.

Some time ago, those three companies came to the FCC and said: Even though we don't own those radio waves you allow us to use and even though the American people own those radio waves, which are perfect for 5G, we are willing to give them up to use for 5G, but here is what we want you to do.

The three foreign companies said: We want you to give us those radio waves, and then we will auction them off to the telecommunications companies that want to use the radio waves for 5G.

This was the kicker: The three foreign corporations said they want to keep the money.

Investment bankers estimate that through that auction being conducted by those three foreign corporations, as much as \$60 billion would have been generated. That is how much telecommunications companies would pay to get the license to use those radio waves.

Some people encouraged the FCC to do that. They said that we ought to do it because these three foreign companies can do an auction faster than the FCC can—even though the three foreign companies had never done an auction of spectrum and even though the FCC has done over 100 public auctions for other radio waves that the FCC has auctioned off. In doing that, the fine men and women at the FCC in charge of these auctions—they have been doing it for 25 years—have brought in \$123 billion for the American people.

That will build a lot of interstate, it will educate a lot of kids, and it will pay a lot of soldiers.

But our three friends—these foreign satellite companies—still said: Even though we have no experience, we can do it faster. If you let the FCC do it, it will take them 7 years.

Well, that just wasn't accurate. I have spoken to the people in charge of doing auctions at the FCC. In fact, on Thursday, they are going to appear before a subcommittee that I chair. We are going to talk about it some more. I don't know where this figure of 7 years came from, but it is just not accurate.

Nonetheless, the FCC came under—there are swamp creatures in the government; we know that. Some of these swamp creatures in and out of government put an awful lot of pressure on the FCC. These swamp creatures are trying to help some of their friends in the telecommunications business. One of the foreign corporations spent about half a million dollars lobbying. I am not saying there is something wrong with that. We all have the right to petition our government. But that is just the fact. I don't mean it in a pejorative sense.

The FCC was under a lot of pressure, but yesterday, the Chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, looked at all this. He resisted the pressure, and he announced that we are going to have a public auction. We are going to let every telecommunications company in America that wants to bid on these valuable air waves come forward and bid. We are going to do an auction within a year and probably less, not 7 years, and the money that is going to be generated is going to go to the owner of those radio waves, not the foreign companies that, through our benevolence, are now using those radio waves. The money is going to go to the American people.

I know what you are thinking. You are thinking: Gosh, how was this ever even an issue? This should have been a no-brainer.

Well, that is part of what is wrong with Washington, DC, in my judgment. Sometimes—not always but sometimes—the American people aren't put first. But yesterday, Ajit Pai, our Chairman at the FCC, put them first, and I just wanted to stand up today and tell him a genuine and heartfelt thank-you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PREVENT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, in the last 40 years, we have had 21 government shutdowns—21. Twenty-one times, Congress and the President have

not been able to agree or the Senate and the House have not been able to agree. As a result of that, Federal workers around the country have faced the consequences of Members of Congress not finding agreement.

Help me understand this. Twenty-one times in 40 years, Federal workers who get up every single day and serve the American people and serve their neighbors have faced the consequences of furloughs because Members of Congress could not come to a resolution. It is not that it has gone unnoticed. For a decade or more, there have been solutions that have been proposed.

Ten years ago, I had a proposal in the House—actually, ROB PORTMAN had a great proposal in the Senate at the same time to deal with government shutdowns. Let's say when we get to the end of the fiscal year, we will just have a continuing resolution, but then we will cut spending every few months to press Congress to get to their work. The problem was, hardly anyone on the other side agreed with that. We couldn't get any bipartisan support for it. So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle proposed that if we get to the end of the fiscal year, we would have a continuing resolution, and every couple of months, the spending would go up, and it would just continue to go up and up and up until it was resolved. Well, they didn't have anyone on my side of the aisle saying "We are going to put in a mechanism that just increases spending over and over again without congressional involvement," so they got no bipartisan support.

An idea was floated to just cut the pay of the Members of Congress. But it really wasn't cutting their pay; it was taking their pay and putting it in an escrow account and just kind of holding it for them, and then when everything was resolved, they would get their money back. So it really wasn't a reduction in pay; it was kind of a shell game—push those dollars off to another side and get them all back later just to make it look like you got a cut in pay. But that hasn't had wide support either. A lot of people have real concerns about that because, quite frankly, some Members of Congress are very wealthy; some Members are not. Some Members don't notice their congressional pay; some do. It is kind of a disproportionate piece of leverage to resolve this.

What is interesting is that all those proposals acknowledged one simple thing: This is a problem. It needs to be resolved. Federal workers are facing the consequences; Members of Congress are not.

About 5 months ago, MAGGIE HASSAN and I—this Chamber knows well the Senator from New Hampshire. She and I started working together on a nonpartisan—not just a bipartisan but a nonpartisan—way to stop government shutdowns. We have two very simple proposals.

There are two problems here. We need to stop Federal workers from getting hurt when there is a shutdown and

make sure those families are not hurt. The second thing is, we want to actually get to appropriations, not continuing resolutions.

When do you a continuing resolution for any length of time, like what we are in right now—we are in our eighth week of a continuing resolution right now. When you do one that long, it hurts temporary workers who are Federal workers. They are laid off in the process. Other folks are not. Many of these agencies need those temporary workers, and those temporary workers are counting on that salary. It hurts contracting because everything can't start in a continuing resolution. You have to wait until there are real appropriations before new programs can start. You can't stop old programs. You can't do purchasing. It creates a tremendous inefficiency in government.

Our simple idea was this: Let's find a way to protect Federal workers and get to appropriations. The solution we came up with is pretty straightforward. When we get to the end of the fiscal year, which right now is October 1, if appropriations are not done, there will be a continuing resolution that kicks into effect to protect Federal workers, but Members of Congress and our staff and the White House Office of Management and Budget—none of us can travel. Members of Congress will be in continuous session 7 days a week until we get appropriations done. And one more thing: We can't move to any issues other than appropriations. We are locked into that box.

Basically, if our work is not done, we all will have to stay until the work is done. I have had folks say that is not really a big consequence. A lot of folks do that all over the country all the time. If at the end of their workday their work is not done, they have to stay until they get it done. Small business owners know that full well. It is not like you can punch a clock. If the work is not done in a small business, you stay until it actually gets done.

Here is the thing. Go back to last December. When the shutdown started last December and we got to an impasse here between the House, the Senate, and the White House, Members of Congress and our staff all left and went home. Federal workers across the country all took a big, deep breath as they walked into the holidays because they were on furlough, but Members of this body walked out. That should never happen—never.

What Senator HASSAN and I are proposing is very simple. The pressure shouldn't be on Federal workers. They can't vote to solve this. The pressure should be on us.

For everyone in this body who says, "I don't like that kind of artificial pressure," why don't you feel what it is like to be a Federal worker for a while and those Federal employees? They don't like that pressure on them. So let's flip it. Let's put the pressure on us, where it should be, and get it off the folks, where it should not be, and let's stay until we get our work done.

This idea is overly simplistic, but what is interesting is, for the first time in a decade, there is an idea that has bipartisan support. We have multiple Members of this body who are looking at it, contemplating it, and then nodding their heads, saying: I would rather the pressure be on us than on the Federal workers and their families.

Let's solve this. We shouldn't have government shutdowns. We should have arguments over debt and deficit. We should have arguments over the budget. That is why people sent us here—to solve how their money is going to be spent most efficiently and argue about issues on debt and deficit.

In the meantime, why in the world would we want to hurt the very people who serve their neighbors, those people being the Federal employees around the country? Let's keep them out of it. Let's keep them still serving their neighbors, and let's keep the fight right here where it needs to be. Let's argue this out until we get it resolved, and let's not quit until we resolve it. It is a simple idea that Senator HASSAN and I actually believe will work.

In the decades to come, people will look back at the time when we used to have government shutdowns and will shake their heads and say: I can't believe there was a period of time during which the Federal government used to shut down when they argued. Now we stay until we get the issue settled.

It is a pretty straightforward idea, and I hope that more of my colleagues will join us in this absolute commitment to solving this for future generations.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I want to spend a few minutes recognizing our late colleague and my friend Senator Kay Hagan.

Kay and I both came to the Senate in 2009. I had the privilege of working with her on two committees—HELP and Banking. As a former vice president of the North Carolina National Bank, she had a lot more to offer to that committee than I had, and I tried to learn from her whenever I could. Kay and I both came to the Senate in the middle of the worst recession since the Great Depression. We were losing 700,000 jobs a month, and millions were losing their homes. It was an incredibly difficult moment for the country, but it brought out all of Kay's best qualities.

Everyone knew that Kay faced some of the toughest politics of any Member of our caucus, but in those early days, I saw her take vote after vote on some

of the hardest issues. She never wavered. She voted for the Recovery Act to save the economy when we were in free fall. She voted for Dodd-Frank to restore confidence and accountability to the financial sector, which was something she knew quite a lot about. She spoke out against amendment No. 1 in North Carolina and for marriage equality. She also cast a decisive vote for the Affordable Care Act.

As a Democratic Senator from North Carolina and as a freshman Senator, none of those positions were easy to take, but she knew they were the right places to be for her State and for the country. Because Kay did what she did, millions of Americans kept jobs they would have lost, and millions of Americans gained quality, affordable health insurance for the first time in their lives. In her home State, the LGBT community had a Senator in Washington who, for the first time in history, was willing to fight for their full and equal rights.

One of our colleagues, the senior Senator from Tennessee, likes to say: If you have come to Washington just to hear yourself talk, just stay home and get a job on the radio. It is not worth the trouble of your coming all the way here.

Kay didn't come to Washington to talk. She came to work and to lead.

Over her term, Kay was a fierce and principled advocate for North Carolina. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, she helped to prevent cuts to tuition programs for veterans. She sponsored the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to help close the gender pay gap across the country. She worked across the aisle to promote conservation and outdoor recreation, which is something we appreciate in my home State of Colorado.

She was a lot less interested in the empty politics of this town and a lot more interested in making progress for the people of North Carolina and for our country. She was a voice of reason, pragmatism, and humility in this body, which sorely lacks all three. In other words, Kay took her job seriously but never herself, and no matter how difficult it might have been, she never failed to put the people of North Carolina ahead of the politics of the moment. It is why she earned deep respect from both sides of the aisle, not only for her work ethic but for her kindness, her warmth, and her grace. There was not a room in this complex, including the one I am standing in right now, that wasn't brightened the moment that Kay Hagan walked in.

To Chip, her husband, and to their kids—Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie—I hope you know how proud we all are of Kay. She represented the best qualities of North Carolina. It is why her colleagues adored her. It is why her staff loved her and revered her, and it is why all of us who had the privilege of working with her in this body will miss her terribly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SATELLITE TELEVISION EXTENSION AND LOCALISM ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise this afternoon because there is a legislative deadline in front of this body that we dare not miss. Even as I speak, our colleagues in the House Energy and Commerce Committee are considering the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act Reauthorization, or STELAR. For 30 years, STELAR and previous versions of the law have allowed people who live beyond the reach of a broadcast signal to receive broadcast programming nonetheless.

Some Senators believe that in 2019, STELAR has outlived its usefulness and want it to expire, but other Senators want to extend some of these provisions—at least in the short term—to prevent consumers from losing these broadcast signals; still others want to use the STELAR reauthorization legislation as a vehicle to implement other reforms.

I have introduced new legislation, the Satellite Television Access Reauthorization—or STAR—Act to move this process forward. The existing STELAR statute expires December 31. So absent congressional action before the end of the year, the provisions included in STELAR that enable nearly 870,000 Americans to access broadcasting TV signals will no longer be the law of the land. These Americans who depend on STELAR are mostly in rural parts of this country, like my home State of Mississippi. They include truckers, tailgaters, and RV drivers, and they include Americans living in very remote areas.

I say to my colleagues, now is the time for Senators to make their positions clear. Over the course of this year, I have been polling Members to ascertain what this body wants. As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I will act according to the majority wishes, but time is running short. Many people point to the fact that the media landscape is changing. There are more options for video content than ever before. New programming is coming out every day that is being streamed through new services. Those are all great things.

As I said at a June Commerce Committee hearing, we are living in the golden age of television. The Commerce Committee has been working to close the digital divide between rural and urban America to make sure all families can access those choices and all families can be a part of the golden age, but there are still Americans without Internet access and without broad-

cast signals. They deserve the ability to view basic television services just like everyone else.

Without the reauthorization of STELAR, many Americans will not be able to watch broadcast news or enjoy access to programming that is available for the rest of the country. They will be on the wrong side of the digital divide, and there will be a wide cultural divide, as they would be cut off from the flow of programs and information.

If Members of this body are of a mind to move forward with some extension of this statute, we will work with our colleagues in the House. That may include improvements and enhancements to STELAR that address good faith requirements, level the playing field in the marketplace, promote access to programming, and ensure robust competition, but we don't have much time.

After this week, Senators will go home for Thanksgiving. Many of those across the country who benefit from STELAR in our States will watch football games and the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade, thanks to the STELAR law. They will enjoy time with their families, and I look forward to doing the same, but when Congress returns, there will be just 2 weeks—10 legislative days—to finalize any legislation and send it to the President for his signature.

In this body, taking no action is easy. It comes naturally. But in this case, no action equals the repeal of the STELAR law in its entirety, and Members should know that. They have 10 days to ensure 870,000 Americans will be able to watch the same programs next year that they are seeing this year, or we can let STELAR expire and take the risk of letting the chips fall where they may.

To repeat, my colleagues should be advised they need to make a voice that is heard on whether the STELAR legislation needs to be extended or expire.

Thank you, Madam President.

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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2486

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to urge immediate passage of the bipartisan FUTURE Act, which is H.R. 2486, to restore critical funding for historically Black colleges and universities, known by the acronym here in Washington as HBCUs, as well as minority-serving institutions, so-called MSIs.

The \$255 million in funding that HBCUs and MSIs rely on lapsed on September 30 of this year. Both the historically Black colleges and univer-

sities and the minority-serving institutions are underresourced and don't have the flexibility to operate in the red in the hopes of potential reimbursement later on.

Campuses are already feeling this impact. Just 2 weeks after this program expired, some campuses notified employees that their positions and programs may be terminated. We are talking about real people losing their jobs and programs being cut that play a critical role in graduating and retaining students in the STEM field—science, technology, engineering, and math fields. All of this is impacting students across the country. Presidents of some of these institutions have told us that planning has "all but stopped." This funding lapse is urgent, and it must be addressed now.

From the perspective of my home State of Pennsylvania, we have two of the oldest historically Black colleges and universities—two of the oldest in the whole country—Cheyney University, as well as Lincoln University, and, in addition to that, a growing Hispanic-serving institution, in this case, the Reading Area Community College.

We know that the investment made by the FUTURE Act will support college completion and academic opportunities at these and all historically Black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions across the country. The FUTURE Act is fully paid for. It would not add to the deficit. It has strong bipartisan support in both Chambers.

My colleagues in the majority are holding this funding hostage in an effort to pass what I would argue is a partisan bill. That is not just my argument or my opinion; some of my Republican colleagues have said this is the reason they are holding up this critical legislation.

Instead of passing a bipartisan comprehensive reauthorization of our future higher education law, which my colleague Senator MURRAY is pushing for, some Republicans want to force Democrats to support a partisan bill.

Instead of working in a bipartisan fashion to fix our current system so it works better for students, families, and teachers, they want us to support a so-called micropackage, the Student Aid Improvement Act. This act, in my judgment and the judgment of others, fails to address a number of critical areas, including improved campus safety and access to higher education affordability and accountability. Because of that, it maintains the status quo.

Make no mistake, the Student Aid Improvement Act is a partisan bill. The bill fails to address the challenges students are facing in obtaining a college degree—including childcare, housing, food and mental health, among others—nor does it address the needs of first-generation students, students of color, and students with disabilities.

Let's debate these issues. Let's come to the table to negotiate on a bipartisan overhaul, but let's not hold historically Black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions hostage in the meantime. We can get something done in the short run that would be beneficial to these institutions.

We need to ensure that colleges and universities have the resources to provide support to all students they serve, including students with disabilities. A couple of examples of some of my bills—the Higher Education Mental Health Act, which is supported by over 250 college and university presidents, including 15 of the historically Black colleges and universities—would help institutions of higher education identify the resources and services needed to support their students with mental health needs.

A second bill of mine, the RISE Act, would make it easier for colleges to provide support to students with disabilities by accepting student assessments from high school and smoothing the transition to higher education.

A third bill, my Expanding Disability Access to Higher Education Act, would increase the funding for TRIO Programs that serve first-generation students with disabilities and make higher education more accessible.

These bills would provide the resources needed for students to be successful as they pursue higher education, but without a comprehensive bill, the needs of these students will continue to go unmet. Rather than blocking vital resources from flowing to our Nation's historically Black colleges and universities, we should immediately pass the FUTURE Act. This would restore funding, while providing us time to work on a comprehensive reauthorization that addresses the needs of all students.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 212, H.R. 2486. I ask unanimous consent that the Murray amendment at the desk be agreed to; 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?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object.

I have a better idea, which I am going to offer to the Senate once again. It is permanent funding for historically Black colleges at the level of \$255 million a year. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has stated he doesn't want a piecemeal bill. He wants a more comprehensive bill. I have offered such a bill and introduced it in the Senate. I will describe it in a few moments when I ask unanimous con-

sent to pass it, and it will include not a 2-year short-term fix based upon a budget gimmick, which will have difficulty passing the Senate, but permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions.

It will include simplification of the FAFSA, the form that 8 million minority students fill out every year, which in our State is the biggest obstacle to minority students having an opportunity for higher education and a variety of other bipartisan proposals.

I am ready to pass a comprehensive bill. I offered one before. It was blocked by my Democratic friends. I am going to offer it again in a minute, and we will see if they agree to it, but I don't think we should pass a piecemeal bill. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think we should be more comprehensive, and not only that, we should do permanent funding of historically Black colleges.

The last point I will make before I object is that the U.S. Department of Education has written all the presidents of the historically Black and minority-serving institutions and said there is sufficient funding in the Federal Government for the rest of the year—fiscal year—until October 1 of next year. So while we need to finish our work, there is no crisis at the moment, so let's do the job right.

I will offer, in just a moment, the way to do that, which is permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2557

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, for the convenience of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I am going to offer my unanimous consent agreement at the beginning of my remarks, and then if he wishes to stay, he can, but if he has another place to go in his schedule, he may do that.

Let me just say that the provision I am going to let me preface it in this way. I know very well the value of historically Black colleges. One of my favorite stories is the story that the late author, Alex Haley, the author of "Roots" and "The Autobiography of Malcolm X"—I suppose the two best selling books ever on the history of the African American—used to tell about his father, Simon P. Haley, who was wasted as a child. That was the word they used.

He was allowed to go to college, and he went to North Carolina A&T where he was ready to drop out. He came back, got a summer job on a Pullman train to Chicago, and a man talked to him at night asking him for a glass of warm milk. He got the glass of warm milk and thought nothing more about it. He went back to North Carolina A&T, a historically Black college.

The principal called him in. He thought he was in real trouble, as the

president of the college called him in. Simon P. Haley thought he was in real trouble. The President of the college said that the man on the train had sent enough money for Simon P. Haley to graduate—to pay his tuition to graduate from college.

So Alex Haley wrote for the Reader's Digest the story of the man on the train who helped his father. That father went to Cornell and became the first Black graduate of Cornell's agricultural college. He came back to Lane College, one of the six historically Black colleges in Tennessee, where he taught and raised a son, who is a lawyer, later Ambassador to Gambia; two daughters, one a teacher; he raised another son, an architect; and then he raised a son he thought wouldn't amount to anything who joined the Coast Guard and ended up writing a Pulitzer Prize-winning book, "Roots," and "The Autobiography of Malcolm X."

I know the value of Lane College, Fisk University, Tennessee State University, Lemoyne-Owen College, Meharry Medical College, and America Baptist College, and I want to help them. The request I am going to make is that the Senate pass a small package of bills that are sponsored by Democrats and Republicans, 29 Senators—17 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The first provision would be permanent funding. That is \$255 million every year permanently for historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions. A second provision—I ask consent to use this document on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the FAFSA. This is the document that 20 million Americans fill out every year. We know how to reduce it. It is the biggest impediment to minority students going to college today. We are ready to pass it. Eight million minority students fill this out. The president of the Southwest Community College from Memphis tells me he loses 1,500 students a semester because of the complexity of that.

There are other provisions in this package, which include the Portman-Kaine provision for short-term Pell grants sponsored by about 20 Senators, many of them Democrats; the provision for Pell grants for prisoners who are eligible for parole; an increase in the number of Pell grants; an increase in the amount of Pell grants. All of that is in this package that I have offered, but it starts with permanent funding for historically black colleges. Since there is time until October 1 of next year, the Department of Education has said that there is plenty of Federal funding for all of those institutions. There is no reason we can't agree to my package today, send it over to the House of Representatives, send it to the President, and let all of these institutions know they don't have to worry about funding permanently instead of just for 2 years.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2557 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just want to make a couple of comments by way of response.

I really want to go back to what we said earlier. There is no reason we can't at least get this piece of legislation done. I will say it again: These institutions are underresourced. They don't have the flexibility to operate in the red in the hopes of potential reimbursement later on.

We are also told by the institutions themselves that planning has "all but stopped." Campuses are feeling this impact already. Just 2 weeks after this program expired, some campuses informed employees that their positions and programs may be terminated. So I would argue that the present circumstance is not acceptable.

I realize the chairman wants to proceed to other issues, and I respect that, but when you consider what he is proposing, there are some changes that should be pointed out.

First of all, when considering the proposal he has, in comparing what it would do, for example, on the Second Chance Pell proposal, that only contains a limited repeal of the ban rather than a full repeal of the ban. Any reference to the JOBS Act making short-term programs eligible for Pell grants—a bipartisan bill that was introduced—excludes for-profit colleges. In this micropackage that the chairman is proposing, the for-profit colleges are added back in.

No. 3, just by way of some examples, in the Grassley-Smith bill on financial aid award letters, some changes were made to that on financial aid award letters that weren't contemplated by the bill's original authors.

Our legislation is fully paid for. It invests up to \$55 million in recovery programs. For several reasons, by way of contrast but also by way of what is happening right now with regard to these institutions—for those and other reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I know this Senate is a deliberative body, but we have been working on higher education for 5 years in our committee, and suddenly, out of the blue, comes a bill out of the House which says that we have an emergency in one provision of the Higher Education Act; don't take it through committee. That is the way we usually do things.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is a member of this committee, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is a valued member of the committee. We have a pretty good reputation for working together, despite our differences, in fixing No Child Left Behind, 21st Century Cures, opioid legislation. Healthcare is a contentious issue, but by a vote of 20 to 3, we brought out a bill to lower healthcare costs.

Yet the suggestion is that we take this bill to the Senate floor without any consideration by the committee. That is not the way we usually do things.

Let me reemphasize that the U.S. Department of Education has told every one of the historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions that there is sufficient Federal funding between now and October 1 of next year. There is no reason to cut anybody's pay and no reason to stop planning. That is what the Federal Government has told those institutions. That is plenty of time for us to take a provision—such as the one I have proposed or such as the one that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has proposed—through our committee and recommend to the full Senate what we ought to do.

Let's not minimize what else there is to do. I mean, we literally have been working for 5 years on simplifying this FAFSA. There are 8 million minority students who fill it out every year. I think we should be concerned about the 300,000 students who attend historically Black colleges and universities. Many of them fill this out. I am told by the former Governor of Tennessee that filling out this complicated form is the single biggest impediment for low-income students having an opportunity to go to college because their families think it is too complicated.

Well, we know what to do about this. Senator BENNET, the Democratic Senator from Colorado, and I began working on this 5 years ago. Senator MURRAY, the Democratic Senator from Washington, and I recommended that the Senate pass legislation getting rid of 22 questions that were double reporting. You have to tell the IRS some facts, and you have to tell the Department of Education the same facts, and then they come in the middle of the semester and try to catch you having one answer here and another answer there. So at East Tennessee State University, 70 percent of the student body has their Pell grant verified, and some of them lose their Federal funding while they check to see if the information they had to give to two Federal agencies is different. We passed the Senate with that—Senator MURRAY and I did that last year.

So why should we wait on this? I don't think we should wait on permanent funding for historically Black colleges, but why hold this hostage to that?

I am ready to move ahead on permanent funding for historically Black col-

leges. I am ready to move ahead on simplifying the FAFSA for 8 million students who fill this out every year. I am ready to move ahead on short-term Pell grants. I have been working with the Senator from Washington on this and with other Members of the Senate. I think we are moving to a consensus. We have time to do this right. Let's take it through committee and send back to the House of Representatives a permanent solution.

I think it is very important that we make clear to all of the presidents and all of the students at historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions, No. 1, you have a year of funding ahead of you; No. 2, you have a proposal by the chairman of the Education Committee that will permanently fund what you are doing; and No. 3, our Democratic friends are asking that the Senate pass short-term funding that will create another funding cliff within a matter of months and that is funded by a budget gimmick that will never pass muster in the Senate. That is not going to happen.

So we need to work together as we normally do and come to a conclusion on the Higher Education Act, including permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority institutions. I am ready to keep doing that. But I am also ready to encourage the passage not only of the provisions that I have introduced and that I asked for permission to pass today, which the Senator objected to, but other provisions that might be included.

I think 5 years is long enough to work on the Higher Education Act. I am coming to the conclusion we have time to do it, and I look forward to saying to our six historically Black colleges in Tennessee that the result of our hard work and debate and discussion has been permanent funding, so you don't have to worry about Federal funding.

Mr. BURR. Mr. Chairman, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I am here as living proof that he is not the Lone Ranger on this. The committee has worked diligently. We may not be as passionate as he is, but the committee has worked diligently to get higher education done.

It is a farce to come in here and think that we are going to pass a 2-year House bill to fund historically Black colleges. Nobody has more historically Black colleges in their State than I do. What they want—they want predictability, permanent funding. The chairman is willing to do that, but part of the condition to do that is to sit down and, now, quit talking and pass higher education. Reduce the FAFSA application to one page. Let these students go out—and their parents—and be able to fill this out and not miss an education because they can't go through the laborious process.

What the chairman has laid on the table is reasonable. The committee has talked about it for years. Now it is time to act. It is not time to act on one little piece of it for temporary funding. It is time to provide permanent funding for that and to do the rest of higher education.

As proud as I am of our being the home of the majority of Black colleges and universities, I also have about 70 other colleges and universities in North Carolina, and they are the beneficiaries of everything else that is in this education bill.

Compromise is not about “Take what I have” and not give anything else. We have been trying to work, with the chairman and the ranking member working together, to find compromise for 5 years. Many times the chairman has come to me and said: I think we can do it this year. Well, we have to have willing partners on the other side of the aisle. Today is a live example of where it is either their way or no way.

I hope we can get back, and, before we leave this year, we can get this package passed. It is really simple: Just commit to do what we all have sat down and talked about for 5 years. If there are minor changes that need to be made, let's make them in the next day or two. But to say that we are going to wait until next year and be here a year from now when that timeframe has run out, let me assure you, if the chairman is not here to object to this request, I will be here to object to this request.

The time to talk is over. The time to act is now.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Just a couple of points on where we are: There is no question that, in my judgment, if you have more time to consider these issues for a full reauthorization, we could address some of the shortcomings that have been proposed already. I mentioned earlier issues that are not addressed, such as childcare, housing, food and mental health, the needs of first-generation students, needs of students of color, and students with disabilities. We can do that if we can get through this short-term period. We are asking for help only for a very limited timeframe so that we can work through these other issues.

The second point I would make is, I can't stand in the shoes of the leaders of these institutions, but when they tell us that they are in a difficult circumstance in the short run, I will take their word for it. The word of the Department of Education—just from my point of view—doesn't compare to what these institutions are telling us. So I think we should rely upon the representations by the leaders of the institutions and act in a short-term fashion, all the while committing ourselves to have a longer process to fully explore and try to reach consensus on a range of issues that come under the broad purview of reauthorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for coming to the floor today on an issue I know he cares about. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

We are accustomed to working together. We are accustomed to getting results, and I want to get a result on this.

I agree with both Senators in this sense: I think it is time to send a signal to historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions that they don't have to worry about funding for the future. For the next year, the Department of Education has told them: You have the money for the next year. It shouldn't take us a year to finish our work.

So I look forward to sitting down with the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Pennsylvania and working out their differences on the provisions that we have. We have the basis for a very good higher education bill—the permanent funding for historically Black colleges, the simplification of the FAFSA, which affects 20 million families every year. We have broad bipartisan consensus on simplifying how you pay back student loans. There are nine different ways now. We could reduce that to two. That affects 43 million families.

The short-term Pell grants make a big difference.

So we have a number of provisions, and I am working well, as I always do, with the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY. I would like to bring this to a conclusion as rapidly as we can. I think this debate has been useful to do that. I look forward to continuing it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, for this 259th climate speech, I am going to return to the theme of corruption. Before diving into the how, let's start with the why because the scale and the remorselessness of the scheme of corruption the fossil fuel industry has run is hard to comprehend without understanding why.

Here is the why. The fossil fuel industry reaps the biggest subsidy in the history of the planet. I will say that again. The fossil fuel industry reaps the biggest subsidy in the history of the planet. The IMF—International Monetary Fund—estimates that the global subsidy for fossil fuel is in the trillions of dollars every year. That is globally. In the United States alone, the fossil fuel industry got a \$650 billion—that is with a “b”—subsidy in 2015, according to the most recent report from the IMF. That is about \$2,000 out of the pocket of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Here is that IMF report. Look it up. Read it and weep.

Stop for a minute and understand this subsidy. Some of it is favorable

tax deals and other direct subsidies that pour public taxpayer money into the pockets of this polluting industry. In recent years, that has been estimated at around \$20 billion annually.

The vast bulk of this \$650 billion is something else. It is people getting hurt. It is the cost of people suffering economic harms. It is the cost of your home burned in a wildfire or swept away in a storm by rising seas. It is the cost of farms withered from unprecedented droughts or crops drowned in unprecedented flooding. It is the cost of fisheries that are lost or moved away as oceans warm and acidify. It is the lost day of work with your kid in the emergency room waiting out a climate-related asthma attack on the ER's nebulizer. It is the cost of tick-borne and mosquito-borne illnesses that didn't used to be where you live. It is the cost to dive tours of tourists seeing dead, white, bleached coral reefs instead of vibrant undersea gardens and the cost to snowmobile moose tours of going through mud instead of snow and when you see moose, seeing emaciated moose calves with thousands of ticks slowly killing them. It is the cost of American military deployments to conflicts caused by resource scarcity or climate migration. It is the cost of relocating Naval Station Norfolk when the community around it floods out. It is the cost of Glacier Park with no glacier. It is the cost of trout streams with no trout. It is the cost of millions of acres of healthy forests killed off by pine beetle infestation. It is the cost to Phoenix of staffing up emergency services when it is not safe to work outside because it is too hot and lost airline flights out of the airport when the tarmac melts. It is the myriad costs of basic operating systems of the natural world gone haywire because of climate change.

All this pain, all this loss, all this suffering has a bloodless economic name: externalities. Externalities are the social costs that are imposed on others by the use of a product. Pollution, of course, is the obvious example. In economic theory, those social costs should be baked into the price of a product. That is why courts and companies and countries around the world apply a social cost of carbon calculation.

But destroying the basic operating systems of the planet is a high-priced externality—by the IMF report, \$650 billion in 2015 just in the United States. And because it is hard to calculate a price for so much of this harm, that is a lowball estimate. For instance, we can estimate the loss to the dive shop of the coral reef off the coast dying, but is that really the full cost of the dead reef? There is a lot more. So the externality is probably well over \$650 billion.

By comparison, let's look at the five major oil companies' earnings. The five major oil companies earned somewhat more than \$80 billion in profits last year all around the world, all right?

Global profits are \$80 billion versus \$650 billion in destruction and harm they caused just in the United States. So make those oil companies follow the rules of market economics. Make them put the cost of the harm of their product into the price of their product—\$80 billion versus \$650 billion—and guess what: Their business is in a \$570-plus billion hole. That is why the fossil fuel industry is so corrupt. It knows it needs to break the laws of market economics in order to survive, and it knows it needs political help to do that.

Fortunately for the fossil fuel industry, up against that \$650 billion subsidy, politicians come cheap. They could put \$650 million into politics every single year, and it would earn them a 1,000-to-1 return on that expenditure protecting the \$650 billion subsidy.

So that is the why of fossil fuel corruption: It pays. It pays hugely. It is as simple as that. They are corrupt because it pays.

Now let's look at the how.

By the way, they have some expertise in this area. These companies operate in the most crooked countries in the world, so they know how to work crooked deals and politics. But what happened here in the United States? Well, I saw it happen. The big change came when five Republican Supreme Court Justices gave this industry and other mega industries big new political artillery. It came in the disgraceful Citizens United decision that let unlimited special interest money into our elections.

I will tell you, there is no special interest more unlimited than fossil fuel. Fossil fuel front groups were all over that Supreme Court case, by the way, signaling to the five Republicans on the Court what they wanted them to do, and sure enough, they did it.

Of course, it does take some fun out of spending unlimited money in politics if people can tell who you are. In theory, we were supposed to know. To get to the outcome the fossil fuel industry wanted, the five Republican Justices had to pretend, as a legal matter, that all this political spending—all this unlimited political spending they were authorizing—was going to be transparent, that we would know who was behind it.

Well, that transparency was not going to work very well for Exxon or Koch Industries or Marathon Petroleum, so they cooked up all sorts of schemes to hide behind. Tax-deductible 501(c)(4)s appeared that can hide their donors. Trade groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce got taken over and co-opted. Disposable shell corporations turned up behind political donations. An enterprise called Donors Trust was established, whose sole purpose is to launder the identity of big donors.

By the way—back to Citizens United—those five Republican Justices would have to be idiots not to see this

apparatus of phony front groups out there mocking their assurances of transparency—assurances that were at the heart of the Citizens United decision—but those Justices have studiously ignored this flagrantly obvious flaw and have made zero effort to clean up their unlimited-spending, dark-money mess. I was taught as a kid that you are supposed to clean up the messes you made. That is not a message that got through to the ‘Roberts Five.’

We have addressed this flotilla of propped-up, dark-money front groups in the Senate before. We call it the web of denial. Academics who study these groups have documented well over 100 of them in the last decade. That sounds like a lot—100 front groups—but remember, there is \$650 billion a year riding on this. And it is a really big help if you can pretend you are, say, Americans for Peace and Puppies and Prosperity instead of ExxonMobil or the Kochs or Marathon Petroleum. People tend to get the joke when the ad says: Brought to you by ExxonMobil.

So they have the motive and the means to spend millions of political dollars and to do so from hiding. How much do they spend? Well, that is hard to tell because the whole purpose is to hide. Responsible watchdogs won't even venture a guess as to how much dark money is sloshing through the political system, but total dark money spending on Federal elections has been at least \$700 million since the Citizens United decision, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. The lion's share of that dark money is probably from fossil fuels because, first, nobody else has the same corrupt motive on the scale of fossil fuel. Plus, when you look at the spending, it is usually groups who can be connected to fossil fuel. And for most, the activity is climate denial and obstruction, so it is fossil fuel work being done. So it is pretty easy to conclude who is likely behind all this.

For colleagues who weren't here before 2010, let me tell you, things were different then. In 2007, 2008, and 2009—those were my first 3 years here—there were lots of bipartisan climate bills kicking around the Senate, real ones that would have headed off the crisis into which we are rocketing right now. Heck, in 2008, the Republican nominee for President ran on a strong climate platform.

After the Citizens United decision in January of 2010, all of that was snuffed out. An oily curtain of denial fell around the Republican Party as the fossil fuel industry brought its new political weapons to bear. The before and after comparison is as plain as day, and it cost us a decade of inaction when time was of the essence. It has been a high cost except, of course, for the fossil fuel industry, whose lying and denying, whose front groups and dark money, whose political obstruction and threats still remain fully dedicated to protecting that \$650 billion subsidy.

Do the math just for a second. At \$650 billion a year, from January 2010 until now, Citizens United let the fossil fuel industry protect nearly \$6 trillion in subsidy—\$6 trillion in losses to our constituents, \$6 trillion that this industry dodged in the laws of market economics to foist on everyone else—and you wonder why they worked so hard to take over the courts.

The fossil fuels' denial operation and obstruction operation is likely the biggest and most corrupt scheme in human history. I can't think of one that is worse, and it is still operating today—right now—as I stand here and speak. Its oily tides pollute our public debate with deliberate falsehoods and nonsense, grease our press to steer away from this subject, slosh slimily through the hallways of this very building, and grip the Supreme Court in a web of oily, dark money influence. We have become like the people who have lived in the shadows for so long and have forgotten what sunlight, what free debate, what laws based on facts can look like.

The fossil fuel industry has polluted our American democracy on as massive a scale as it has polluted our atmosphere and oceans. For those in our history who gave up their lives—who died in the service of our democracy—who are looking down on us now, that pollution of the democracy they died defending must be a bitter spectacle.

As a boy, there was an ominous hymn that we often sang in chapel about how “once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide, in the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side.” “Truth,” the hymn went on, is “forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne,” but “though the cause of Evil prosper, yet 'tis Truth alone is strong.”

Now is our moment to decide: Do we finally bring down fossil fuels' false Babylon of corruption or, in the strife of truth with falsehood, do we keep protecting the evil side?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FREEDOM AROUND THE WORLD

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it really has been quite a year here in Washington for drawn-out policy battles. It is November, and we are still fighting over defense spending, trade, and the results of an election long since decided in 2016.

A quick flip through this morning's world news sections serves as my daily reminder that Americans really do have so much for which to be thankful. One might even feel inclined to say we are really lucky to live here in the United States. Yet I will tell you that luck really doesn't have a lot to do with it. Our freedom was bought with the blood of thousands who instigated a revolution in spite of being outspent, outmanned, and outgunned by the global superpower of their time, and thank goodness they had that fighting spirit. That same absolute belief in the

right to self-determination went on to fuel the abolitionists, the women's suffragists, and the civil rights warriors. Their fearlessness inspires freedom movements that we are seeing all across the globe today.

Just a few months ago, heads turned toward China as thousands of Hong Kong people poured into the streets and said no to Beijing's stranglehold, but just saying no wasn't enough. Now their neighborhoods and universities have morphed into war zones, and Chinese authorities have long since justified shooting live rounds of ammunition into the crowds.

Imagine the intensity of the fear it takes to push a government to fire on its own people when the entire world is watching. Beijing is worried, but Beijing will also not hesitate to use any force it deems necessary to tighten its grip on Hong Kong.

Now, here in the Senate, we are working on a few pieces of legislation to let the Chinese and the Hong Kong Governments know that the United States is watching. We have included a bill that will prevent U.S. companies from exporting crowd control supplies to the Hong Kong Police Force. It is important, though, for everyone to understand that the motivating factors behind political oppression have nothing to do with tear gas or with stun guns. There is only so much that legislation can do.

Governments in Iraq, Vietnam, Algeria, and Lebanon are also hard at work in doing whatever they can to prevent their citizens from stepping out of line, because they know what will happen if their citizens are free to criticize the state, and they are terrified of losing power.

This month, the entire world looks toward Central Europe to commemorate the fall of the Berlin Wall. When East Berliners first stepped into the western half of their city, they revealed to the rest of the world the horrors of living under a political regime that sustained itself by consuming the autonomy of its subjects. History serves as an enduring warning against the dangers of the all-powerful state.

As we watch mass protests play out a half a world away, many Americans still see social chaos not as a symptom of a disease but as a spontaneous expression of some nebulous desire to be free. They don't stop to recall what sparked the first feelings of unease long before the Molotov cocktails started flying through the air.

This is why, here in the United States, my colleagues in the majority have forced many conversations on the perils of degrading the foundations of our Republic. We have debated ad nauseam the Constitution's place in civil and legal discourse, asking: Does it provide a workable standard or is it just an outdated piece of paper now rendered illegitimate by the male whiteness of its drafters? I think the Presiding Officer knows my response.

We defend the Constitution and the system of government it created be-

cause we know, from studying history and from observing current events, that freedom does not suddenly expire. Freedom begins to wither the moment those in power convince themselves that a reprieve from uncomfortable policy debates over speech, self-defense, or the size of government will be worth the risk of shelving the standards that protect individual liberty.

The current blase tolerance and, in some cases, incomprehensible enthusiasm for socialism and other authoritarian philosophies is sending a strong message to the rest of the world that the standard for global freedom is up for debate. If we acquiesce to the argument that America's founding principles have passed their expiration date, we will have failed as a people and as a world leader. That failure will change the course of our history, and it will be used as a weapon to quash dissent elsewhere in the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2019

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, in a moment here, as my colleagues gather, we hope to pass the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

I first acknowledge all of the people who worked so hard on it—our staffs, obviously, and, in addition, Senators CARDIN, RISCH, MENENDEZ, and over 50 cosponsors, many of whom will join us here this evening. I also thank Leaders MCCONNELL and SCHUMER for their support in helping us get here. I thank Chairman CRAPO, who has helped us make some important changes at the end that will make the sanctions easier to implement.

A lot of people have been watching on the news the protests that have been going on in Hong Kong and are wondering as to, perhaps, the depths of what it is all about.

When the United Kingdom handed Hong Kong over to China, they signed an agreement that is known as the Joint Declaration. It basically guarantees a high degree of autonomy and freedom of the people of Hong Kong. As a result of that agreement, the United States has treated commerce and trade with Hong Kong differently than it has its commercial and trade activity with the mainland of China. What has happened over the last few years is the steady effort, on the part of Chinese authorities, to erode that autonomy and those freedoms.

The most recent protests really began with a proposal to pass an extradition law that would allow the Chinese Government to basically have arrested and extradite someone in Hong Kong over to the mainland. There was a huge pushback against that, and protests emerged as a result of it. Even though the Government of Hong Kong has pulled out from pursuing that law, the protests have continued because

the people of Hong Kong have seen what is coming. They see the steady effort to erode their autonomy and their freedoms.

The response by the Hong Kong authorities, with its having been under tremendous pressure from Beijing, has been that of violence and repression. So far, over 5,000 people have been arrested in Hong Kong. The youngest has been 12 years of age. The oldest has been 82. Hundreds more have been injured by violence committed by police authorities but also by street gangs—criminals, thugs—who have been empowered and encouraged by the Chinese authorities.

This effort by China to exert control and remove autonomy continues unabated. Here are some examples. There was a law that was passed that banned wearing masks, and a Hong Kong court ruled that the ban was unconstitutional. The so-called National People's Congress in Beijing today ruled that Hong Kong courts have no authority—no power—to review Hong Kong Government legislation. Under pressure from Beijing, the Government of Hong Kong threatened to cancel the November 24 elections—elections, by the way, that China has been interfering in. China has pushed to ban critics, like Joshua Wong, from running. Seven candidates who are running have been attacked by street gangs during this campaign, and two candidates have been arrested while campaigning.

And now for the latest move, China is pushing the Hong Kong Government to pass what they call the new national security law—a law that would allow them to arrest political critics and opponents. If this passes, if that happens, that is the very definition of control and de facto proof of all loss of autonomy.

By the way, China is also pushing for something very ominous. They call it patriotic education. What China is really pushing for in Hong Kong is moving from “one country, two systems” to “one country, one system”—the Chinese system.

So the bill that we will bring up here in a moment, with tremendous bipartisan support, requires five quick things that I will touch on.

First, its most important element is that it requires the Secretary of State to annually certify whether Hong Kong warrants being treated differently than China. If Hong Kong is no longer autonomous—and that is the rationale for different treatment—then, they should no longer receive that treatment.

It says that students in Hong Kong shouldn't be barred from entering the United States or getting a visa to study here, for example, because they have been the subject of a politically motivated arrest or detention.

It says that for the next 7 years, the Secretary of Commerce is going to report on whether export controls and sanction laws are being enforced by the Government of Hong Kong or whether

China is using Hong Kong as a back door to evade export controls and sanctions.

It says that if Hong Kong ultimately returns and passes that extradition bill that China wants, the President has to present a plan to protect Americans from this law.

Last but not least, it mandates that the President identify and sanction foreigners the President determines, based on credible information, who are responsible for extraditions, for arbitrary detention, for torture, or for forced confessions inside of Hong Kong or any other human rights violations in Hong Kong.

By the way, it would also allow blocking the assets of these persons if those assets are located here in the United States.

So, in a moment here, as we continue to gather, we are waiting the arrival of companion legislation.

I yield the floor because I know we have lot of important sponsors that are here who want to speak on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, first of all, this is an important step that we are taking here. This is a matter that we have been discussing for a long time. There has been a lot of action on it, and I want to thank Senator RUBIO and Senator CARDIN, who are the lead supporters of this bill and who have, on behalf of the committee, done yeoman's work getting it together and getting the bipartisan compromise to get the language here. Also, virtually all members of the committee have had fingerprints on this bill, and so in that regard, I think it is going to pass quite handily.

I want to thank the Banking staff, particularly my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAPO, who, of course, has the expertise—the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee—on these kinds of things on sanctions. They were very helpful in hammering out the language that we needed for the sanctions.

I want to thank the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee staff, who were helpful.

I want to thank the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, who work for us—both the minority staff, Senator MENENDEZ's staff, and my staff, the majority staff—for doing this and all of the people who worked on this. So thank you to all of you.

Since June, millions of people in Hong Kong have taken to the streets protesting the erosion of their rights and freedoms.

Hong Kong was supposed to maintain a high degree of autonomy after China regained sovereignty over the territory in 1997. This wasn't just a verbal understanding. This was in the treaty that China signed with Great Britain. However, since that time, China has gradually chipped away at Hong Kong's autonomy, and this is now becoming a real problem.

China now refers to its treaty with Great Britain as “a historical document,” and says it is no longer bound by its terms. This is just one of many examples that show that the Chinese Government has no respect for the rule of law.

After two decades of broken commitments, it is past time that we hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable. What it is doing in Hong Kong is just wrong.

That is why I am proud to join Senator RUBIO and Senator CARDIN and all the others who have had hands on this bill in bringing the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act to the Senate floor. This bill is the result of a strong, strong bipartisan consensus that we must act in support of the Hong Kong people.

Thank you all for helping. We will get to the unanimous consent here in a little bit.

I yield the floor to Senator CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me first thank Senator RUBIO for his leadership on this issue and Senator MENENDEZ and Senator RISCH for their leadership in our committee and so many others who have been involved, because tonight we have a chance to reaffirm our commitment for human rights and democracy.

That is exactly what our legislation does. It recognizes the fact that for 24 consecutive weeks, the people of Hong Kong have been asking for their basic democracy and freedom.

On Monday, it was reported—just yesterday—that police fired 1,458 rounds of tear gas, 1,391 rubber bullets, 325 beanbag rounds, and 265 sponge grenades—that is just yesterday—on peaceful protesters.

They are asking nothing more than to exercise the rights they were told would be protected to express their views and to be able to have democracy in Hong Kong, which is the way it was in the previous time.

Senator RUBIO and I introduced legislation, and the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator RISCH and Menendez, joined us, and we passed this bipartisan legislation on June 13. It reaffirms the principles set forth in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, which supports democratization, human rights, and the autonomy of Hong Kong.

Now, Senator RUBIO already talked about this, but this is a very important thing. We gave Hong Kong a special status in its relationship with the United States that China does not enjoy, and we gave them that special status upon their protecting democracy and human rights in Hong Kong. That was the commitment.

If they don't comply with that, this special status should no longer be available, and this legislation requires that we get information on a regular basis as to whether China is respecting

the rights that we put in our legislation in 1992, that they notify us on a regular timeframe. That is an important point, because if they don't, we shouldn't give them that protected status.

Secondly, it identifies persons who suppress basic freedoms, similar to the Magnitsky Act sanctions. Those that are taking away the human rights of the people of Hong Kong would be subject to the same type of visa restrictions to visit America and to use our banking system. That makes a great deal of sense, and we know that is pretty effective.

So it is time that we back up our words and our commitment to supporting Hong Kong's democratization, human rights, and autonomy with action. Let's make sure the people of Hong Kong know that the U.S. Congress and the American people stand in solidarity with them, as the Chinese authorities, as we speak, are repressing the legitimate rights of the people of Hong Kong. We can stand with the people of Hong Kong for democracy and human rights by our actions this evening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in support of the motion that shortly will be made by our colleague, the Senator from Florida. I want to congratulate Senator CARDIN and him for their leadership in this regard. I appreciate the chairman and myself having joined them and moving this expeditiously through the committee, and I am looking forward to its critical passage on the floor. Time is of the essence.

The people of Hong Kong are fighting for their lives. Six months ago, millions of Hong Kong citizens took to the streets to peacefully protest the erosion of their democracy and their rights. Now, half a year later, we find mounting anger and unrest, with the violence against students and protesters—most dramatically, in the crackdown on Hong Kong Polytechnic University—only getting worse.

People are being shot. Universities are being burned. The violence perpetrated by the authorities in Hong Kong and, by extension, Beijing are turning the city into a battlefield.

This is not the Hong Kong that any of us want to see. The special character of Hong Kong is one of the world's great success stories. The vibrancy of the people of Hong Kong, especially its young people and the rising generation of leaders standing up for democracy and self-governance, should inspire all of us.

We admire Hong Kong's success as a burgeoning economic powerhouse, and we admire the vibrant and autonomous civil society and civic life that has flourished under the “one country, two systems” principle.

Hong Kong is one of the remarkable success stories of the Indo-Pacific—one

of the most remarkable success stories of China and the Chinese people—and it is a success worth protecting.

I call on the police to act professionally and to treat its fellow citizens with respect and restraint. We call for Beijing and the Hong Kong authorities to address the noble and legitimate aspirations of the people of Hong Kong.

In these turbulent times, the Congress of the United States must lead with our values. We must stand on the side of freedom and human dignity, and we must send a clear and uncompromising statement that America stands with the people of Hong Kong in their quest to maintain their self-governance and autonomy, to safeguard their human rights, to exercise their democratic freedom, and to determine their own future.

The House of Representatives already passed their version of this bill, and the situation in Hong Kong grows more tenuous by the day. That is why the United States should and must act today.

I look forward to the passage of this bill without delay. Let us work to hold China accountable for the erosion of democracy in Hong Kong, and let us together send a message to the people of Hong Kong that their cries for democracy and freedom have been heard through both Chambers of the U.S. Congress, and that America stands with them in their call for justice and self-determination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act is really about promises—making promises and keeping promises. Unfortunately, the Chinese Communist Party has a long history of making promises but not keeping them.

You can ask a rice farmer from Stuttgart. You can ask a software programmer from Fayetteville, a factory worker from Fort Smith, or a Christian missionary from Searcy.

In this case, China promised in 1984 that it would uphold the “one country, two systems” approach to Hong Kong when it took over in 1997, a promise to preserve the freedoms that have made Hong Kong distinctive—the freedom to practice one’s religion as one sees fit, to speak one’s mind, and to participate in the political process.

But that is just another promise they are on the verge of breaking. Apparently, the “one country, two systems” approach can’t satisfy Beijing’s rapacious appetite. They look at and covet Hong Kong’s wealth, and they fear and loathe its freedom, which stands in shining contrast to the Orwellian oppression on the mainland. In fact, they fear that mainland Chinese might look across the bay and start to get ideas.

So the Chinese Communist Party has been breaking its promises to Hong Kong and to the world, waging a brutal campaign to absorb Hong Kong into its dystopian, high-tech dictatorship.

Hongkongers are bravely resisting in the face of this kind of escalating violence. In recent days, Hong Kong security forces have shot a protestor in the stomach. They have trapped hundreds of students in the university, using rubber bullets and tear gas on them. They have threatened them with mass arrest.

Beijing’s propagandists have been hinting that even harsher measures are on the way.

An article in the party-controlled China Daily argues that Beijing must accelerate Hong Kong’s integration with the mainland and then reeducate Hongkongers, just like they are doing on a mass scale to 1 million Uighurs in concentration camps in Xinjiang.

I said this in the summer when the protests started. Let me say it again. It would be a grave mistake of historic proportion—surpassing the massacre of Tiananmen Square—if Beijing were to impose martial law, occupy, or otherwise crackdown on Hong Kong.

But the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act is about more than China making and breaking promises. It is also about the United States finally enforcing China’s promises.

We have a shot to avert catastrophe, protect the people of Hong Kong, and to finally enforce Beijing promises or hold them accountable for breaking those promises.

Very soon, the Senate will pass this legislation on a unanimous, bipartisan basis to give you a sense of sentiment in the Congress. This legislation requires the Secretary of State to certify Hong Kong’s autonomy from the mainland each year. Otherwise, they will lose the special privileges that U.S. law currently grants to Hong Kong.

The bill will freeze the assets and travel of officials who are responsible for abducting Hongkongers, like journalists, booksellers who have been vanishing without a trace since 2017, and it will ensure that pro-democracy protesters cannot be denied visas to the United States despite their specious arrests. But if the Hong Kong Chinese Communist Party will simply pull back from the brink, if they will keep their promises, if they will respect their one-country, two-system approach, none of this will happen.

So Beijing has a promise. Keep its promises, or give Americans and the world one more reason to treat China like an outlaw regime.

Choose wisely, Mr. General Secretary Xi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues, Senators RUBIO, CARDIN, MENENDEZ, and Representative CHRIS SMITH for moving the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act in both Chambers, legislation I was proud to cosponsor. With the situation deteriorating by the hour in Hong Kong, the passage of legislation could not be more timely. I urge my colleagues in the House to take action

quickly without delay. This bill sends an important message of bipartisan support from the U.S. Congress for the democratic aspirations of the broad majority of the people of Hong Kong.

Some of you may realize that we, just a few months ago, celebrated the 30th anniversary of the bloody crackdown that ended the peaceful democracy movement in Tiananmen Square. Who among us can forget those riveting weeks during which there was real hope and possibility of China opening its political system—the Goddess of Democracy statue modeled after our own Statue of Liberty—and, sadly, the jarring image of the protestor that was standing to try to block the onslaught of a tank?

The crude propaganda and disinformation used by Communist hardliners to brainwash young military conscripts to turn on their own people was both heartbreaking and infuriating. Remembering those days, we must not sit by idly and quietly and allow Hong Kong’s freedoms to be similarly threatened.

I have been moved by the courageousness of the pro-democracy protesters in the face of increasingly excessive use of force by the Hong Kong police in one of the most vibrant cities in the world. What exactly are Hong Kong protesters fighting for—the freedoms we in America take for granted every day—the freedom of assembly, suffrage, speech, due process, and rule of law. Rather than sitting down with the protesters, Hong Kong authorities have increasingly used excessive force instead of engaging in constructive dialogue. Yet, ultimately, I believe the Hong Kong Government and the protesters are capable of finding a solution, and I hope they do.

Let me end by appealing to the leadership in China to show the courage to allow the continued prosperous democratic autonomy enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong. Hong Kong’s continued special status is the sign of strength and confidence, not weakness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the greatest threat the United States faces in the next century, the threat of Communist China.

I have been saying, for months, Communist China is not our friend. They are stealing our technology; refusing to open up their markets to foreign goods as required by the WTO; militarizing the South China Sea, even after promising President Obama they wouldn’t; holding over 1 million Uighurs in prison camps just for their religion; harvesting the organs of detainees against their will; and Communist China is intentionally pushing fentanyl into the United States, killing Americans every day.

Communist China continues to strip the people of Hong Kong of their basic rights. I was the first Senator to visit

Hong Kong since the protests started nearly 6 months ago. I had the opportunity to meet with the protestors—students, parents, and grandparents—who are fighting to regain the freedom they were once promised. I heard their stories, horrible and frightening stories of police brutality, threats against individuals and their families, and mysterious disappearances.

Six months in and no signs of Communist China loosening their grip—their efforts to crack down on the protests in Hong Kong reflect their commitment to denying basic human rights and snuffing out any opposition to their totalitarian goals. We cannot stay silent. General Secretary of the Communist Party Xi is trying to be the dominant world power. It is Hong Kong now, then it will be Taiwan.

Communist China believes that, in order for them to be stronger, other freedom-loving countries must be weaker. As Communist China becomes more and more aggressive, we must ask ourselves: Is this the next Tiananmen Square? We all remember that famous image. Times have changed, but one thing stays the same: Wherever totalitarian regimes exist, there will be brave freedom fighters who will stand up against injustice and stand for human rights. That is what we are seeing in Hong Kong today.

Beijing soldiers have been appearing on the city streets, raising questions about the army's future role. Will Communist China once again use its military might to quash peaceful protests? Will they once again stand against those fighting for human rights and democracy? Will the United States stand by and allow this to happen?

We are seeing Americans like Michael Bloomberg putting profits above human rights and propping up the Chinese Government by continuing to host huge events in Communist China. It is time for the world to stand and present a unified front against Communist China's aggression, and that starts with supporting the brave people of Hong Kong.

We must do everything we can to communicate our commitment to democracy, freedom, and human rights. I am proud to stand in support of the Hong Kong Freedom and Democracy Act, which will give the United States more authority to reevaluate Beijing's influence on Hong Kong. This bill makes it clear that General Secretary of the Communist Party Xi needs to comply with what China agreed to in 1997. Communist China must give Hong Kong its autonomy, or the United States will continue to ramp up pressure on Communist China.

We cannot underestimate this threat. We must be vigilant. We must be aggressive. America's role of fighting for freedom and liberty worldwide depends on it. The future of our children and grandchildren depends on it.

To the brave and resilient people of Hong Kong, the United States is with you. Your fight will not be in vain, and it does not go unnoticed.

And to Communist China and General Secretary of the Communist Party Xi, consider your next moves carefully. The world is watching.

I won't stop fighting until America's economic and political future—and the freedom of nations across the globe—is secure from the threat of China's influence.

I want to thank Senator RUBIO and Senator CARDIN and all Senators of the U.S. for their support of this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, just two brief points this evening—the first is that I am proud to join not only as a supporter of this measure but as original cosponsor, and I want to thank the other Senators—Senator RUBIO, especially Senator CARDIN, and Senator RISCH—for their leadership on this issue, but I want to be clear that we are here today in this Chamber, and what we are doing is possible tonight because of the bravery and the courage of the protesters in Hong Kong.

Many of them are very young people who are risking their very lives, taking to the streets, standing for democracy, standing for the promises that were made to them by Beijing many years ago and fighting for them now, putting everything on the line. And I just want to say to those protesters that you are making a difference, that your lives have made a difference, and to those who even now are trapped inside PolyU in this siege that the Hong Kong police force has created—this humanitarian crisis that the Hong Kong police force has fostered—what you are doing is inspiring the world. What you are doing has moved this body. What you are doing is changing the world. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for your bravery. Thank you for believing in your city, and thank you for believing in Hong Kong.

The other thing I would say is that, while today is a good day in the struggle to preserve the freedoms of this city and the struggle against a totalitarian regime in Beijing, it is not the last day. Although this step is an important step that this Chamber takes, it is not the last step that this Nation may need to take in order to hold China to its commitments made in 1984, in order to protect the autonomy and the liberty of the city of Hong Kong because, make no mistake, we are in for a long struggle with Communist China. We are in for a long struggle with Beijing. We know what their ambitions are: to dominate Hong Kong, to dominate Taiwan, to dominate the region and, ultimately, to impose their will on the entire international system. We are going to have to stand against that for freedom, for liberty, for our security and our prosperity.

So there is much to do. There is a long road ahead of us, but today is a good day, and I hope the people of Hong Kong will see that the people of the

free world are awake, that they are with you, and we are ready to stand together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I want to thank Senator RUBIO for the work that he has done on this a few minutes earlier. Today, I spoke about the cause of freedom and how we are seeing people around the world stand up for freedom—and, yes, indeed, we see this in Hong Kong, and it does inspire us. The message that we are sending to Beijing is that, indeed, we are watching and we are paying attention—and to the Hong Kong protesters, for them to know that we are watching what they are doing and that we are standing with them.

It is important to note that China has really earned its place atop the list of the world's most notorious human rights violators, and over the past few weeks, Hong Kong's descent into chaos and bloodshed has provided a much-needed reminder of the horrors, the absolute horrors of authoritarian rule.

There can be no change without accountability, and Beijing needs to know we are focused on that accountability, which is why, today, I am so pleased to stand with these other Members of this Chamber in support of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. The bill does demand accountability, not only from Beijing but also from us. It will require us to monitor Hong Kong's progress toward autonomy and China's behavior toward Hong Kong people who choose to exercise their internationally recognized rights, those rights that we have spoken of in this Chamber today.

The bill will help us identify the tactics Beijing uses to capture Hong Kong's dissidents and then to trap them on mainland China, and we will also ensure that no peaceful protesters are denied visas to the United States because of the alleged crimes.

Now, I will tell you, the bill is a great start, but the time and the work that we put in it will be wasted unless every single Member of this Chamber makes a commitment to hold us accountable, to hold China accountable. I would encourage my colleagues to view their support of this legislation as a promise to these protesters in Hong Kong, that their cries for help are not going to go unanswered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, today, brave men and women, boys and girls, are standing up and demanding that the Chinese Communist Party protect Hong Kong's autonomy, protect free speech, and defend human rights.

Despite these peaceful protests, the Chinese Communist Party is fighting back with brutality and violence. The police brutality that we have seen and the Chinese Communist Party's larger assault on the people of Hong Kong has

been shameful. Just this past weekend, the Hong Kong police began attacking young, innocent students who were peacefully protesting that brutality. They were attacked with tear gas and rubber bullets.

These students' college campus was turned into a warzone, where no one was safe. Today, we have the opportunity to tell the world, these blatant human rights attacks and this campaign to bully Hong Kong into submission are not OK and America won't stand for it.

Last month, I traveled to Hong Kong. I met with many brave men and women who were standing up. I met with the dissidents, the pro-democracy protesters who are speaking out for Hong Kong's autonomy and free speech and basic human rights. Along with them, I dressed in all black to express my solidarity with the peaceful protesters who have taken to the streets.

Right now, in response to that protest, tear gas, sponge grenades, rubber bullets are being fired at university campuses in Hong Kong. In Xinjiang Province, millions of detained Uighurs and other religious minorities are languishing in concentration camps, and across China, Falun Gong practitioners are captured and murdered so that the Communist Party can harvest their organs.

Freedom from this brutality and the tyranny of the Chinese Communist Party is the battle cry of the dissidents in Hong Kong. What have they been waving? American flags. What have they been singing? The American National Anthem—reciting quotations from our Founding Fathers who risked everything for freedom in America.

Madam President, I want to thank Senators RUBIO, CARDIN, RISCH, MENENDEZ, and all the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both Republicans and Democrats who have joined together. This legislation the Senate is preparing to pass, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, is important legislation. It is bipartisan legislation. I urge the House to take it up and pass it and pass it promptly.

The people in Hong Kong are engaged in an existential battle for liberty, and they should know and they will know, by our actions in just a few moments, that the people of America stand with Hong Kong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 238, S. 1838.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1838) to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Statement of policy.

Sec. 4. Amendments to the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992.

Sec. 5. Annual report on violations of United States export control laws and United Nations sanctions occurring in Hong Kong.

Sec. 6. Protecting United States citizens and others from rendition to the People's Republic of China.

Sec. 7. Sanctions relating to undermining fundamental freedoms and autonomy in Hong Kong.

Sec. 8. Sanctions reports.

Sec. 9. Sense of Congress on People's Republic of China state-controlled media.

Sec. 10. Sense of Congress on commercial exports of crowd control equipment to Hong Kong.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.*—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) *SOCIAL CREDIT SYSTEM.*—The term “social credit system” means a system proposed by the Government of the People's Republic of China and scheduled for implementation by 2020, which would—

(A) use existing financial credit systems, public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business; and

(B) use such data to monitor, shape, and rate certain financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

(3) *UNITED STATES PERSON.*—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a lawfully admitted permanent resident of the United States; or

(C) an entity organized under the laws of—

(i) the United States; or

(ii) any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the principles and objectives set forth in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383), namely that—

(A) the United States has “a strong interest in the continued vitality, prosperity, and stability of Hong Kong”;

(B) “[s]upport for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy” and therefore “naturally applies to United States policy toward Hong Kong”;

(C) “the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong [and] serve as a basis for Hong Kong's continued economic prosperity”; and

(D) Hong Kong must remain sufficiently autonomous from the People's Republic of China to “justify treatment under a particular law of the United States, or any provision thereof, different from that accorded the People's Republic of China”;

(2) to support the high degree of autonomy and fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong, as enumerated by—

(A) the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing December 19, 1984 (referred to in this Act as the “Joint Declaration”);

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

(C) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948;

(3) to support the democratic aspirations of the people of Hong Kong, including the “ultimate aim” of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, as articulated in the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (referred to in this Act as the “Basic Law”);

(4) to urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to uphold its commitments to Hong Kong, including allowing the people of Hong Kong to govern Hong Kong with a high degree of autonomy and without undue interference, and ensuring that Hong Kong voters freely enjoy the right to elect the Chief Executive and all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

(5) to support the establishment of a genuine democratic option to freely and fairly nominate and elect the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, and the establishment by 2020 of open and direct democratic elections for all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council;

(6) to support the robust exercise by residents of Hong Kong of the rights to free speech, the press, and other fundamental freedoms, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(7) to support freedom from arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention, or imprisonment for all Hong Kong residents, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(8) to draw international attention to any violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China of the fundamental rights of the people of Hong Kong, as provided by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and any encroachment upon the autonomy guaranteed to Hong Kong by the Basic Law and the Joint Declaration;

(9) to protect United States citizens and long-term permanent residents living in Hong Kong, as well as people visiting and transiting through Hong Kong;

(10) to maintain the economic and cultural ties that provide significant benefits to both the United States and Hong Kong; and

(11) to coordinate with allies, including the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, to promote democracy and human rights in Hong Kong.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES-HONG KONG POLICY ACT OF 1992.

(a) *REPORT.*—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(b), by striking “such date” each place such term appears and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 205. SECRETARY OF STATE REPORT REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF HONG KONG.

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, on at least an annual basis, and in conjunction with the report required under section 301, shall issue a certification to Congress that—

“(A) indicates whether Hong Kong continues to warrant treatment under United States law in the same manner as United States laws were applied to Hong Kong before July 1, 1997;

“(B) addresses—

“(i) commercial agreements;

“(ii) law enforcement cooperation, including extradition requests;

“(iii) sanctions enforcement;

“(iv) export controls, and any other agreements and forms of exchange involving dual use, critical, or other sensitive technologies;

“(v) any formal treaties or agreements between the United States and Hong Kong;

“(vi) other areas of bilateral cooperation that the Secretary determines to be relevant; and

“(vii) decision-making within the Government of Hong Kong, including executive, legislative, and judicial structures, including—

“(I) freedom of assembly;

“(II) freedom of speech;

“(III) freedom of expression; and

“(IV) freedom of the press, including the Internet and social media;

“(viii) universal suffrage, including the ultimate aim of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

“(ix) judicial independence;

“(x) police and security functions;

“(xi) education;

“(xii) laws or regulations regarding treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, or theft of state secrets;

“(xiii) laws or regulations regarding foreign political organizations or bodies;

“(xiv) laws or regulations regarding political organizations; and

“(xv) other rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

“(C) includes—

“(i) an assessment of the degree of any erosions to Hong Kong’s autonomy in each category listed in subparagraph (B) resulting from actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China that are inconsistent with its commitments under the Basic Law or the Joint Declaration;

“(ii) an evaluation of the specific impacts to any areas of cooperation between the United States and Hong Kong resulting from erosions of autonomy in Hong Kong or failures of the Government of Hong Kong to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements within the categories listed in subparagraph (B); and

“(iii) a list of any specific actions taken by the United States Government in response to any erosion of autonomy or failures to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements identified in this certification and the report required under section 301.

“(2) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making each certification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The certification under section (1) shall be issued annually, but the Secretary may issue additional cer-

tifications at any time if the Secretary determines it is warranted by circumstances in Hong Kong.

“(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, the Secretary notifies the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the intent to waive such subsection;

“(2) PARTIAL WAIVER.—Except for the list of actions described in subsection (a)(1)(C)(iii), the Secretary of State may waive relevant parts of the application of subsection (a) if the President issues an Executive order under section 202 that suspends the application of any particular United States law to Hong Kong.”.

(b) VISA APPLICANTS.—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 206. TREATMENT OF HONG KONG APPLICANTS FOR VISAS TO STUDY OR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) VISA ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN HONG KONG STUDENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, applications for visas to enter, study, or work in the United States, which are submitted by otherwise qualified applicants who resided in Hong Kong in 2014 and later, may not be denied primarily on the basis of the applicant’s subjection to politically-motivated arrest, detention, or other adverse government action.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that consular officers are aware of the policy described in subsection (a) and receive appropriate training and support to ensure that the policy is carried out so that affected individuals do not face discrimination or unnecessary delay in the processing of their visa applications, including—

“(1) providing specialized training for all consular officers posted to the United States Embassy in Beijing or to any United States consulate in the People’s Republic of China, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, or the Macau Special Administrative Region;

“(2) instructing the United States Consulate in Hong Kong to maintain an active list of individuals who are known to have been formally charged, detained, or convicted by the Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region or by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, or intermediaries of such governments, based on politically-motivated considerations related to their exercise of rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, to facilitate the cross-checking of visa applications for Hong Kong residents; and

“(3) updating any relevant United States Government websites with information on the policy described in subsection (a).

“(c) COOPERATION WITH LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State shall contact appropriate representatives of other democratic countries, particularly those who receive a large number of applicants for student and employment visas from Hong Kong—

“(1) to inform them of the United States policy regarding arrests for participation in nonviolent protests in Hong Kong; and

“(2) to encourage them to take similar steps to ensure the rights of nonviolent protesters are protected from discrimination due to the actions of the Government of Hong Kong and of the Government of the People’s Republic of China.”.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF UNITED STATES EXPORT CONTROL LAWS AND UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS OCCURRING IN HONG KONG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the committees specified in subsection (b) that includes—

(1) an assessment of the nature and extent of violations of United States export control and sanctions laws occurring in Hong Kong;

(2) to the extent possible, the identification of—

(A) any items that were reexported from Hong Kong in violation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) the countries and persons to which the items referred to in subparagraph (A) were reexported; and

(C) how such items were used;

(3) an assessment of whether sensitive dual-use items subject to the export control laws of the United States are being—

(A) transshipped through Hong Kong; and

(B) used to develop—

(i) the Sharp Eyes, Skynet, Integrated Joint Operations Platform, or other systems of mass surveillance and predictive policing; or

(ii) the “social credit system” of the People’s Republic of China;

(4) an assessment of the efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to use the status of Hong Kong as a separate customs territory to import items into the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong in violation of the export control laws of the United States, whether as part of the Greater Bay Area plan, through the assignment by Beijing of Hong Kong as a national technology and innovation center, or through other programs that may exploit Hong Kong as a conduit for controlled sensitive technology;

(5) an assessment of whether the Government of Hong Kong has adequately enforced sanctions imposed by the United Nations;

(6) a description of the types of goods and services transshipped or reexported through Hong Kong in violation of such sanctions to—

(A) North Korea or Iran; or

(B) other countries, regimes, or persons subject to such sanctions for engaging in activities—

(i) relating to international terrorism, international narcotics trafficking, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; or

(ii) that otherwise present a threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States; and

(7) an assessment of whether shortcomings in the enforcement of export controls or sanctions by the Government of Hong Kong necessitates the assignment of additional Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, or Department of State personnel to the United States Consulate in Hong Kong.

(b) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(5) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 6. PROTECTING UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND OTHERS FROM RENDITION TO THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) POLICY STATEMENTS.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to safeguard United States citizens from extradition, rendition, or abduction to the People's Republic of China from Hong Kong for trial, detention, or any other purpose;

(2) to safeguard United States businesses in Hong Kong from economic coercion and intellectual property theft;

(3) pursuant to section 103(7) of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5713(7)), to encourage United States businesses "to continue to operate in Hong Kong, in accordance with applicable United States and Hong Kong law"; and

(4) pursuant to section 201(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 5721(b)), to evaluate, not less frequently than annually and as circumstances dictate whether the Government of Hong Kong is "legally competent to carry out its obligations" under treaties and international agreements established between the United States and Hong Kong.

(b) **RESPONSE TO THREAT OF RENDITION.**—Not later than 30 days after the President determines that legislation proposed or enacted by the Government of Hong Kong would put United States citizens at risk of extradition or rendition to the People's Republic of China or to other countries that lack protections for the rights of defendants, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) contains a strategy for protecting United States citizens and businesses in Hong Kong;

(2) assesses the potential risks of the legislation to United States citizens residing in, traveling to, or transiting through Hong Kong; and

(3) determines whether—

(A) additional resources are needed for American Citizen Services at the United States Consulate in Hong Kong; and

(B) the Government of Hong Kong is "legally competent" to administer the United States-Hong Kong Agreement for the Surrender of Fugitive Offenders, done at Hong Kong December 20, 1996, or other relevant law enforcement agreements between the United States and Hong Kong.

SEC. 7. SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, in accordance with paragraph (2), that identifies each foreign person that the President determines, based on credible information, is responsible for—

(A) the extrajudicial rendition, arbitrary detention, torture, or forced confession of any person in Hong Kong; or

(B) other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Hong Kong.

(2) **TIMING OF REPORTS.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) the report required under paragraph (1)—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) not less frequently than annually thereafter in conjunction with the publication of the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731); and

(B) an update to the report not later than 15 days after any new action is taken under subsection (b) based on the discovery of new credible information described in paragraph (1).

(3) **CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President shall consider—

(A) information provided jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of each of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) credible information obtained by other countries or reputable nongovernmental organizations that monitor violations of human rights abuses.

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

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) **IMMEDIATE EFFECT.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(C) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.**—Sanctions under this paragraph shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(3) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(2) **GOOD DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term "good" means any article, natural or man-made substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) credible information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms "admission", "admitted", and "alien" have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term "foreign person" means a person that is not a United States person.

SEC. 8. SANCTIONS REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 7, the President shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a report that includes—

(1) a list of each foreign person with respect to which the President imposed sanctions during the year preceding the submission of the report;

(2) a description of the type of sanctions imposed with respect to each such person;

(3) the number of foreign persons with respect to which the President terminated sanctions under section 7 during that year;

(4) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed or terminated, as applicable;

(5) the reasons for imposing or terminating such sanctions; and

(6) a description of the efforts of the President to encourage the governments of other countries to impose sanctions that are similar to the sanctions authorized under section 7.

(b) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The unclassified portion of the report required under subsection (a) shall be made available to the public, including through publication in the Federal Register.

(c) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO VISA RECORDS.**—The President shall publish the report required under subsection (a) without regard to the requirements of section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)) with respect to confidentiality of records pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA STATE-CONTROLLED MEDIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States condemns the deliberate targeting and harassment of democracy activists, diplomatic personnel of the United States and other nations, and their families by media organizations controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including Wen Wei Po and Ta Kung Po;

(2) the Secretary of State should clearly inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the use of media outlets to spread disinformation or to intimidate and threaten its perceived enemies in Hong Kong or in other countries is unacceptable; and

(3) the Secretary of State should take any activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) into consideration when granting visas for travel and work in the United States to journalists from the People's Republic of China who are affiliated with any such media organizations.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF CROWD CONTROL EQUIPMENT TO HONG KONG.

It is sense of Congress that the Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should consider appropriate adjustments to the current United States export controls with respect to Hong Kong to prevent the supply of crowd control and surveillance equipment that could be used inappropriately in Hong Kong.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Rubio substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill as amended be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1246) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 1838), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1838

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Statement of policy.
- Sec. 4. Amendments to the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992.
- Sec. 5. Annual report on violations of United States export control laws and United Nations sanctions occurring in Hong Kong.
- Sec. 6. Protecting United States citizens and others from rendition to the People's Republic of China.
- Sec. 7. Sanctions relating to undermining fundamental freedoms and autonomy in Hong Kong.
- Sec. 8. Sanctions reports.
- Sec. 9. Sense of Congress on People's Republic of China state-controlled media.
- Sec. 10. Sense of Congress on commercial exports of crowd control equipment to Hong Kong.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SOCIAL CREDIT SYSTEM.**—The term "social credit system" means a system proposed by the Government of the People's Republic of China and scheduled for implementation by 2020, which would—

(A) use existing financial credit systems, public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business; and

(B) use such data to monitor, shape, and rate certain financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

(3) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a lawfully admitted permanent resident of the United States; or

(C) an entity organized under the laws of—

(i) the United States; or

(ii) any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the principles and objectives set forth in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383), namely that—

(A) the United States has "a strong interest in the continued vitality, prosperity, and stability of Hong Kong";

(B) "[s]upport for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy" and therefore "naturally applies to United States policy toward Hong Kong";

(C) "the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong [and] serve as a basis for Hong Kong's continued economic prosperity"; and

(D) Hong Kong must remain sufficiently autonomous from the People's Republic of China to "justify treatment under a particular law of the United States, or any provision thereof, different from that accorded the People's Republic of China";

(2) to support the high degree of autonomy and fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong, as enumerated by—

(A) the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing December 19, 1984 (referred to in this Act as the "Joint Declaration");

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

(C) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948;

(3) to support the democratic aspirations of the people of Hong Kong, including the "ultimate aim" of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, as articulated in the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (referred to in this Act as the "Basic Law");

(4) to urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to uphold its commitments to Hong Kong, including allowing the people of Hong Kong to govern Hong Kong with a high degree of autonomy and without undue interference, and ensuring that Hong Kong voters freely enjoy the right to elect the Chief Executive and all members of the

Hong Kong Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

(5) to support the establishment of a genuine democratic option to freely and fairly nominate and elect the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, and the establishment by 2020 of open and direct democratic elections for all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council;

(6) to support the robust exercise by residents of Hong Kong of the rights to free speech, the press, and other fundamental freedoms, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(7) to support freedom from arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention, or imprisonment for all Hong Kong residents, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(8) to draw international attention to any violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China of the fundamental rights of the people of Hong Kong, as provided by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and any encroachment upon the autonomy guaranteed to Hong Kong by the Basic Law and the Joint Declaration;

(9) to protect United States citizens and long-term permanent residents living in Hong Kong, as well as people visiting and transiting through Hong Kong;

(10) to maintain the economic and cultural ties that provide significant benefits to both the United States and Hong Kong; and

(11) to coordinate with allies, including the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, to promote democracy and human rights in Hong Kong.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES-HONG KONG POLICY ACT OF 1992.

(a) **REPORT.**—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(b), by striking "such date" each place such term appears and inserting "the date of the enactment of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019"; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 205. SECRETARY OF STATE REPORT REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF HONG KONG.

"(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, on at least an annual basis, and in conjunction with the report required under section 301, shall issue a certification to Congress that—

"(A) indicates whether Hong Kong continues to warrant treatment under United States law in the same manner as United States laws were applied to Hong Kong before July 1, 1997;

"(B) addresses—

"(i) commercial agreements;

"(ii) law enforcement cooperation, including extradition requests;

"(iii) sanctions enforcement;

"(iv) export controls, and any other agreements and forms of exchange involving dual use, critical, or other sensitive technologies;

"(v) any formal treaties or agreements between the United States and Hong Kong;

"(vi) other areas of bilateral cooperation that the Secretary determines to be relevant; and

"(vii) decision-making within the Government of Hong Kong, including executive, legislative, and judicial structures, including—

"(I) freedom of assembly;

"(II) freedom of speech;

"(III) freedom of expression; and

"(IV) freedom of the press, including the Internet and social media;

“(viii) universal suffrage, including the ultimate aim of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

“(ix) judicial independence;

“(x) police and security functions;

“(xi) education;

“(xii) laws or regulations regarding treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, or theft of state secrets;

“(xiii) laws or regulations regarding foreign political organizations or bodies;

“(xiv) laws or regulations regarding political organizations; and

“(xv) other rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

“(C) includes—

“(i) an assessment of the degree of any erosions to Hong Kong’s autonomy in each category listed in subparagraph (B) resulting from actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China that are inconsistent with its commitments under the Basic Law or the Joint Declaration;

“(ii) an evaluation of the specific impacts to any areas of cooperation between the United States and Hong Kong resulting from erosions of autonomy in Hong Kong or failures of the Government of Hong Kong to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements within the categories listed in subparagraph (B); and

“(iii) a list of any specific actions taken by the United States Government in response to any erosion of autonomy or failures to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements identified in this certification and the report required under section 301.

“(2) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making each certification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The certification under section (1) shall be issued annually, but the Secretary may issue additional certifications at any time if the Secretary determines it is warranted by circumstances in Hong Kong.

“(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, the Secretary notifies the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the intent to waive such subsection;

“(2) PARTIAL WAIVER.—Except for the list of actions described in subsection (a)(1)(C)(iii), the Secretary of State may waive relevant parts of the application of subsection (a) if the President issues an Executive order under section 202 that suspends the application of any particular United States law to Hong Kong.”

(b) VISA APPLICANTS.—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 206. TREATMENT OF HONG KONG APPLICANTS FOR VISAS TO STUDY OR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) VISA ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN HONG KONG STUDENTS.—Notwithstanding any other

provision of law, applications for visas to enter, study, or work in the United States, which are submitted by otherwise qualified applicants who resided in Hong Kong in 2014 and later, may not be denied primarily on the basis of the applicant’s subjection to politically-motivated arrest, detention, or other adverse government action.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that consular officers are aware of the policy described in subsection (a) and receive appropriate training and support to ensure that the policy is carried out so that affected individuals do not face discrimination or unnecessary delay in the processing of their visa applications, including—

“(1) providing specialized training for all consular officers posted to the United States Embassy in Beijing or to any United States consulate in the People’s Republic of China, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, or the Macau Special Administrative Region;

“(2) instructing the United States Consulate in Hong Kong to maintain an active list of individuals who are known to have been formally charged, detained, or convicted by the Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region or by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, or intermediaries of such governments, based on politically-motivated considerations related to their exercise of rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, to facilitate the cross-checking of visa applications for Hong Kong residents; and

“(3) updating any relevant United States Government websites with information on the policy described in subsection (a).

“(c) COOPERATION WITH LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State shall contact appropriate representatives of other democratic countries, particularly those who receive a large number of applicants for student and employment visas from Hong Kong—

“(1) to inform them of the United States policy regarding arrests for participation in nonviolent protests in Hong Kong; and

“(2) to encourage them to take similar steps to ensure the rights of nonviolent protesters are protected from discrimination due to the actions of the Government of Hong Kong and of the Government of the People’s Republic of China.”

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF UNITED STATES EXPORT CONTROL LAWS AND UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS OCCURRING IN HONG KONG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the committees specified in subsection (b) that includes—

(1) an assessment of the nature and extent of violations of United States export control and sanctions laws occurring in Hong Kong;

(2) to the extent possible, the identification of—

(A) any items that were reexported from Hong Kong in violation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) the countries and persons to which the items referred to in subparagraph (A) were reexported; and

(C) how such items were used;

(3) an assessment of whether sensitive dual-use items subject to the export control laws of the United States are being—

(A) transshipped through Hong Kong; and

(B) used to develop—

(i) the Sharp Eyes, Skynet, Integrated Joint Operations Platform, or other systems of mass surveillance and predictive policing; or

(ii) the “social credit system” of the People’s Republic of China;

(4) an assessment of the efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to use the status of Hong Kong as a separate customs territory to import items into the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong in violation of the export control laws of the United States, whether as part of the Greater Bay Area plan, through the assignment by Beijing of Hong Kong as a national technology and innovation center, or through other programs that may exploit Hong Kong as a conduit for controlled sensitive technology;

(5) an assessment of whether the Government of Hong Kong has adequately enforced sanctions imposed by the United Nations;

(6) a description of the types of goods and services transshipped or reexported through Hong Kong in violation of such sanctions to—

(A) North Korea or Iran; or

(B) other countries, regimes, or persons subject to such sanctions for engaging in activities—

(i) relating to international terrorism, international narcotics trafficking, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; or

(ii) that otherwise present a threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States; and

(7) an assessment of whether shortcomings in the enforcement of export controls or sanctions by the Government of Hong Kong necessitates the assignment of additional Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, or Department of State personnel to the United States Consulate in Hong Kong.

(b) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(5) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 6. PROTECTING UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND OTHERS FROM RENDITION TO THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) POLICY STATEMENTS.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to safeguard United States citizens from extradition, rendition, or abduction to the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong for trial, detention, or any other purpose;

(2) to safeguard United States businesses in Hong Kong from economic coercion and intellectual property theft;

(3) pursuant to section 103(7) of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5713(7)), to encourage United States businesses “to continue to operate in Hong Kong, in accordance with applicable United States and Hong Kong law”; and

(4) pursuant to section 201(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 5721(b)), to evaluate, not less frequently than annually and as circumstances dictate whether the Government of Hong Kong is “legally competent to carry out its

obligations" under treaties and international agreements established between the United States and Hong Kong.

(b) **RESPONSE TO THREAT OF RENDITION.**—Not later than 30 days after the President determines that legislation proposed or enacted by the Government of Hong Kong would put United States citizens at risk of extradition or rendition to the People's Republic of China or to other countries that lack protections for the rights of defendants, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) contains a strategy for protecting United States citizens and businesses in Hong Kong;

(2) assesses the potential risks of the legislation to United States citizens residing in, traveling to, or transiting through Hong Kong; and

(3) determines whether—

(A) additional resources are needed for American Citizen Services at the United States Consulate in Hong Kong; and

(B) the Government of Hong Kong is "legally competent" to administer the United States-Hong Kong Agreement for the Surrender of Fugitive Offenders, done at Hong Kong December 20, 1996, or other relevant law enforcement agreements between the United States and Hong Kong.

SEC. 7. SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, in accordance with paragraph (2), that identifies each foreign person that the President determines is responsible for—

(A) the extrajudicial rendition, arbitrary detention, or torture of any person in Hong Kong; or

(B) other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Hong Kong.

(2) **TIMING OF REPORTS.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) the report required under paragraph (1)—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) not less frequently than annually thereafter in conjunction with the publication of the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731); and

(B) an update to the report not later than 15 days after any new action is taken under subsection (b) based on the discovery of new information described in paragraph (1).

(3) **CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President shall consider—

(A) information provided jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of each of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) information obtained by other countries or reputable nongovernmental organizations that monitor violations of human rights abuses.

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

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emer-

gency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) **IMMEDIATE EFFECT.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) **GOOD DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term "good" means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or

manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) **SUNSET.**—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms "admission", "admitted", and "alien" have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term "foreign person" means a person that is not a United States person.

SEC. 8. SANCTIONS REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 7, the President shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a report that includes—

(1) a list of each foreign person with respect to which the President imposed sanctions during the year preceding the submission of the report;

(2) a description of the type of sanctions imposed with respect to each such person;

(3) the number of foreign persons with respect to which the President terminated sanctions under section 7 during that year;

(4) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed or terminated, as applicable;

(5) the reasons for imposing or terminating such sanctions; and

(6) a description of the efforts of the President to encourage the governments of other countries to impose sanctions that are similar to the sanctions authorized under section 7.

(b) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO VISA RECORDS.**—The President shall publish the report required under subsection (a) without regard to the requirements of section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)) with respect to confidentiality of records pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA STATE-CONTROLLED MEDIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States condemns the deliberate targeting and harassment of democracy activists, diplomatic personnel of the United States and other nations, and their families by media organizations controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including Wen Wei Po and Ta Kung Po;

(2) the Secretary of State should clearly inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the use of media outlets

to spread disinformation or to intimidate and threaten its perceived enemies in Hong Kong or in other countries is unacceptable; and

(3) the Secretary of State should take any activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) into consideration when granting visas for travel and work in the United States to journalists from the People's Republic of China who are affiliated with any such media organizations.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF CROWD CONTROL EQUIPMENT TO HONG KONG.

It is sense of Congress that the Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should consider appropriate adjustments to the current United States export controls with respect to Hong Kong to prevent the supply of crowd control and surveillance equipment that could be used inappropriately in Hong Kong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I sincerely thank my colleagues. This has been a great bipartisan moment on the floor of the Senate for a very important issue.

I particularly thank my colleagues from Florida, Senator RUBIO; from Maryland, Senator CARDIN; from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ; and from Idaho, Senator RISCH, as well as all the others who had a hand in this work.

The Senate has just sent a resounding message to the Chinese Communist Party and President Xi that the United States stands with the democratic protestors in Hong Kong. The bipartisan legislation, with the great help of the chair and ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee, will safeguard Hong Kong's democracy and autonomy and hold accountable those responsible for any human rights abuses in Hong Kong. The bipartisan legislation that will soon be offered by the Senators from Oregon and Texas will make sure that U.S. companies don't sell riot equipment to Hong Kong.

We have sent a message to President Xi: Your suppression of freedom, whether in Hong Kong, in northwest China, or anywhere else, will not stand. You cannot be a great leader and you cannot be a great country when you oppose freedom, when you are so brutal to the people of Hong Kong, young and old, who are protesting, when you are so brutal to the Uighurs in northwest China, and when China is censored so that Chinese people can't get the truth. History has shown that that always fails, President Xi—always fails.

China has taken dramatic steps backward in the curtailment of freedom.

As my colleagues well know, the protests in Hong Kong have now taken an ominous turn. The Hong Kong police—no doubt at the behest of the Communist Party in Beijing—have undertaken an increasingly violent crackdown on student protestors. As the ruling party in Beijing continues to flout Hong Kong's judicial independence while perpetrating a brutal suppression of minority groups from one end of

China to the other, Americans' support for the democratic rights of Hong Kong citizenry is paramount.

To the people of China: We stand with you in freedom.

To the kids in Hong Kong, the students and the adults: We stand with you.

To the Uighurs who simply want to practice their religion: We stand with you.

Freedom will prevail, and the Chinese system will either change or fail. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, on June 9, the streets of Hong Kong filled with over 1 million individuals peacefully protesting what they saw as an unjust law and attack on democracy. It was an incredible visual of people standing up for democracy and standing up for human rights.

Here we are 5 months later, and the images are much different. You would be forgiven if you saw them and thought they were in a war zone. Hundreds of student protesters barricaded themselves in a Hong Kong university surrounded by armored riot police, pummeled by rubber bullets and tear gas, fires raging, destruction, devastation, and smoke everywhere.

There have been 5 months of protests, rising anger, and tension. There have been 5 months of police crackdowns on peaceful protests, spurring further protests and resistance, and U.S.-made, U.S.-exported police equipment being misused by the Hong Kong police to violate the human rights of protestors. So far, over 10,000 rounds of tear gas have been fired into the crowds of protestors.

We believe in free speech, freedom to assemble, freedom to protest, not state-sponsored oppression and violence. It is time to ban the export of U.S.-made police equipment to Hong Kong that is being used to abuse their human rights. That is why I am so pleased to introduce, in partnership with my colleague from Texas, S. 2710, which prohibits the export of munitions and crowd-control equipment to the Hong Kong Police Force.

Since the protests in June, over 1,700 Hong Kong residents have been injured and over 5,000 have been arrested. Amnesty International verified incidents involving the dangerous use of U.S.-made pepper spray, batons used to beat protestors, rubber bullets, and tear gas. One young woman was clubbed from behind with a police baton and continued to be beaten even after she was on the ground with her arms zip-tied behind her.

We have seen tear gas fired into confined spaces, in violation of the U.N. Basic Principles on the Use of Force

and Firearms. We have seen brutal police tactics that continued even when women and men were held in captivity or in custody. There has been report after report of violent assaults taking place inside police stations.

We cannot turn a blind eye. It is time to stand with the people of Hong Kong who are demanding a democratic future and against the violent suppression of free speech.

The bill the Senator from Texas and I have introduced lays out a series of products that we will no longer export to the Hong Kong Police Force: tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, foam and bean bag rounds, pepper balls, water cannons, handcuffs, shackles, stun guns, and tasers.

This bill is backed by many colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I say a huge thank-you to Senator MARKEY, Senator BLACKBURN, Senator LEAHY, Senator SCOTT, Senator COONS, Senator WICKER, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator INHOFE, Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator CARDIN, Senator WYDEN, Senator BRAUN, Senator GARDNER, and Senator VAN HOLLEN.

I am really proud to stand here in a bipartisan representation tonight, to stand with my colleagues who have introduced the Hong Kong Human Rights Democracy Act, and to stand together in a bipartisan fashion to ban the export of these brutal crowd-control strategies being misused in Hong Kong by their police to abuse the protestors.

I turn to my colleague from Texas. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, for months, the world has watched as the brave citizens of Hong Kong have sustained protests against China's decades-long degradation of their civil liberties.

The U.N. High Commissioner has found credible evidence of the Hong Kong Police Force using nonlethal crowd-control weapons in ways that violate international norms and standards. That is why I am proud to support the bipartisan PROTECT Hong Kong Act, as described by our colleague Senator MERKLEY.

The PROTECT Hong Kong Act would direct the President to ban the issuance of licenses for commercial export of riot-control weapons like tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, stun guns, and tasers to the Hong Kong Police Force. This ensures that the Hong Kong pro-democracy protestors are not subjected to police brutality using products made in the United States of America. I am also proud to support the just-passed Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

I think the statement being made by the passage of these two pieces of legislation and the presence today of so many of our colleagues on a bipartisan basis standing with the people of Hong Kong against this oppression by their Communist overlords is very, very significant.

Now more than ever, the United States must send a clear message to

China that the free world stands with Hongkongers in their struggle.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I want to take a moment to congratulate my colleague from Oregon and a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee who has worked on this issue, alongside of Senator CORNYN, with great skill in a way that allowed the legislation we just passed to take place, which he strongly supports, and to make his legislation, along with Senator CORNYN, a reality shortly. He has been very adept about it and very constructive. It is going to be a great moment when we send a message that U.S. weaponry isn't going to be part of the oppression in Hong Kong. I salute him, and I join him in his effort.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be included as an original cosponsor of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senator CORNYN, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from consideration of S. 2710 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2710) to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Merkley amendments, which are at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 1247 and 1248) were agreed to as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1247

(Purpose: To include the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate as part of the notification requirement)

On page 1, line 7, insert "the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and" before "the Committee on Foreign Relations".

AMENDMENT NO. 1248

(Purpose: To provide a one-year sunset)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

The prohibition under section 2 shall expire one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill (S. 2710), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2710

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS.—The term "covered munitions items" means tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, foam rounds, bean bag rounds, pepper balls, water cannons, handcuffs, shackles, stun guns, and tasers.

(3) HONG KONG.—The term "Hong Kong" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5702).

(4) HONG KONG POLICE FORCE.—The term "Hong Kong Police Force" means—

(A) the Hong Kong Police Force; and

(B) the Hong Kong Auxiliary Police Force.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prohibit the issuance of licenses to export covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to the issuance of a license with respect to which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees, not fewer than 30 days before the date of such issuance, a written notice—

(1) certifying that the exports to be covered by such license are important to the national interests and foreign policy goals of the United States; and

(2) describing the manner in which such exports will promote such interests and goals.

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

The prohibition under section 2 shall expire one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAREER ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, when we in Congress are fortunate enough to win our elections, we then must take an oath of office. It is quite simple and straightforward: "I do sol-

emnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God"—defend the Constitution and faithfully discharge the duties of this sacred office. Notably, the oath does not say defend the President over the rule of law or our constitutional duties.

And yet President Trump has made crude and inexcusable attacks against our professional diplomats and military officials who bravely and patriotically tried to abide by this same oath by upholding these values of honor and the rule of law. Career professionals testifying as part of the ongoing impeachment inquiry are facing partisan attacks and even efforts that threaten their lives and careers. President Trump has made no secret of his long-held suspicion of government workers, which he and his allies have perpetually accused of trying to bring down his Presidency.

That former U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Marie Yovanovitch told House Members that she felt "threatened" by our own President who called her "bad news" is despicable. In fact, Trump even attacked Yovanovitch on Twitter last week during her powerful public testimony before the House Intelligence Committee.

There have also been countless baseless attacks and insulting questions of loyalty faced by witnesses such as LTC Alexander Vindman. Vindman, who was born in Kiev, immigrated to the U.S. and spent 20 years as an Army officer, an officer who has shed blood for our country, as recognized by his Purple Heart.

Twenty-five years ago, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was another longtime Army officer who was born behind the Iron Curtain. GEN John Shalikashvili was born in Poland and moved to Peoria, IL, when he was 16. Thank goodness he served our country in a time where his career was not derailed by such degrading attacks.

I commend Defense Secretary Esper for promising that Lieutenant Colonel Vindman "shouldn't have any fear of retaliation," which only begs the question: Why can't Secretary Pompeo make the same promise for State Department officials? U.S. diplomats and military officials put their lives at risk every day at embassies and conflict zones around the world. To be attacked by their own government—and at the highest levels—defies belief and is beneath the offices they hold.

That President Trump and Republicans deride and bully these American patriots for telling the truth while Secretary Pompeo sits silently on his hands is simply beyond the pale. It is the opposite of what we teach our children. These career professionals—these

patriots—are models of courage and respect for our democratic system that the President and his circle of enablers should look to emulate rather than belittle.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL WOMEN VETERANS UNITED

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, we celebrated Veterans Day last Monday. On the 11th day of the 11th month, we pause to honor the courage and sacrifice of our Nation's veterans. Millions of Americans have served in uniform over the years, many of whom return home with visible and invisible wounds alike, often to serve again in their communities.

I had the privilege to meet with a group of such dedicated veterans recently at a meeting of the National Women Veterans United in Chicago. National Women Veterans United is the only center in Illinois dedicated to serving women servicemembers and veterans. Run by women and for women, I met with founder and president, the formidable Rochelle Crump. Rochelle served in the Army during the Vietnam era and has a long history of working with the VA at the Federal, State, and local levels. Rochelle and other members of her community in Chicago noticed that women veterans were falling through the cracks when it came to accessing the benefits they have earned, so they founded National Women Veterans United in 2005 to help fill the gap.

The VA reports that there are approximately 2 million women veterans in America, reflecting 9 percent of the total veteran population. By 2045, the share of female veterans is projected to double to 18 percent. Women are among the fastest growing segments of the veteran population; yet many women veterans are either not aware of the benefits afforded to them or they are frustrated with the VA's inability to understand or address the unique needs of women veterans. For example, women veterans tend to be older. The top reported health issues they face are PTSD, TBI, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease, but many also require services related to unique health needs such as military sexual trauma and reproductive health.

Now, the VA has made great strides over the years to provide for women veterans, but we must do more, especially when it comes to changing the culture at the VA that has often been a barrier to women seeking care at the VA. Groups like National Women Veterans United try to break down those barriers. They have helped hundreds of women veterans and their families, providing assistance in navigating the VA, holding healthcare screenings, and offering a host of personal and professional development opportunities and support groups. National Women Veterans United also supported entire families, such as the Gold Star Robinson-Wilson family. SGT Simone Robinson

of Robbins, IL, was 21 years old when she died of wounds sustained while serving in Afghanistan. At the time, she had a 2-year-old daughter. National Women Veterans United has helped care for the family after the sergeant's death. Earlier this year, they named their beautiful new center after her, now the SGT Simone A. Robinson Military Women Veteran's Center.

I would like to recognize a few of the other great women I had the opportunity to meet during my visit with National Women Veterans United, including two Korean war veterans: Wille Merine Rouse and Miljan Akin—Rouse also served again in Iraq, as did her daughter Rene—Sharon Stokes-Parry, who served in Iraq with the Marine Corps; Diane Halle, a retired U.S. Army master sergeant who later worked at the Jesse Brown VA and with Team Rubicon on disaster relief around the world; Jeannie Adams, a Vietnam Air Force veteran who serves as their treasurer; Donna Cooper; Hazel Noble; Valerie Harris—the list goes on.

I look forward to continuing to work with National Women Veterans United. These brave women stood guard for our freedom in uniform, and now, they continue to stand in support of their community—and specifically as African Americans, some of whom served during times of racial segregation, they faced challenges not only as women, but as Black women. Now, they help others who face challenges.

May we use their inspiration—and the inspiration of all of our veterans—to find our own ways to sacrifice for the good of our Nation and our world.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Washington Nationals' upset victory in the 2019 World Series reminded a good friend of mine, Rabbi Michael Cohen of Manchester, VT, of another unforeseen win. Fifty years ago, the New York Mets, led by star pitcher Tom Seaver, and manager—former Brooklyn Dodgers star Gil Hodges—shocked the baseball world by defeating the heavily favored Baltimore Orioles in the fall classic.

Rabbi Cohen, who has led an exemplary life, taking action on major issues including Mideast peace, antisemitism, and other difficult challenges, sees a common theme in these two victories, 50 years apart. Life, as in sports, offers all of us the opportunity to achieve what at the outset seems insurmountable. Peace in the Middle East is possible. We can end the scourges of antisemitism, xenophobia, and racism.

Rabbi Cohen's words in an article published in the Jerusalem Post on October 28, 2019, "Letter from America: The '69 Mets and lessons for today" are a powerful reminder of what we humans can achieve against the odds.

I ask unanimous consent that Rabbi Cohen's writing be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Jerusalem Post]

(By Michael M. Cohen, October 28, 2019)

LETTER FROM AMERICA: THE '69 METS AND LESSONS FOR TODAY

The articles we read in The Jerusalem Post and other news sources can be daunting, leaving us with a feeling of hopelessness and a debilitating sense that the conditions of the world are only getting worse.

From the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, which seems intractable, to climate change, to endless strife in the Middle East, to an assault on the institutions of, and belief in, democracy, to the worldwide rise of antisemitism, xenophobia and racism, to name but a few, the odds appear against us.

Fifty years ago the New York Mets began the baseball season with 100 to 1 odds against the scenario they would win the World Series. Before the 1969 season they had won a total of 394 games and lost a staggering 737 games since they first started playing in 1962. A sense of gloom pervaded the team. But in 1969 they would win 100 games, and this year's World Series marks the 50th anniversary of the final out in game five against the favorite and imposing Baltimore Orioles led by Frank Robinson and Boog Powell.

Baseball and other sports are not only about wins and losses and statistics. On a deeper level, sports are a metaphor for life and a holder of lessons for life. The '69 Mets are no different for us today.

The 1969 Season did not begin with a stellar start for the Mets. By the end of May they were continuing to lose more than win, with a record of 18-23.

I attended my first major league baseball game on June 19, when the Mets beat the Phillies in Philadelphia at the old Connie Mack Stadium, 6-5. Member of the tribe Art Shamsky went four for four, including two home runs, and pitcher Tom Seaver stole second base!

Three weeks later Seaver would pitch two outs short of a perfect game against the Chicago Cubs, as the Mets moved within 3 games of the division-leading Cubs.

Change seemed at hand, but change is rarely perfectly linear. By mid-August the Mets had fallen 10 games behind the Cubs. But then the Mets took all the accumulated and invaluable lessons from the losses of those previous seasons and applied them to win an incredible 38 of their last 49 games, and win the Eastern Division of the National League.

That is the thing about baseball. A good batting average is .300, which means that 70% of the time a good player fails when he is at bat. Players will tell you they take all the lessons from their previous at bats every time they are in the batter's box, with most of those lessons coming from failed experiences.

In addition, baseball is the only sport where the team on offense, the team at bat, does not have the ball. Rather, the team on defense pitches to you. That dynamic makes the encounter more difficult, but batters know those are the conditions they operate within.

The Mets would go on to sweep baseball legend Hank Aaron and the Atlanta Braves in the National League playoff series and then face the Baltimore Orioles in the World Series. They would win the Series by tenacity, hustle, a strong work ethic, smart baseball, and that factor out of our hands, serendipity.

On the second pitch of the first game of the World Series, Don Buford hit a home run off Seaver, and the Orioles would go on to win

the game. After that game many felt that an Orioles sweep of the Mets was a very good possibility. The tenacious Mets had other ideas, and went on to win the next four games in a row to become the champions.

In game two, their oldest member, Ed Charles, 38, came through, batting, and helped end the game with a difficult and brilliant throw to Donn Clendenon at first base.

Game three was all about two magnificent running catches by center fielder Tommie Agee. The first, with two runners on base, was caught in the webbing of his glove, the white of the baseball protruding from the glove, while the second diving catch was made with the bases loaded.

Game four the Mets won because the correct call was not made. J.C. Martin bunted in the bottom of the 10th inning and ran to first base on the wrong side of the first base line. Because of that, Oriole pitcher Pete Richert's throw hit Martin's wrist and the ball rolled to the ground, allowing Rod Gaspner to score the winning run. Martin should have been called out, but he was not.

The final game was won by the Mets because of smart, creative and detailed thinking by Mets manager Gil Hodges. In the bottom of the sixth inning, with the Mets trailing 3-0, Dave McNally's pitch to Cleon Jones went low and ended up in the Mets dugout. Umpire Lou DiMuro ruled the ball had not hit Jones. Hodges then emerged with the baseball showing a smudge of shoe polish on it. Jones was then awarded first base, and the next batter, Donn Clendenon, would hit a two-run homer, and the Mets would go on to win the game, 5-3.

The challenges we face can feel disheartening. We may feel like the Mets before the '69 season began, when the past suggested 100 to 1 odds against a different and better outcome. But change did happen. Fifty years later, that uplifting lesson should not be lost on us.

We are also reminded of that lesson in the Bible, where Moses's last speech to the people is a poem. We see in the life of Moses—who 40 years earlier said to God, "I have never been a man of words . . . I am slow of speech and slow of tongue" (Exodus 4:10)—someone who develops from a poor orator to a master of prose and poetry.

That which appears to be insurmountable may be difficult to overcome, but as Babe Ruth said, "Never let the fear of striking out keep you from playing the game." The batter's box awaits.

The writer, rabbi emeritus of the Israel Congregation in Manchester Center, Vermont, teaches at Bennington College and the Kibbutz Ketura campus of the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies.

OCEAN PLASTIC POLLUTION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the world's oceans serve as a crucial carbon sink, a home to hundreds of thousands of known and countless unknown species of marine life, an essential source of protein for billions of people, and a facilitator of billions of dollars in tourism, fishing, shipping, and other economic activity. Today, the oceans, on which life on Earth depends, are under serious threat.

Threats from climate change, habitat destruction, illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, and pollution—plastic waste pollution in particular—are accelerating and causing potentially irreparable harm to this planet.

I spoke recently on the significant health, environmental, and economic

impacts of the more than 300 billion pounds of plastic waste circulating in the oceans, and on funding in the Senate version of the fiscal year 2020 Department of State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill to strengthen U.S. efforts to address this pollution.

Today I will further discuss the scale of the problem and actions that governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), private companies, and other stakeholders can take to address this challenge.

I want to share a few findings and recommendations from a report recently published by Ocean Conservancy and the Trash Free Seas Alliance, a global group of companies and NGOs seeking to reduce and reinvent products and services that contribute to ocean pollution.

Absent collective action, the report depicts a bleak future—one involving more than 550 billion pounds of plastic waste in the oceans by 2025, clogging our rivers and waterways, threatening marine life and seabirds, endangering human health, contaminating the food supply, and triggering a significant decline in economic benefits.

For perspective, the amount of plastic entering the oceans each year is equivalent to dumping a garbage truck full of plastic into the ocean every minute of every hour of every day. That is 1,440 truckloads of plastic per day, or more than half a million truckloads per year. And, of course, this does not include the immense amounts of chemical waste and other types of pollution that enter the oceans every day.

As the report describes, rising ocean plastic pollution is a direct result of the increasing global production and use of plastic, which totals more than 750 billion pounds per year, an estimated 40 percent of which is single-use. Waste management systems, particularly in developing countries, are woefully incapable of managing the growing quantity of plastic waste.

So the majority of plastic entering the oceans was never collected as part of a formal waste management system, and without increased resources for waste management programs and improvements to collection infrastructure, developing countries—and the oceans—will continue to be inundated with plastic waste.

There is no single solution. Instead, the report outlines four priority areas on which to focus our collective efforts: financing the collection of plastic waste; reducing the production and use of single-use plastics; improving design standards to address nonrecyclable or difficult to recycle plastics; and increasing the demand for post-consumer plastics.

One option for increasing resources to finance the collection of plastic waste is by charging fees to companies based on the amount of nonrecyclable materials used in their products. Such fees have the potential to generate up to 75 percent of the resources needed to

support effective waste collection programs. And increasing the demand for recycled products—one of the other priority lines of effort—reportedly has the potential to reduce the resources needed for such programs by more than 30 percent. Other options for tackling plastic pollution include a ban on microplastics, incentive programs for recycling, preferential procurement policies, and the use of refillable packaging.

All of this is to say that steps can, and must, be urgently taken. While ocean plastic pollution may be a devastating and growing challenge, it is not an insurmountable one.

And as I have said before, while the United States should significantly increase our engagement and leadership on this issue, we cannot solve this problem alone. There is no greater unifier than the oceans. Their protection should be of the utmost importance to governments, companies, and individuals on every continent and in every country.

TRIBUTE TO MAIDA TOWNSEND

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the achievements of Maida Townsend, a Vermont State Representative and now a decorated figure skater, who recently took home the gold medal in an international figure skating competition in Lake Placid, NY. Marcelle and I have known Maida for many years, and we have always been impressed with her dedication, artistry, and selflessness. While we have come to know Maida through her tireless work for the State of Vermont, we have been impressed, but not surprised, that she brings the same dedication to figure skating, a sport she picked up at the age of 50.

Maida has served the State of Vermont over the years through her leadership as the president of the Vermont branch of the National Education Association, as a chair of the Vermont Democratic Party, and in recent years as a State representative for South Burlington. Most noteworthy though is Maida's long career as a public school teacher, a career in which she has taught young Vermonters the French language for well over 30 years. Maida's career of public service is exemplary. I know that she will continue to dedicate herself to Vermont for many more years to come.

But just as inspiring as her long career in public service is her pursuit of a personal joy and passion, that of figure skating. Maida, proving it is never too late to pursue a new joy, is as dedicated to her sport as she is to her career. Starting her days hours before many of us see the sun rise, Maida hits the ice before she hits the halls of the State legislature. Maida is a friend, a true Vermonter, and a true treasure.

Marcelle and I are proud to join her loved ones in offering a hearty congratulations to Maida Townsend on

this impressive win in one of her many passions. We are lucky to know her, and Vermont is lucky to have her.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "State rep wins gold in international skating competition," originally published by "The Other Paper," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Other Paper Nov. 7, 2019]

STATE REP WINS GOLD IN INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

It was an introduction even Townsend—Chittenden District 7-4 State representative—wasn't expecting to hear. But sure enough, it's how she was presented to judges, the audience and her fellow competitors at the International Adult Figure Skating Competition in Lake Placid, N.Y., on Oct. 17.

"I confess that it got my attention being introduced as representing the United States as opposed to representing my club, which is what I am used to hearing," Townsend said.

But represent the U.S. she did, as skaters from around the globe filled the Olympic-size rink. In her own category, Adult Ladies Bronze V division—V designating competitors born in 1951 or earlier—Townsend skated against three other Americans and a Canadian to earn the gold.

As she took to the ice, she noted the judges' position and prepared herself for the music to begin. "Bumpin' on Sunset," a Jazz song by Wes Montgomery, filled the arena. It was a personal selection, as most of Townsend's program music is.

"There is the adage, let the music take you there," she said. "It does; you have practiced so long, over and over again, this music is part of a person and the music just carried me."

As she left the ice and awaited her score, Townsend felt great pride. She knew she had skated well and met her requirements.

"I'm my hardest critic," she said, but added, "I knew when I came off the ice that I'd skated it really well."

But getting to victory was no small feat. Townsend began preparing her program with her coach, Martha Harding, in early summer. The two worked an hour each day Tuesday through Thursday, adding in Fridays the month before internationals.

The program looked better each week, until just before internationals.

"For two solid weeks before this competition, nothing was working right, everything was falling apart," Townsend said. "I was psyching myself out."

But getting on the "storied rink" at Lake Placid—where countless "greats" like the Russian duo, the Protopopovs, Sonja Henie and Scott Hamilton have skated—made the rough practices disappear.

"I got on the ice to do the program and it was like those two awful weeks never happened," Townsend said. "I was in the zone and it just felt so good."

What's noteworthy about Townsend's skating is that it only began 25 years ago, when she was 50 years old.

Townsend was an avid fan of watching the elite figure skaters on television.

"I'd find myself just so drawn to it, and oftentimes I'd find it so beautiful I was there crying watching the performances," she said.

When an ad for group skating lessons stared up at her from the pages of a newspaper, Townsend knew the message was meant for her.

Townsend wasn't fearful about safety when she hit the ice for the first time. Rather, she said she was concerned about being the "tallest skater." Figure skating is a sport that

typically attracts a less aged crowd, but Townsend discovered age is but a number. She practiced the basics in group lessons, then found a coach to study under.

With Coach Julie MacDonald's help, Townsend honed her skills and grew tremendously. Though Townsend was content to continue lessons with MacDonald, her coach saw a greater future for her.

"At a given point in time, Julie [MacDonald] informed me that she needed to kick me out of the nest," Townsend said. "I was very comfortable with Julie and she sensed I was too comfortable." That's when Townsend paired with Harding.

"Martha [Harding] was this really big deal coach," Townsend recalls. "I was really scared, I remember saying to Julia, 'What if she rejects me?'"

But Townsend met all of Harding's requirements and the duo has worked well together ever since.

"Julie knew what she was doing when she kicked me out of the nest," Townsend said. "Martha worked with me, understanding as an older skater my goals are very different from a kids'."

Harding and Townsend spend much of their time working on "quality skating." For Townsend, that means dedicating effort to flow, posture and working the edges of her blades.

"To me, skating is when your foot is on the ice, as opposed to jump, jump, jump, jump," she said. "There's the whole business of interpreting the music ... if all you're doing is going back and forth jump, back and forth jump, it's not being one with the music."

Don't let that fool you, Townsend still gets some air. In her early years with Harding, she did all the single jumps—save for the Axel. Today she does what jumps and spins her body permits.

And one of her big requirements is looking confident and competent on the ice. It's not uncommon for people who start skating in their adulthood to be more cautious than their youthful counterparts, according to Townsend.

"Adults are more cautious in skating, I think, than kids are," she said. "Kids don't have so far to fall, kids heal a lot faster than adults and kids don't have to go to work the next day."

But Townsend challenges that. In fact, she's had judges assume she's skated for most of her life. And though Townsend is the first to say she's learned a great deal from Harding, Harding says the feeling is mutual. "I've learned a lot from [Townsend] as far as being disciplined," Harding said.

Townsend's disciplined nature keeps her skating even when the Legislature is in session. During the session, she's up at 3:15 a.m. to walk her dog and prepare for the day, then she's on the ice at 5:45 a.m. and en route to the Capitol by 6:35 a.m. But skating is good for both mind and body, Townsend said. During the session it's a joyful event that can be "cleansing."

"If I didn't skate I think I'd be a much older 75 than I am," Townsend said.

That's why Townsend would recommend the sport to anyone who's interested but perhaps trepidatious to skate.

"You're not too old to do it. There's no reason to be defined by a number," she said. "I really believe that. I intend to keep skating 'til my body tells me, 'Stop.' So far my body's nowhere near telling me to stop."

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I implore the Senate to take up legislation addressing America's gun violence epi-

demio. We must pass legislation requiring universal and completed background checks for individuals seeking to purchase a gun, to help insure that guns do not fall into the wrong hands, with deadly results.

Last week, on the morning of November 14, it was a normal Thursday at Saugus High School in Santa Clarita, CA. Just before second period, a 16-year-old boy pulled a semiautomatic pistol out of his backpack. In just 16 seconds, he shot five of his classmates, killing two. A short time later, he turned the gun on himself.

After hearing the gunshots, Katie Holt, a teacher at Saugus High School, rushed students into her classroom and barricaded the door. One of the injured girls made it into Holt's classroom. Thankfully and incredibly, Holt had a gunshot wound kit in case of a school shooting. The girl had been shot twice, and Holt only had one kit. Holt dressed the two wounds as best she could with one kit, while a freshman student applied pressure. The injured girl survived.

Katie Holt's preparedness and quick action likely saved that young girl's life. As we commend her heroic actions, we have to ask ourselves: How did we get to this point? How did we get a place where American teachers feel obligated to keep gunshot wound kits in their classrooms?

We also mourn the tragic loss of life in several other recent mass shootings. On November 18, three people were killed outside a Walmart in Duncan, OK. Just this past weekend, on November 17 in Fresno, CA, 10 individuals were shot and 4 were killed at a football watch party. On October 31 in Orina, CA, five individuals were killed and four wounded at a Halloween block party. And we all remember the horrific spate of mass shootings this summer, including those in Texas, Ohio, California, and Virginia, leading to dozens killed.

In February 2019, the House passed H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act, by a bipartisan vote of 240-190. That month, the House also passed H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act. Since that time, these bills have languished in the Senate where the Republican leader refuses to allow Senate consideration.

By refusing to take up legislation to require universal and completed background checks, the Senate is failing the American people. We have a responsibility to pass commonsense gun reform to end the senseless bloodshed. We need gun reform now, not only to address our country's seemingly endless cycle of mass shootings, but we need gun safety legislation now because our communities are ravaged by daily gun violence that does not make news headlines.

On average, about every 13 hours, someone is killed with a gun in Maryland. On average, 656 Marylanders die from fatal gunshot wounds every year. Firearms are the first leading cause of

death among children and teens in Maryland. African-American children and teens in Maryland are five times as likely as their White peers to die by guns. In Maryland, African-Americans are 16 times as likely to die by gun homicide as White people.

In 2017, 53 percent of the guns recovered from Maryland crime scenes came from another State. Often, these guns used in crimes in Maryland are from States with more lenient gun control laws.

American women are 21 times more likely to be killed with a gun than women in other high-income countries; 4.5 million women in the United States have been threatened with a gun by their current or previous intimate partner. It has estimated that 900,000 American women have been shot or shot at by their current or previous intimate partner. When there is a gun present during a domestic violence situation, a woman's risk of being killed goes up 500 percent.

In Maryland, from 2013 to 2017, 48 women were fatally shot by an intimate partner. African-American women are 1.7 times more likely as White women to be fatally shot by a partner. These are women like Maryland resident, Timira Hopkins. Hopkins' relationship with her boyfriend was abusive, and he had made threats before. One night in 2014, Hopkins' boyfriend delivered on his threats, shooting Hopkins five times before killing himself. Incredibly, Hopkins survived, but the right side of her face is paralyzed, and she is deaf in one ear. In September of this year, Hopkins shared her story on NPR in the hopes she can help other survivors.

We need to do more for brave women like Timira Hopkins. We need to join her in the fight to protect people suffering domestic violence. This body understands the dangerous potential consequences of domestic violence perpetrators owning guns. That is why, in 1996, we passed the Lautenberg amendment, banning gun ownership for individuals convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence. However, without universal background checks, we can't effectively enforce this prohibition and keep guns out of the hands of violent abusers.

An estimated 22 percent of U.S. gun owners purchased their most recent firearm without a background check. When background checks are not required, domestic abusers get ahold of guns. In 2018, Sara Schmidt was murdered by her husband, who should have been prohibited from purchasing a firearm because of a domestic violence felony. Schmidt's husband purchased the gun he used to murder Sara from an online private seller, bypassing background check requirements.

Passing legislation to expand background checks to every gun sale, including those conducted online, at gun shows, and through private transfers, should be the top priority in Congress. Congress should also make sure that

background checks are fully completed before a gun sale is finally approved. There is no one answer which will fix America's gun violence epidemic. But we can't let the complexity of the problem paralyze us. We need to take steps forward.

The American people deserve action. They are demanding action. An overwhelming majority of Americans—97 percent—support expanding background checks. Congress must listen to the 97 percent of Americans and take action. We cannot wait any longer. While we wait, Americans are dying, and communities are traumatized by violence. We must do the right thing and take up the House legislation requiring universal and completed background checks for individuals seeking to purchase a gun. The time for action is now.

CONFIRMATION OF STEVEN J. MENASHI

Mr. VAN VOLLEN. Madam President, last week, I voted against Steven Menashi's nomination to serve on the Second Circuit, to the same seat once held by Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Throughout his legal career, Menashi has shown himself to be hostile to women's rights, communities of color, and LGBT Americans.

I am disappointed that my colleagues have avoided passing important legislation and have solely focused on confirming many extremist judges. The Senate Republican leader has refused to allow votes on a host of important legislation, including bills to secure our elections from foreign interference, to strengthen background checks, and to reduce the rate of gun violence in our communities, and to provide a path to citizenship for DACA and TPS recipients. All of these bills deserve a vote, but they are all languishing in the Senate legislative graveyard.

Menashi has a record of bias and while at the Department of Education, has repeatedly supported policies that hurt students and borrowers. Alongside Secretary DeVos, Menashi, created an illegal scheme to deny debt relief to defrauded students, including Marylanders. Additionally, Menashi has worked hand-in-hand with Trump senior advisor Steven Miller to advance cruel policies that undermine American values.

The American people deserve better from the U.S. Senate. We should not have voted on and confirmed this nominee and instead should be working on legislation to improve the lives and ensure the safety of our constituents.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WOOTEN

Mr. BURR. Madam President, Senator THOM TILLIS and I would like to recognize the distinguished service of a great North Carolinian. After a 25-year career with the North Carolina Farm Bureau, Larry Wooten is stepping aside as president at the end of this year.

President Wooten has been a steadfast advocate for agriculture and rural North Carolina.

Larry has worked tirelessly to advance initiatives that strengthen and improve our State's rural communities. He is an exemplary servant leader that has always encouraged others to "give back" to the organizations, the communities, and the State that have provided them with opportunities for growth and advancement. He is a founding member of the NC Rural Economic Development Center where he served on the board of directors and executive committee. He has also served with distinction on the American Farm Bureau Board of Directors, the NC Board of Agriculture, the Agricultural Consortium Board, and the Rural Prosperity Task Force. He has served as chair of the American Farm Bureau Foreign Trade Committee and on USDA's Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee, APAC.

Most significant, however, is the impact Wooten has had on North Carolina agriculture. In his role as president, he has been an effective voice for agribusiness and farmers—educating leaders and lawmakers about the State's largest economic sector and helping shape sound State and national policy for its future. A lifelong farmer from Pender County, North Carolina, Larry knows firsthand the positive impact of a sound agricultural education, research, and extension of that research onto his farm. Larry was a key influencer in the inclusion of NC State University's Plant Sciences Building in North Carolina's Connect NC Bond Referendum, as well as supporting the university's efforts to create new paths for more rural students to earn their NC State degree. Wooten, through his leadership of the Farm Bureau, has been a tireless supporter of NC A&T State University's Small Farms Initiative. All these efforts will create pathways for North Carolinians to have an oversized positive impact on farming and economic development in our state and nation.

Larry Wooten is a remarkable leader who put the wellbeing of our state and its citizens above his own. It is through the work of selfless leaders like Larry that North Carolina has become a state where the weak have an opportunity to grow strong, and the strong can grow great.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE HULMAN-GEORGE FAMILY

• Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate and recognize the Hulman-George family for their accomplishments and success in business and their stewardship of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway for the last 75 years.

On November 4, 2019, principals of Hulman & Company announced the sale of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, among other assets of the

Hulman-George family, to a newly formed entity to be led by industry legend Roger Penske. This announcement marks the end of one glorious era, and the start of another for so many Hoosiers and racing fans around the world who recognize Indianapolis Motor Speedway as the racing capital of the world. Beloved as the famous track at 16th and Georgetown in Indianapolis is today, it is nearly impossible to imagine our capital city without it, which was nearly the case.

Shortly after World War II, an era in which the track sat dormant from 1941 through 1945 and fell almost into complete disrepair, a businessman from Terre Haute stepped up to purchase the facility with the goal of continuing and building upon the legacy of the already famous Indianapolis 500. That businessman, Anton "Tony" Hulman, Jr., saved the speedway from either becoming a housing development or a private automobile testing facility.

For the last 75 years, Indianapolis Motor Speedway has been controlled by Hulman & Company, an entity with a deep portfolio but nothing as visible and recognizable worldwide as the famed racecourse. From the initial days of owning the facility and preparing it to run the 1946 race to the celebration of centennial era and beyond, the Hulman-George family has been the steadfast caretaker and promoter of this iconic venue.

The Indianapolis Motor Speedway has served as the front door to Indianapolis, the State of Indiana, and the entire Midwest for those across the world who travel each year to personally watch the world's largest single day sporting event, the Indianapolis 500, which attracts approximately 350,000 spectators, the NASCAR Brickyard 400, and the IndyCar Grand Prix of Indianapolis. The Speedway has also recently hosted the Formula One United States Grand Prix, Red Bull Air Races, and even a Rolling Stones concert. The economic impact of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway to central Indiana in the 75 years that the Hulman-George family has owned the property is incalculable. The personal impact the speedway has had on tens of thousands of families who use the facility as an anchor for what becomes weekend-long reunions is inspiring, as one need not search far on Memorial Day weekend in May to find a family who has been attending the Indy 500 as a group for as long as can be remembered.

The facility which started as a testing ground for Indiana's growing automotive industry in 1909 became a testing ground of speed, endurance, strength, and the will to win over the last 110 years. Without the Hulman-George family, that story would have likely ended in the 1940s.

Madam President, I want to personally thank the Hulman-George family for their amazing commitment and contributions to the State of Indiana and the United States of America. Both are better because of this family.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA

● Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, the Rotary Club of Lafayette will turn 100 years old in 2020. I would like to share with you some of the accomplishments of the club since its founding in 1920. Early in their history, they underwrote the election to fund the first public library, they helped to establish One Acadiana and started the first Lafayette Boy Scout troop. In addition to establishing Rotary Park in the 1980s, they currently fund annual scholarships for local students, coordinate food drives for FoodNet, and support Rotary's mission to eradicate polio worldwide, in addition to supporting other local charities.

Congratulations to the Rotary Club of Lafayette on this historic achievement. I wish you all the best of luck in years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TINA QUIGLEY

● Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I come forward today to recognize the chief executive officer of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, Tina Quigley, who, after over 14 years of dedicated service, announced her retirement this year.

Tina Quigley has been a visionary during her tenure at the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Her forward thinking and planning for the future has led the RTC to be named one of the most efficient transit providers in the Nation. Her leadership has helped Southern Nevada reap the benefits of an advanced transportation system that has helped attract tourists, residents, and new businesses.

Ms. Quigley has over 25 years of experience in transportation management. She has consistently been on the leading edge of improving how residents, workers, and visitors travel the Las Vegas Valley. With a rapidly growing population of 2.1 million residents and more than 42 million annual visitors, that is no small task. Her determination in pushing for technological advancements, forging partnerships, and strategizing for the future have positioned the region for ongoing and sustained economic growth.

Ms. Quigley is also a licensed pilot and earned her bachelor of science degree in aviation business and planning from Embry Riddle Aeronautical University. She is a former manager of one of the Nation's busiest airports, McCarran International Airport, and has amassed an impressive number of professional achievements throughout her career.

The incredible work that Ms. Quigley has done for Southern Nevada has not gone unrecognized. She has earned numerous awards for her leadership, innovation, and vision. These awards include but are not limited to the Woman

of Distinction Award for Government Services by the National Association of Women Business Owners, the Carolyn M. Sparks Founders Award from the Nevada International Women's Forum, and the 2012 Women in Transportation award from Metro Magazine.

Ms. Quigley has also remembered to give back to her community and has directed her energy, passion, and commitment into bettering the Las Vegas Valley. She serves on a multitude of boards and committees in Southern Nevada, including as chairperson of the Desert Research Institute Foundation, which supports the nonprofit environmental science research branch of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

Today, I celebrate the many contributions of Tina Quigley to the city of Las Vegas and to the Southern Nevada community. Her service is as an example to all of us who wish to innovate, serve, and better our communities.●

TRIBUTE TO JAY HILDEBRANDT

● Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I congratulate Jay Hildebrandt, who is retiring after more than four decades in news reporting.

Jay has worked for KIFI's Local News 8 in Idaho Falls for the past 35 years. As an anchor for the weeknight news, Jay is known for his calm, gentle demeanor and steady role delivering the news. Originally, from Milwaukee, WI, Jay earned a degree in communications from Brigham Young University. Before anchoring for our local news, he anchored in Twin Falls and Fort Wayne, IN. Thankfully, he then returned to Idaho, where we have been blessed with Jay's reliable, professional and compassionate reporting all these years.

His positive influence can be felt throughout our community. Jay has made a difference in many lives through his involvement in impactful projects and community and statewide efforts. In addition to anchoring the weeknight news, Jay produced the weekly "Wednesday's Child" reports for 28 years. Through this project, he has helped elevate the stories of area children in need of adoptive homes. He also highlighted the hard work of remarkable high school seniors in his "Distinguished Student" series. Additionally, Jay has served as an adjunct instructor at Brigham Young University Idaho and helped lead important efforts, including his service on the Governor's Children's Trust Fund Board, the Region VII Health and Welfare Advisory Board, and the Safe Place Advisory Board.

While most of us enjoyed Jay over the years on the television, there are those who have been able to work with him personally. And without exception, he is admired, emulated and respected by his coworkers. One of those fortunate individuals is my current chief of staff in DC, Susan Hawkes Wheeler. She got her start just out of college

working for Jay at KIFI in the mid-1980s, when Jay was already becoming the institution that he remains in Idaho broadcasting. His gentle leadership and kind demeanor did much to stabilize a work place that can be very chaotic as news develops, even in small town news stations. He was a patient teacher, an insightful editor, and a delightful storyteller, clearly evidenced by his enjoyment of some of the special projects he undertook like the aforementioned "Wednesday's Child." My office benefits every day from lessons Susan learned through Jay's leadership, and I am grateful for those.

In an article about his retirement, his co-anchor of 30 years, Karole Honas, used the words "solid," "steady," "kind," and "positive" to describe Jay. Professionalism, hard work, compassion, and optimism are his hallmarks. Thank you, Jay, for your outstanding reporting all these years and for working to highlight the needs and the great achievements in our community. While your reassuring and thoughtful presence on our local news will no doubt be deeply missed, the caring standard you have set will be ever-present. Congratulations on your exemplary career. I wish you well on your well-earned retirement. May it be filled with many happy times with Sally, your children, grandchildren, and friends.●

RECOGNIZING NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

● Mr. MENENDEZ, Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute and to recognize a New Jersey organization celebrating its 25th anniversary, the New Jersey Community Development Corporation, NJCDC. I wish to take a moment now to honor NJCDC for the important work it is doing in the State of New Jersey and the accomplishments it has achieved over the past 25 years.

The NJCDC provides hope for a rewarding future through urban revitalization efforts, financial support, education initiatives, and job creation. The work done by NJCDC has directly transformed the lives of many, especially in the city of Paterson.

In honor of the accomplishments of this organization, I ask that a proclamation honoring the 25th anniversary of the NJCDC be printed in the RECORD. The material follows:

Whereas, the New Jersey Community Development Corporation is a non-profit community development and social service agency based in the City of Paterson, New Jersey;

Whereas, the New Jersey Community Development Corporation and its dedicated staff empowers individuals to transform their lives and offers a variety of programs and services to assist economically disadvantaged individuals, at-risk youth, and people with disabilities;

Whereas, the New Jersey Community Development Corporation has contrib-

uted to the revitalization of the City of Paterson and the Great Falls Historic District, helping to ensure a vibrant future for the City and its residents; and

Whereas, now as the New Jersey Community Development Corporation celebrates its 25th Anniversary, I congratulate its staff and volunteers on this milestone.

Therefore, in presenting this citation to the New Jersey Community Development Corporation, I, on behalf of the People of the State of New Jersey hereby congratulate the New Jersey Community Development Corporation and its contribution to the community, the City of Paterson, and the State of New Jersey.●

RECOGNIZING HAMMER DOWN RIVER EXCURSIONS

● Mr. RISCH, Madam President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. However, in honor of Veterans Day on November 11, this month I will honor a veteran-owned small business for each of the 10 days the Senate is in legislative session. The personal sacrifices made by America's veterans have protected the very freedoms and values that give each of us and our children the ability to achieve the American dream. The skills veterans learn as members of the military are invaluable and undoubtedly contribute to Idaho's flourishing veteran business community. I am proud of the sacrifices veterans have made to protect our country and that they are choosing Idaho to call home when they complete their service in the military.

As your U.S. Senator from the great State of Idaho, it is my pleasure to recognize Hammer Down River Excursions in White Bird as the veteran-owned Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 19, 2019.

Hammer Down River Excursions is owned and operated by U.S. Army veteran Homer Brown. The business offers guided tours, dinner cruises, and fishing expeditions to showcase Idaho's rich, natural beauty in the heart of Hells Canyon and the Salmon River. Professional, experienced guides teach guests how to fish Idaho's steelhead, trout, bass, and salmon.

Brown spent his youth fishing and working along the Salmon River before entering the Army. After completing his time of service, Brown got his captain's license so he could return to the Salmon River to work as a jet boat captain. Brown takes pride in sharing Idaho's beauty with his patrons.

Congratulations to Homer Brown and all of the employees at Hammer Down River Excursions for being selected as the Veteran-owned Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 19, 2019. You make our great State proud, and I

look forward to your continued growth and success.●

REMEMBERING JIMMY KOIKOS

● Mr. SHELBY, Madam President, I rise today to honor the life of James Bill "Jimmy" Koikos, beloved coowner of Bessemer's famous Bright Star restaurant. Jimmy passed away on November 16, 2019, at the age of 81. I had the honor of knowing Jimmy, as I frequented the Bright Star many times during his 60 years of running the institution.

Jimmy was born and raised in Bessemer, AL, just miles from the restaurant. He attended Arlington School and then Bessemer High School, where he played high school football. Jimmy then attended the University of Alabama until 1959, when a visit from his mother changed his plans. She informed him of his uncle's decision to retire, prompting him to move home to manage the Bright Star with his father, Bill Koikos. Jimmy believed in the restaurant, and he knew he wanted to be a part of the Bright Star's continued success.

Nine years later, Jimmy's younger brother, Nicky, joined him in managing the restaurant. The two brothers went on to work side-by-side as owner-operators of the Bright Star until Jimmy's death. As his brother fondly remembered not long ago, "He's the heart and soul of the restaurant, and it's going to be hard to replace that."

I will always remember Jimmy for his kindness and ability to make customers feel at home when they visited the Bright Star. He generously greeted each person who entered the establishment. He promised his father he would take care of the restaurant, and that is exactly what he did.

Because of the hard work of Jimmy and others who spent their lives devoted to the Bright Star, it began to draw national attention. In 2010, the James Beard Foundation honored the Bright Star with an America's Classics Award, distinguishing the restaurant for its timeless appeal and quality food that reflects the character of the community.

As a huge Alabama fan, Jimmy was always ecstatic when the Bright Star attracted Alabama football coaches like Bear Bryant, Gene Stallings, and Nick Saban. He would also frequent Alabama football practices, bringing along some of the famous icebox pies for the coaches, players, and staff.

Jimmy even went as far as to ensure that the Bright Star would be taken care of when he was gone, asking a younger relative, Andreas Anastassakis, to move to Bessemer and carry on the legacy of the Bright Star. Anastassakis was honored.

Jimmy Koikos's legacy will live on through the people whose lives he touched at the Bright Star, in the community and throughout the entire State of Alabama. I offer my deepest condolences to his brother Nick, his

sister Helen, and all of his loved ones. I am proud to have known him, and I will always think of him when passing through Bessemer to visit one of my very favorite places, the Bright Star.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13712 OF NOVEMBER 22, 2015, WITH RESPECT TO BURUNDI—PM 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in Burundi declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, is to continue in effect beyond November 22, 2019.

The situation in Burundi, which has been marked by killing and other violence against civilians, unrest, the incitement of violence, and significant political repression, and which threatens the peace, security, and stability of Burundi and the region, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13712 with respect to the situation in Burundi.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 2019.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3702. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide disaster assistance to States, Puerto Rico, units of general local government, and Indian tribes under a community development block grant disaster recovery program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to enable Indian Tribes and tribally designated housing entities to apply for, receive, and administer grants and subgrants under the Continuum of Care Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

H.R. 4300. An act to provide Federal housing assistance on behalf of youths who are aging out of foster care, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4344. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek and Federal courts to grant disgorgement of unjust enrichment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4634. An act to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9455(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: Mr. Lamborn of Colorado.

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following current resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 3055.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3702. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide disaster assistance to States, Puerto Rico, units of general local government, and Indian tribes under a community development block grant disaster recovery program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to enable Indian Tribes and tribally designated housing entities to apply for, receive, and administer grants and subgrants under the Continuum of Care Program of the Department of Hous-

ing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4300. An act to provide Federal housing assistance on behalf of youths who are aging out of foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4344. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek and Federal courts to grant disgorgement of unjust enrichment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4634. An act to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. FISCHER for Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Joseph Bruce Hamilton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2022.

*Jessie Hill Roberson, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2023.

*Thomas A. Summers, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2020.

*Dana S. Deasy, of Virginia, to be Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

*Lisa W. Hershman, of Indiana, to be Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

*Robert John Sander, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

Army nomination of Col. Patrick R. Michaelis, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Daniel L. Karbler, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Stephanie A. Purgerson, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Leslie A. Beavers and ending with Col. Adrian K. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 30, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Lee Ann T. Bennett and ending with Brig. Gen. Scott A. Sauter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 30, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Col. Darrin D. Lambrigger, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. John C. Boyd, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Damon N. Cluck, to be Brigadier General.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jeffrey J. Autrey and ending with Jennifer T.

Vecchione, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 19, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Thomas Jason Abell and ending with Lawrence Nahno Yazzie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 12, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Joshua B. Stierwalt, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael W. Torre, to be Major.

Army nomination of Austin C. Vann, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael J. Blanton, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Laina G. Cafego, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lyle E. Bushong, to be Major.

Army nomination of Garth E. Coke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brent R. Robertson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Gerald J. Hall, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicole L. Kruse, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Emma R. Shinn, to be Captain.

Marine Corps nomination of Ryan J. Nowlin, to be Major.

Navy nomination of John N. Amiral, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Thomas Q. Gallagher, to be Captain.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*James P. Danly, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2023.

*Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

*Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2891. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish Tribal Wildlife Corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2892. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2893. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide for the consideration of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2894. A bill to establish a National Shipper Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2895. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate selective androgen receptor modulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2896. A bill to establish the Pullman National Historical Park in the State of Illinois as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2897. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2898. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2899. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2900. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to prevent the circumvention of anti-dumping and countervailing duties by non-market economy countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2901. A bill to establish within the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services a special task force on ensuring Medicare beneficiary access to innovative diabetes technologies and services; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARASSO):

S. Res. 430. A resolution designating December 10, 2019, as "Wyoming Women's Suffrage Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. JONES, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 431. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Diabetes Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. ERNST):

S. Res. 432. A resolution designating November 2019 as "National College Application Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. Res. 433. A resolution designating February 1, 2020, as "Blue Star Mother's Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 434. A resolution honoring the life of Nicholas Anthony Buoniconti; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 172

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 172, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2021.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 350, a bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

S. 393

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 393, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 966

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 966, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize the physician self-referral prohibitions to promote care coordination in the merit-based incentive payment system and to facilitate physician practice participation in alternative payment models under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 982

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to promote United States-Mongolia trade by authorizing duty-free treatment for certain imports from Mongolia, and for other purposes.

S. 1311

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1311, a bill to provide lasting protection for inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System.

S. 1397

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1397, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to provide for a national Federal write-in absentee ballot for domestic use.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing.

S. 1572

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1572, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1601

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1601, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes.

S. 1657

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1657, a bill to provide assistance to combat the escalating burden of Lyme disease and other tick and vector-borne diseases and disorders.

S. 1772

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, *supra*.

S. 1868

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill to provide support to States to establish invisible high-risk pool or reinsurance programs.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1992, a bill to amend the FAST Act to repeal a rescission of funds.

S. 2012

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2012, a bill to provide that certain regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect.

S. 2180

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2180, a bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections.

S. 2203

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2203, a bill to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization

System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes.

S. 2407

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2407, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for individuals acting as agents or attorneys for the preparation, presentation, or prosecution of a claim under a law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs without being recognized by the Secretary for such purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2418

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2418, a bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify a definition and the disposition and authorized uses of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act and to exempt State and county payments under that Act from sequestration, to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 2446

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2446, a bill to provide certain coverage of audiologist services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to counter efforts by foreign governments to pursue, harass, or otherwise persecute individuals for political and other unlawful motives overseas, and for other purposes.

S. 2491

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to terminate certain rules issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce relating to endangered and threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2539, a bill to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2549

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms.

DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2549, a bill to allow nonprofit child care providers to participate in the loan programs of the Small Business Administration.

S. 2615

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2615, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2666

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2666, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 2671

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2671, a bill to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives by investing in effective violence reduction initiatives.

S. 2679

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2679, a bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2680

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2680, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, *supra*.

S. 2732

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2732, a bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to establish the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Terra, and for other purposes.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2733, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as co-

sponsors of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2743, a bill to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, and for other purposes.

S. 2754

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2754, a bill to create jobs and drive innovation and economic growth in the United States by supporting and promoting the manufacture of next-generation technologies, including refrigerants, solvents, fire suppressants, foam blowing agents, aerosols, and propellants.

S. 2765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 2765, a bill to improve Federal fiscal controls and the congressional budget process.

S. 2774

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

S. 2794

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2794, a bill to provide for the creation of the Missing Armed Forces Personnel Records Collection at the National Archives, to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of Missing Armed Forces Personnel records, and for other purposes.

S. 2805

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2805, a bill to improve transit-oriented development financing, and for other purposes.

S. 2833

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2833, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to extend the consumer credit protections provided to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents under title 10, United States Code, to all consumers.

S. 2836

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2836, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action to implement,

enforce, or otherwise give effect to the final rule, entitled "Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority".

S. 2869

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2869, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 395

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 395, a resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Iran Hostage Crisis, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 411

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 411, a resolution affirming that States maintain primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands, that the President has no authority to declare a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing on State and private lands, and that the President should not attempt to declare a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands (including the Outer Continental Shelf) or lands held in trust for an Indian Tribe, unless the moratorium is authorized by an Act of Congress.

S. RES. 418

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 418, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Government of Turkey's crackdown on dissent related to its incursion into northeast Syria, and broader human rights violations.

S. RES. 420

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 420, a resolution encouraging the President to expand the list of the Department of Veterans Affairs of presumptive medical conditions associated with exposure to Agent Orange to include Parkinsonism, bladder cancer, hypertension, and hypothyroidism.

S. RES. 429

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 429, a resolution recognizing the importance of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the laws derived from the Civil Rights Act of 1866.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2896. A bill to establish the Pullman National Historical Park in the State of Illinois as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2896

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pullman National Historical Park Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1970, the Secretary of the Interior designated the Pullman Historic District as a National Historic Landmark District because of—

(A) the significance of the District to the labor history, social history, architecture, and urban planning of the United States; and
(B) the pivotal role of events in the District in creating the first national Labor Day holiday in the world;

(2) between 1880 and 1884, George M. Pullman, owner of the Pullman Palace Car Company, built the Pullman community, which was envisioned by Pullman as an industrial town that would provide employees with—

(A) a model community; and
(B) suitable living conditions;
(3) the town developed by George M. Pullman, which consisted of over 1,000 buildings and homes, was awarded "The World's Most Perfect Town" at the International Hygienic and Pharmaceutical Exposition in 1896;

(4) the Pullman factory site is a true symbol of the historic struggle in the United States to achieve fair labor practices for the working class, with the original factory serving as the catalyst for the first industry-wide strike in the United States;

(5) in the midst of economic depression in 1894, to protest unsafe conditions and reductions in pay, Pullman factory workers initiated a strike that—

(A) when taken up as a cause by the American Railway Union, crippled the entire rail industry;

(B) continued even in the face of a Federal injunction and a showdown between laborers and Federal troops that turned violent and deadly; and

(C) set a national example for the ability of working people in the United States to change the existing system in favor of more just practices for protecting workers rights and safety;

(6) following the deaths of a number of workers at the hands of the United States military and United States Marshals during the 1894 strike, Congress unanimously voted to approve rush legislation that created a national Labor Day holiday, which was signed into law by President Grover Cleveland 6 days after the end of the strike;

(7) the Pullman Palace Car Company also played an important role in African-Amer-

ican and early civil rights history through the legacy of the Pullman porters, many of whom were ex-slaves and employed in a heavily discriminatory environment immediately following the Civil War;

(8) the Pullman porters, who served diligently between the 1870s and the 1960s, have been commended for—

(A) their level of service and attention to detail; and

(B) their contributions to the development of the African-American middle class;

(9) the information, ideas, and commerce the Pullman porters carried across the country while traveling on trains helped to bring education and wealth to African-American communities throughout the United States;

(10) the positive role of the Pullman porters in the historical image of the first-class service that was made available on Pullman cars is unmistakable;

(11) the Pullman community was the seminal home to the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, which—

(A) was founded by civil rights pioneer A. Philip Randolph in 1925;

(B) was the first African-American labor union with a collective bargaining agreement;

(C) fought—

(i) against discrimination; and

(ii) in support of just labor practices; and

(D) helped lay the groundwork for what became the great Civil Rights Movement of the 20th Century;

(12) the Pullman community is—

(A) a paramount illustration of the work of architect Solon Spencer Beman;

(B) a well-preserved example of 19th Century community planning, architecture, and landscape design; and

(C) comprised of a number of historic structures, including the Administration Clock Tower Building, Hotel Florence, Greenstone Church, Market Square, and hundreds of units of rowhouses built for Pullman workers;

(13) the preservation of the Pullman site has been threatened by—

(A) plans for demolition in 1960; and

(B) a fire in 1998, which damaged the iconic clock tower and the rear erecting shops;

(14) the diligent efforts of community organizations, foundations, nonprofit organizations, residents, the State, and units of local government in the restoration and preservation of the District after the 1998 fire were vital to the protection of the Pullman site;

(15) due to the historic and architectural significance of the District, the District is designated as—

(A) a registered National Historic Landmark District;

(B) an Illinois State Landmark; and

(C) a City of Chicago Landmark District; and

(16) the preservation, enhancement, economic, and tourism potential and management of the important historic and architectural resources of the Park requires cooperation and partnerships from among local property owners, the Federal Government, the State, units of local government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and the more than 100 civic organizations that have expressed support for community preservation through the establishment of the Pullman National Historical Park.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) PARK.—The term "Park" means the Pullman National Historical Park established by section 4(a).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Illinois.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PULLMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.**—There is established in the State a unit of the National Park System, to be known as the “Pullman National Historical Park”—

(1) to preserve and interpret for the benefit of future generations—

(A) the significant labor, industrial, civil rights, and social history of the Park;

(B) the significant architectural structures in the Park; and

(C) the role of the Pullman community in the creation of the first national Labor Day holiday in the world;

(2) to coordinate preservation, protection, and interpretation efforts of the Park by the Federal Government, the State, units of local government, and private and nonprofit organizations; and

(3) to coordinate appropriate management options necessary to ensure the protection, preservation, and interpretation of the many significant aspects of the Park.

(b) **PARK BOUNDARY.**—The boundary of the Park—

(1) shall be established by the Secretary; but

(2) shall not exceed the boundary of the approximately 300-acre Pullman Historic District in Chicago, which is between—

(A) 103rd Street on the north;

(B) 115th Street on the south;

(C) Cottage Grove Avenue on the west; and

(D) the Norfolk & Western Rail Line on the east.

(c) **INCLUSION OF HISTORIC SITES.**—On conveyance by the State to the Secretary, the Park shall include—

(1) the Pullman Factory Complex, including the Clock Tower Building and rear erecting shops; and

(2) the approximately 13 acres of land on which the structures described in paragraph (1) are located.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer land within the boundary of the Park in accordance with—

(1) this Act; and

(2) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(B) chapter 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State or other public and nonpublic entities, under which the Secretary may identify, interpret, and provide assistance for the preservation of non-Federal land within the boundaries of the Park and at sites in close proximity to the Park but located outside the boundaries of the Park, including providing for placement of directional and interpretive signage, exhibits, and technology-based interpretive devices.

(c) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—The Secretary may acquire for inclusion in the Park any land (including interests in land), buildings, or structures owned by the State or any other political, private, or nonprofit entity by donation, transfer, exchange, or purchase from a willing seller.

(d) **TECHNICAL AND PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary may provide public interpretation and technical assistance for the preservation of historic structures of, the maintenance of the cultural landscape of, and local preservation planning for, related historic and cultural resources within the boundaries of the Park.

(e) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act,

the Secretary, in consultation with the State, shall complete a general management plan for the Park in accordance with—

(1) section 100502 of title 54, United States Code; and

(2) any other applicable laws.

(f) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this Act modifies any authority of the Federal Government to carry out Federal laws on Federal land located in the Park.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2901. A bill to establish within the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services a special task force on ensuring Medicare beneficiary access to innovative diabetes technologies and services; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my fellow co-chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, which would improve access to innovative diabetes technologies. Our bill, the Improving Medicare Beneficiary Access to Innovative Diabetes Technologies Act, would create a special task force at the Department of Health and Human Services to examine and address barriers that seniors face in accessing the latest diabetes management technologies.

Since I founded the bipartisan Senate Diabetes Caucus in 1997 Federal funding for diabetes research has tripled from \$319 million to more than \$1 billion last year, and these research dollars are yielding results. This past summer, the Aging Committee held a hearing in conjunction with the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation’s Children’s Congress titled “Redefining Reality: How the Special Diabetes Program is Changing the Lives of Americans with Type 1 Diabetes.” We heard compelling testimony from Dr. Griffin P. Rodgers, Director of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and JDRF President and CEO Dr. Aaron Kowalski on the pipeline from private-public research to commercially available products.

New diabetes technologies—such as the artificial pancreas and implantable continuous glucose monitoring systems—allow diabetes patients to better manage and improve glycemic control, assess needed therapy on a timely basis, and adhere to treatment regimens. These technological advances make diabetes easier to manage. The market arrival of cutting-edge diabetes technologies, however, does not immediately benefit patients if our nation’s seniors are unable to afford them.

As Chairman of the Aging Committee, I have heard from numerous seniors who, when transitioning from employer-provided insurance to Medicare, were shocked to learn that the technologies they have relied upon for years to manage their diabetes are no longer covered. For example, one Main-er was unfortunately met with the re-

ality that Medicare’s coverage denial of a particular sensor he needs for his insulin pump means paying up to \$8,000 out-of-pocket each year if he wants to continue with his current treatment regimen. He wrote, “Because I am now 65, I am denied care that was available when I was 64.” He continued, “This approach not only puts me at risk but is quite likely not cost effective. While the sensors are expensive, the cost of ambulance calls and hospitalizations . . . is certainly more.”

I couldn’t agree more. To better support adoption of these technologies, our bill would require HHS to create a special task force on coverage and payment for innovative diabetes technologies that would bring all stakeholders—from patients to device manufacturers to government officials who are making coverage decisions—to the same table. The Task Force would identify and plan for changes in Medicare coverage and payment policies to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have access to innovative diabetes technologies that are currently available, as well as those that are in the pipeline. The Task Force would also be tasked with developing strategies for supporting adoption of these technologies.

This effort builds on my past advocacy with Senator SHAHEEN to improve the day-to-day life of individuals with diabetes by improving coverage of innovative diabetes technologies. In January 2017, in response to our bipartisan effort, CMS first approved the use of continuous glucose monitors (CGMs). We also successfully urged CMS last year to support the use of smartphone apps in conjunction with CGMs. These proven, lifesaving devices are relied upon by people with diabetes to provide them with real-time measurements of their glucose levels. This information is key to preventing costly—and sometimes deadly—diabetes complications.

While I am pleased our advocacy has helped spur these policy changes, I remain frustrated with the pace at which Medicare lags behind commercial insurers. Greater adoption of new diabetes technologies can literally change our country’s future with regard to addressing the explosive growth in the financial and human tolls of diabetes. Diabetes accounts for an exorbitant one in three dollars in Medicare spending. It is paramount that we encourage HHS to adopt a more cost-effective approach to treating this chronic disease that affects more than 30 million Americans.

The Improving Medicare Beneficiary Access to Innovative Diabetes Technologies Act encourages a proactive approach to diabetes technology coverage and payment, and I encourage my colleagues to support its adoption.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—DESIGNATING DECEMBER 10, 2019, AS “WYOMING WOMEN’S SUFFRAGE DAY”

Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 430

Whereas the epithets for the State of Wyoming are the “Cowboy State” and, more aptly, the “Equality State”;

Whereas the official State motto of Wyoming is “Equal Rights”;

Whereas, at the founding of the United States, the inherent right of women to vote and participate in the political process was inhibited;

Whereas the contributions of women to the fight for the independence, founding, and rise to prominence of the United States were extensive, vital to those objectives, and worthy of recognition;

Whereas women, like all persons, have always inherently held the right to vote and participate in government;

Whereas, on December 10, 1869, the Wyoming Territory approved the first law in the history of the United States to grant women the right to vote and hold public office;

Whereas, in 1869, the Territorial Legislature of the Wyoming Territory also passed legislation formally enabling women to hold property and assuring equal pay for teachers;

Whereas the government of the Wyoming Territory was the first government to explicitly acknowledge and affirm the inherent right of women to vote and to hold office;

Whereas the Wyoming Territory granted women the right to vote more than 20 years before Wyoming became the 44th State admitted to the Union;

Whereas, when Congress invited Wyoming to join the Union and demanded that women’s suffrage be revoked, the Wyoming Legislature said, “We will remain out of the Union one hundred years rather than come in without the women”;

Whereas, on September 6, 1870, Louisa Gardner Swain became the first woman in the world to cast a ballot after being granted universal suffrage in Wyoming;

Whereas the right of women to vote in Wyoming has been maintained in perpetuity;

Whereas, on March 7, 1870, in Laramie, Wyoming, the first jury in the United States to include women was sworn in;

Whereas, in 1870, Mary Atkinson served as the first female court bailiff in Laramie, Wyoming;

Whereas Esther Hobart Morris was appointed to serve as justice of the peace in February 1870, making her the first woman to serve as a judge in the United States;

Whereas, in 1892, the women of Wyoming became the first women to vote in a presidential election;

Whereas, in 1894, the people of Wyoming elected Estelle Reel to serve as the State superintendent of public instruction, making her one of the first women in the United States elected to serve in a statewide office;

Whereas, in 1920, the residents of the town of Jackson, Wyoming, elected a city council composed entirely of women, the first all-women government in the United States, which was dubbed the “petticoat government” by the press;

Whereas, in 1924, Wyoming became the first state to elect a female governor, Nellie Tayloe Ross;

Whereas, on May 3, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Nellie Tayloe

Ross as Director of the United States Mint, making Ross the first woman to hold that position;

Whereas, as Director of the United States Mint, Nellie Tayloe Ross oversaw the establishment of the Franklin half dollar and the beginning of the production of proof coins for public sale;

Whereas the United States did not endorse women’s suffrage until 1920, with the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, 50 years after Wyoming;

Whereas the decision of the people of Wyoming to endorse women’s suffrage demonstrates the foresight, bravery, individualism, and honesty of the citizens of Wyoming and the staunch adherence of the citizens of Wyoming to the storied “Code of the West”;

Whereas achieving voting rights for all women required firm and continuing resolve to overcome reluctance, and even fervent opposition, to rightful enfranchisement;

Whereas the milestones of women’s suffrage in Wyoming illuminate and strengthen the heritage of Wyoming as the “Equality State”;

Whereas December 10, 2019, marks the 150th anniversary of the date on which women’s suffrage became law in Wyoming; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by women to Wyoming and the United States should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 10, 2019, as “Wyoming Women’s Suffrage Day”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 431—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN DIABETES MONTH

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. JONES, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 431

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as the “CDC”)—

(1) 30,300,000 individuals in the United States have diabetes; and

(2) an estimated 84,100,000 individuals in the United States who are 18 years of age or older have prediabetes;

Whereas diabetes is a serious chronic condition that affects individuals of every age, race, ethnicity, and income level;

Whereas the CDC reports that—

(1) Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans are disproportionately affected by diabetes and suffer from the disease at much higher rates than the general population of the United States; and

(2) 23.8 percent of individuals with diabetes in the United States have not been diagnosed with the disease;

Whereas, according to the CDC—

(1) an individual who is 20 years of age or older is diagnosed with diabetes every 21 seconds;

(2) the prevalence of diabetes in the United States increased more than threefold between 1990 and 2015; and

(3) in 2015, diabetes was the seventh leading cause of death in the United States and con-

tributed to the deaths of more than 252,806 individuals during that year;

Whereas approximately 4,110 adults in the United States are diagnosed with diabetes each day;

Whereas the CDC estimates that approximately 1,500,000 adults in the United States were newly diagnosed with diabetes in 2015;

Whereas a joint study carried out by the National Institutes of Health and the CDC found that, in the United States during 2011 and 2012—

(1) an estimated 17,900 individuals younger than 20 years of age were newly diagnosed with type 1 diabetes; and

(2) 5,300 individuals between the ages of 10 and 19 were newly diagnosed with type 2 diabetes;

Whereas, in the United States, more than 9.4 percent of the population, including 25.2 percent of individuals who are 65 years of age or older, have diabetes;

Whereas the risk of developing diabetes at some point in life is 40 percent for adults in the United States;

Whereas, after accounting for the difference of the average age of each population, data surveying adults in the United States between 2013 and 2015 indicates that 7.4 percent of non-Hispanic Whites, 12.7 percent of non-Hispanic Blacks, 12.1 percent of Hispanics, and 8 percent of Asian Americans have been diagnosed with diabetes;

Whereas, according to the American Diabetes Association, the United States spent an estimated \$327,000,000,000 on cases of diagnosed diabetes in 2017, an increase of 26 percent since 2012, and out-of-pocket costs for insulin have grown significantly in recent years for many patients;

Whereas the American Diabetes Association reports that care for people with diagnosed diabetes accounts for 1 in 4 health care dollars spent in the United States;

Whereas, as of November 2019, a cure for diabetes does not exist;

Whereas there are successful means to reduce the incidence, and delay the onset, of type 2 diabetes;

Whereas, with proper management and treatment, individuals with diabetes live healthy and productive lives; and

Whereas individuals in the United States celebrate American Diabetes Month in November: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of American Diabetes Month, including—

(A) encouraging individuals in the United States to fight diabetes through public awareness of prevention and treatment options; and

(B) enhancing diabetes education;

(2) recognizes the importance of awareness and early detection, including awareness of symptoms and risk factors such as—

(A) being—

(i) older than 45 years of age; or

(ii) overweight; and

(B) having—

(i) a particular racial and ethnic background;

(ii) a low level of physical activity;

(iii) high blood pressure;

(iv) a family history of diabetes; or

(v) a history of diabetes during pregnancy; and

(3) supports decreasing the prevalence of type 1, type 2, and gestational diabetes in the United States through research, treatment, and prevention.

SENATE RESOLUTION 432—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 2019 AS “NATIONAL COLLEGE APPLICATION MONTH”

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 432

Whereas equality of opportunity for all people is one of the noblest aspirations of the United States;

Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics reports that the employment rate for young adults with a bachelor's degree and the employment rate for young adults whose highest credential is a high school diploma differ by 14 percentage points;

Whereas a 2015 study by Georgetown University identified that the average lifetime earnings gap between college graduates and individuals with only a high school diploma is \$1,000,000;

Whereas the Pew Economic Mobility Project finds that whether a child born in the lowest income quintile obtains a 4-year degree or higher credential is associated with—

(1) an approximately 70 percent difference in the probability of that child earning an income outside the lowest income quintile; and

(2) a threefold difference in the probability of that child going on to earn an income in the highest income quintile;

Whereas the Education Commission of the States highlights that the number of non-traditional students at colleges and universities is expected to rise 65 percent faster than the number of traditional students during the 15-year period ending in 2024;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that approximately 31 percent of high school graduates in 2018 did not matriculate to an institution of higher education the following fall semester, representing little change in the college enrollment of new high school graduates from the prior year;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics also reports that the unemployment rate for recent high school graduates not enrolled in college in the fall semester of 2018 was 18.6 percent, significantly higher than the national unemployment rate;

Whereas many secondary students struggle to identify and assess postsecondary options due to a number of factors, including insufficient information on programmatic outcomes and difficulties in accessing effective or consistent counseling services and resources;

Whereas the complexity of financial aid systems and processes, rising college costs, and a shortage of effective financial education and literacy programs can serve as additional deterrents or barriers for students and families as they assess the viability of higher education programs as a postsecondary option;

Whereas the United States built a thriving middle class in part by nurturing the potential for colleges and universities to provide avenues to economic opportunity;

Whereas the data on the benefits of higher education demonstrate that, in spite of ongoing barriers to access and student success, colleges and universities can still provide pathways to economic opportunity; and

Whereas completion of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid is one of the best predictors of future college enrollment, as high school seniors who complete the form are 63 percent more likely to begin postsecondary education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 2019 as “National College Application Month”;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to—

(A) evaluate options for pursuing higher education;

(B) submit a Free Application for Federal Student Aid to understand college financing opportunities; and

(C) support every student, regardless of the background or resources of the student, in obtaining the skills and knowledge needed to thrive;

(3) supports efforts to better assist low-income and first generation students throughout the financial aid and college application process;

(4) urges public officials, educators, parents, students, and communities in the United States to observe National College Application Month with appropriate activities and programs designed to encourage students to consider, research, and apply to college and for financial aid; and

(5) commends teachers, counselors, mentors, and parents who support students throughout the college application process, as well as the organizations and institutions partnering to eliminate barriers to higher education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 433—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 1, 2020, AS “BLUE STAR MOTHER’S DAY”

Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 433

Whereas, on January 22, 1942, in the midst of the Second World War, United States Army Captain George Maines ran an advertisement in the Flint News Observer calling for mothers of members of the Armed Forces to meet;

Whereas, on February 1, 1942, 300 mothers of members of the Armed Forces held their first meeting at the Durant Hotel in Flint, Michigan, and February 1, 2020, is the 78th anniversary of that meeting;

Whereas, on July 14, 1960, the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., received its charter from Congress;

Whereas Blue Star Mothers make enormous sacrifices while their sons and daughters are providing for the defense of the United States;

Whereas Blue Star Mothers pack and ship thousands of care packages every year to members of the Armed Forces deployed overseas, volunteer to help homeless veterans, provide support for wounded warriors, visit with hospitalized veterans, honor fallen heroes during funeral services, and offer a compassionate community for the mothers of men and women of the Armed Forces serving in harm's way;

Whereas Blue Star Mothers promote the values of the United States, demonstrate a patriotic spirit, and advance a national sense of pride and appreciation for the men and women of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas there are 198 active chapters of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., throughout the United States representing thousands of military families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 1, 2020, as “Blue Star Mother’s Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes—

(A) the contributions of the members of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc.; and

(B) the important role Blue Star Mothers play in supporting each other and members and veterans of the Armed Forces; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to—

(A) to observe Blue Star Mother’s Day; and

(B) to support the work of local chapters of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc.

SENATE RESOLUTION 434—HONORING THE LIFE OF NICHOLAS ANTHONY BUONICONTI

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 434

Whereas Nicholas Anthony Buoniconti (referred to in this preamble as “Nick Buoniconti”) passed away at his home in Bridgehampton, New York, on July 30, 2019;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti was born on December 15, 1940, in Springfield, Massachusetts;

Whereas the parents of Nick Buoniconti, Nicholas Buoniconti Sr. and Pasqualina (Mercolino) Buoniconti, contributed greatly to the Springfield community and ran an Italian bakery named Mercolino’s in the South End neighborhood of the city;

Whereas the brother of Nick Buoniconti, Peter Buoniconti, remembers him as the best athlete and the smartest and toughest kid in the South End;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti played guard on offense and linebacker on defense for the football team of the University of Notre Dame and graduated from the university in 1962;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti was chosen in the 13th round of the 1962 American Football League (referred to in this preamble as the “AFL”) draft by the Boston Patriots;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti played for the Patriots from 1962 until 1968;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti appeared in 5 AFL All-Star games and made 24 interceptions during his time with the Patriots;

Whereas, in 1968, Nick Buoniconti earned his juris doctor from Suffolk University Law School in Boston and was a member of both the Florida Bar and the Massachusetts Bar;

Whereas, in 1969, Nick Buoniconti was traded to the Miami Dolphins, for whom he played until 1976;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti was the captain of the back-to-back Super Bowl Championship teams of the Dolphins, including the undefeated 1972 team;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti earned the Most Valuable Player title of the Dolphins 3 times during his career with the team;

Whereas, in 7 seasons with the Dolphins, Nick Buoniconti earned 3 Pro Bowl berths and advanced to 3 straight Super Bowl appearances, winning 2 of them;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti was inducted into the National Football League (referred to in this preamble as the “NFL”) Pro Football Hall of Fame in 2001 for his years as a middle linebacker with the Patriots and the Dolphins;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti served as an agent to professional athletes and, for 23 seasons, co-hosted the weekly sports show “Inside the NFL”;

Whereas, on September 8, 2019, the Dolphins honored the passing of Nick Buoniconti by wearing a helmet sticker with his initials, “NAB”, during the regular season opener of the team;

Whereas current NFL commissioner Roger Goodell praised Nick Buoniconti for his grit, fearlessness, and skill while playing with the Patriots and the Dolphins;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti consistently advocated and fought for the health and safety of other NFL players;

Whereas, in 1985, the beloved son of Nick Buoniconti, Marc Buoniconti, became a quadriplegic after suffering a spinal cord injury while playing college football;

Whereas Nick and Marc Buoniconti were among the co-founders of the Miami Project to Cure Paralysis at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, a leading research center for spinal cord and brain injuries;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti founded The Buoniconti Fund, which has raised more than \$500,000,000 to fund the mission of the Miami Project to find a cure for paralysis resulting from spinal cord injury;

Whereas Nick Buoniconti donated his brain to the Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy (referred to in this preamble as “CTE”) Center of Boston University and the Concussion Legacy Foundation;

Whereas, upon making the decision to donate his brain, Nick Buoniconti expressed his hope for a better understanding of the long-term effects of CTE and other brain injuries that impact thousands of individuals each year; and

Whereas Nick Buoniconti served on the Board of Trustees of the University of Miami for 27 years and received the Man of the Year “Helping Hands Award” from the Miller School of Medicine; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends its heartfelt sympathies to the family, friends, and teammates of Nicholas Anthony Buoniconti (referred to in this resolving clause as “Nicholas Buoniconti”);

(2) honors the life and legacy of Nicholas Buoniconti; and

(3) expresses appreciation for the fight of Nicholas Buoniconti both on and off the field.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1246. Mr. RUBIO proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1838, to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

SA 1247. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2710, to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

SA 1248. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2710, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1246. Mr. RUBIO proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1838, to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Statement of policy.
- Sec. 4. Amendments to the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992.
- Sec. 5. Annual report on violations of United States export control laws and United Nations sanctions occurring in Hong Kong.
- Sec. 6. Protecting United States citizens and others from rendition to the People’s Republic of China.
- Sec. 7. Sanctions relating to undermining fundamental freedoms and autonomy in Hong Kong.

Sec. 8. Sanctions reports.

Sec. 9. Sense of Congress on People’s Republic of China state-controlled media.

Sec. 10. Sense of Congress on commercial exports of crowd control equipment to Hong Kong.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SOCIAL CREDIT SYSTEM.**—The term “social credit system” means a system proposed by the Government of the People’s Republic of China and scheduled for implementation by 2020, which would—

(A) use existing financial credit systems, public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business; and

(B) use such data to monitor, shape, and rate certain financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

(3) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a lawfully admitted permanent resident of the United States; or

(C) an entity organized under the laws of—

(i) the United States; or

(ii) any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the principles and objectives set forth in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383), namely that—

(A) the United States has “a strong interest in the continued vitality, prosperity, and stability of Hong Kong”;

(B) “[s]upport for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy” and therefore “naturally applies to United States policy toward Hong Kong”;

(C) “the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong [and] serve as a basis for Hong Kong’s continued economic prosperity”;

(D) Hong Kong must remain sufficiently autonomous from the People’s Republic of China to “justify treatment under a particular law of the United States, or any provision thereof, different from that accorded the People’s Republic of China”;

(2) to support the high degree of autonomy and fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong, as enumerated by—

(A) the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing December

19, 1984 (referred to in this Act as the “Joint Declaration”);

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

(C) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948;

(3) to support the democratic aspirations of the people of Hong Kong, including the “ultimate aim” of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, as articulated in the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China (referred to in this Act as the “Basic Law”);

(4) to urge the Government of the People’s Republic of China to uphold its commitments to Hong Kong, including allowing the people of Hong Kong to govern Hong Kong with a high degree of autonomy and without undue interference, and ensuring that Hong Kong voters freely enjoy the right to elect the Chief Executive and all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

(5) to support the establishment of a genuine democratic option to freely and fairly nominate and elect the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, and the establishment by 2020 of open and direct democratic elections for all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council;

(6) to support the robust exercise by residents of Hong Kong of the rights to free speech, the press, and other fundamental freedoms, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(7) to support freedom from arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention, or imprisonment for all Hong Kong residents, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(8) to draw international attention to any violations by the Government of the People’s Republic of China of the fundamental rights of the people of Hong Kong, as provided by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and any encroachment upon the autonomy guaranteed to Hong Kong by the Basic Law and the Joint Declaration;

(9) to protect United States citizens and long-term permanent residents living in Hong Kong, as well as people visiting and transiting through Hong Kong;

(10) to maintain the economic and cultural ties that provide significant benefits to both the United States and Hong Kong; and

(11) to coordinate with allies, including the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, to promote democracy and human rights in Hong Kong.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES-HONG KONG POLICY ACT OF 1992.

(a) **REPORT.**—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(b), by striking “such date” each place such term appears and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 205. SECRETARY OF STATE REPORT REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF HONG KONG.

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, on at least an annual basis, and in conjunction with the report required under section 301, shall issue a certification to Congress that—

“(A) indicates whether Hong Kong continues to warrant treatment under United States law in the same manner as United

States laws were applied to Hong Kong before July 1, 1997;

“(B) addresses—

“(i) commercial agreements;

“(ii) law enforcement cooperation, including extradition requests;

“(iii) sanctions enforcement;

“(iv) export controls, and any other agreements and forms of exchange involving dual use, critical, or other sensitive technologies;

“(v) any formal treaties or agreements between the United States and Hong Kong;

“(vi) other areas of bilateral cooperation that the Secretary determines to be relevant; and

“(vii) decision-making within the Government of Hong Kong, including executive, legislative, and judicial structures, including—

“(I) freedom of assembly;

“(II) freedom of speech;

“(III) freedom of expression; and

“(IV) freedom of the press, including the Internet and social media;

“(viii) universal suffrage, including the ultimate aim of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

“(ix) judicial independence;

“(x) police and security functions;

“(xi) education;

“(xii) laws or regulations regarding treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, or theft of state secrets;

“(xiii) laws or regulations regarding foreign political organizations or bodies;

“(xiv) laws or regulations regarding political organizations; and

“(xv) other rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

“(C) includes—

“(i) an assessment of the degree of any erosions to Hong Kong’s autonomy in each category listed in subparagraph (B) resulting from actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China that are inconsistent with its commitments under the Basic Law or the Joint Declaration;

“(ii) an evaluation of the specific impacts to any areas of cooperation between the United States and Hong Kong resulting from erosions of autonomy in Hong Kong or failures of the Government of Hong Kong to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements within the categories listed in subparagraph (B); and

“(iii) a list of any specific actions taken by the United States Government in response to any erosion of autonomy or failures to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements identified in this certification and the report required under section 301.

“(2) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making each certification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The certification under section (1) shall be issued annually, but the Secretary may issue additional certifications at any time if the Secretary determines it is warranted by circumstances in Hong Kong.

“(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, the Secretary notifies the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the intent to waive such subsection;

“(2) PARTIAL WAIVER.—Except for the list of actions described in subsection (a)(1)(C)(iii), the Secretary of State may waive relevant parts of the application of subsection (a) if the President issues an Executive order under section 202 that suspends the application of any particular United States law to Hong Kong.”

(b) VISA APPLICANTS.—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 206. TREATMENT OF HONG KONG APPLICANTS FOR VISAS TO STUDY OR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) VISA ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN HONG KONG STUDENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, applications for visas to enter, study, or work in the United States, which are submitted by otherwise qualified applicants who resided in Hong Kong in 2014 and later, may not be denied primarily on the basis of the applicant’s subjection to politically-motivated arrest, detention, or other adverse government action.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that consular officers are aware of the policy described in subsection (a) and receive appropriate training and support to ensure that the policy is carried out so that affected individuals do not face discrimination or unnecessary delay in the processing of their visa applications, including—

“(1) providing specialized training for all consular officers posted to the United States Embassy in Beijing or to any United States consulate in the People’s Republic of China, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, or the Macau Special Administrative Region;

“(2) instructing the United States Consulate in Hong Kong to maintain an active list of individuals who are known to have been formally charged, detained, or convicted by the Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region or by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, or intermediaries of such governments, based on politically-motivated considerations related to their exercise of rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, to facilitate the cross-checking of visa applications for Hong Kong residents; and

“(3) updating any relevant United States Government websites with information on the policy described in subsection (a).

“(c) COOPERATION WITH LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State shall contact appropriate representatives of other democratic countries, particularly those who receive a large number of applicants for student and employment visas from Hong Kong—

“(1) to inform them of the United States policy regarding arrests for participation in nonviolent protests in Hong Kong; and

“(2) to encourage them to take similar steps to ensure the rights of nonviolent protesters are protected from discrimination due to the actions of the Government of Hong Kong and of the Government of the People’s Republic of China.”

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF UNITED STATES EXPORT CONTROL LAWS AND UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS OCCURRING IN HONG KONG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the committees specified in subsection (b) that includes—

(1) an assessment of the nature and extent of violations of United States export control and sanctions laws occurring in Hong Kong;

(2) to the extent possible, the identification of—

(A) any items that were reexported from Hong Kong in violation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) the countries and persons to which the items referred to in subparagraph (A) were reexported; and

(C) how such items were used;

(3) an assessment of whether sensitive dual-use items subject to the export control laws of the United States are being—

(A) transshipped through Hong Kong; and

(B) used to develop—

(i) the Sharp Eyes, Skynet, Integrated Joint Operations Platform, or other systems of mass surveillance and predictive policing; or

(ii) the “social credit system” of the People’s Republic of China;

(4) an assessment of the efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to use the status of Hong Kong as a separate customs territory to import items into the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong in violation of the export control laws of the United States, whether as part of the Greater Bay Area plan, through the assignment by Beijing of Hong Kong as a national technology and innovation center, or through other programs that may exploit Hong Kong as a conduit for controlled sensitive technology;

(5) an assessment of whether the Government of Hong Kong has adequately enforced sanctions imposed by the United Nations;

(6) a description of the types of goods and services transshipped or reexported through Hong Kong in violation of such sanctions to—

(A) North Korea or Iran; or

(B) other countries, regimes, or persons subject to such sanctions for engaging in activities—

(i) relating to international terrorism, international narcotics trafficking, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; or

(ii) that otherwise present a threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States; and

(7) an assessment of whether shortcomings in the enforcement of export controls or sanctions by the Government of Hong Kong necessitates the assignment of additional Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, or Department of State personnel to the United States Consulate in Hong Kong.

(b) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(5) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in

unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 6. PROTECTING UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND OTHERS FROM RENDITION TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) **POLICY STATEMENTS.**—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to safeguard United States citizens from extradition, rendition, or abduction to the People's Republic of China from Hong Kong for trial, detention, or any other purpose;

(2) to safeguard United States businesses in Hong Kong from economic coercion and intellectual property theft;

(3) pursuant to section 103(7) of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5713(7)), to encourage United States businesses "to continue to operate in Hong Kong, in accordance with applicable United States and Hong Kong law"; and

(4) pursuant to section 201(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 5721(b)), to evaluate, not less frequently than annually and as circumstances dictate whether the Government of Hong Kong is "legally competent to carry out its obligations" under treaties and international agreements established between the United States and Hong Kong.

(b) **RESPONSE TO THREAT OF RENDITION.**—Not later than 30 days after the President determines that legislation proposed or enacted by the Government of Hong Kong would put United States citizens at risk of extradition or rendition to the People's Republic of China or to other countries that lack protections for the rights of defendants, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) contains a strategy for protecting United States citizens and businesses in Hong Kong;

(2) assesses the potential risks of the legislation to United States citizens residing in, traveling to, or transiting through Hong Kong; and

(3) determines whether—

(A) additional resources are needed for American Citizen Services at the United States Consulate in Hong Kong; and

(B) the Government of Hong Kong is "legally competent" to administer the United States-Hong Kong Agreement for the Surrender of Fugitive Offenders, done at Hong Kong December 20, 1996, or other relevant law enforcement agreements between the United States and Hong Kong.

SEC. 7. SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, in accordance with paragraph (2), that identifies each foreign person that the President determines is responsible for—

(A) the extrajudicial rendition, arbitrary detention, or torture of any person in Hong Kong; or

(B) other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Hong Kong.

(2) **TIMING OF REPORTS.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) the report required under paragraph (1)—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) not less frequently than annually thereafter in conjunction with the publication of the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731); and

(B) an update to the report not later than 15 days after any new action is taken under

subsection (b) based on the discovery of new information described in paragraph (1).

(3) **CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President shall consider—

(A) information provided jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of each of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) information obtained by other countries or reputable nongovernmental organizations that monitor violations of human rights abuses.

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

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) **IMMEDIATE EFFECT.**—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et

seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) **GOOD DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term "good" means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) **SUNSET.**—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms "admission", "admitted", and "alien" have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term "foreign person" means a person that is not a United States person.

SEC. 8. SANCTIONS REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 7, the President shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a report that includes—

(1) a list of each foreign person with respect to which the President imposed sanctions during the year preceding the submission of the report;

(2) a description of the type of sanctions imposed with respect to each such person;

(3) the number of foreign persons with respect to which the President terminated sanctions under section 7 during that year;

(4) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed or terminated, as applicable;

(5) the reasons for imposing or terminating such sanctions; and

(6) a description of the efforts of the President to encourage the governments of other

countries to impose sanctions that are similar to the sanctions authorized under section 7.

(b) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO VISA RECORDS.**—The President shall publish the report required under subsection (a) without regard to the requirements of section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)) with respect to confidentiality of records pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA STATE-CONTROLLED MEDIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States condemns the deliberate targeting and harassment of democracy activists, diplomatic personnel of the United States and other nations, and their families by media organizations controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including Wen Wei Po and Ta Kung Po;

(2) the Secretary of State should clearly inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the use of media outlets to spread disinformation or to intimidate and threaten its perceived enemies in Hong Kong or in other countries is unacceptable; and

(3) the Secretary of State should take any activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) into consideration when granting visas for travel and work in the United States to journalists from the People's Republic of China who are affiliated with any such media organizations.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF CROWD CONTROL EQUIPMENT TO HONG KONG.

It is sense of Congress that the Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should consider appropriate adjustments to the current United States export controls with respect to Hong Kong to prevent the supply of crowd control and surveillance equipment that could be used inappropriately in Hong Kong.

SA 1247. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2710, to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force; as follows:

On page 1, line 7, insert "the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and" before "the Committee on Foreign Relations".

SA 1248. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2710, to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force; as follows:

At the end, add the following

SEC. 3 SUNSET.

The prohibition under section 2 shall expire one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are au-

thorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy, James P. Danly, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 19, 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 Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Olivia Geveden be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier

today: S. Res. 430, S. Res. 431, S. Res. 432, S. Res. 433, and S. Res. 434.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, that the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REAUTHORIZING SECURITY FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES ACT OF 2019

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4258, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4258) to authorize the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to protect the Justices, employees, and official guests of the Supreme Court outside of the Supreme Court grounds, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4258) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the postclosure time on the Lagoa nomination be considered expired at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 20. I further ask that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, November 20; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time

for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Lagoa nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:23 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ALINA I. MARSHALL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE L. PAIGE MARVEL, TERM EXPIRING.

CHRISTIAN N. WEILER, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ALBERT G. LAUBER, TERM EXPIRING.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND
DEVELOPMENT

J. STEVEN DOWD, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DIRECTOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE JUDY LYNN SHELTON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

HENRY T. WOOSTER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
HUMANITIES

CROSBY KEMPER III, OF MISSOURI, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KATHRYN K. MATTHEW, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

MARK A. ROBBINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE MICHAEL L. RANKIN, RETIRED.

CARL EZEKIEL ROSS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JUDITH BARTNOFF, RETIRED.

KATHRYN C. DAVIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE CHARLES F. LETTOW, TERM EXPIRED.

EDWARD HULVEY MEYERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE J. BLOCK, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DOUGLAS M. GABRAM

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(D):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS G. ALLAN
REAR ADM. (LH) LAURA M. DICKY
REAR ADM. (LH) DOUGLAS M. FEARS
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. MAUGER
REAR ADM. (LH) NATHAN A. MOORE
REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. PENOYER
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW W. SIBLEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

ANDREW J. OLIVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

MARJORIE A. KUIPERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

YUANDRE G. DIEUJUSTE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER M. FEROLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS E. AXTELL

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

D014331

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be captain

JENNIFER J. CONKLIN
DIANE M. CROFF
KIMBERLY K. GUEDRY
KARL A. HANSEN
JAMES J. JOHNSON
BECKY K. JONES
MAUREEN R. KALLGREN
BRUCE G. MACK
NATALIE M. MURPHY
GENNARO A. RUOCCO

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 19, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT J. LUCK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.