United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019 No. 186

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 20, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PAST TIME TO PASS USMCA

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, it is time. Actually, it is past time. It is past time for Congress to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Today, I am pleased to join with my colleague and friend, Senator STEVE DAINES, to draw attention to the USMCA's importance to Montana.

President Trump and his trade negotiators have done a great job negotiating this trade deal. USMCA will secure open access to markets in Mexico and Canada, markets critical to Montana farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and businesses.

USMCA will bring over $68 billion in new economic growth. USMCA will create 176,000 new American jobs. USMCA helps family farmers and ranchers, which is why 1,000 ag groups from across the country have endorsed it. USMCA increases agricultural exports by $2 billion a year. USMCA supports American workers.

Speaker, USMCA is a win for Montana and America. But here we are, 355 days, almost a full year, since President Trump signed USMCA, and the deal has gone nowhere in the House.

So, what is the holdup? The Speaker has stalled since the deal was announced. She objected to it. Those objections were addressed, yet here we are.

The Speaker says she is on a path to yes on USMCA. A path to yes, however, isn't a yes. Farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and business owners deserve certainty, not just a path to yes and more delays.

Unfortunately, just yesterday, Politico reported USMCA faces another delay because of House leadership—another delay. The House has 13 days left this year, 13 days to get this deal done. It is up to Congress to act.

Speaker, the needless delays must end. The Trump administration has done its job and negotiated an agreement that works for Montana and our country. It is time for Congress to do its job.

I urge House leaders to give farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and business owners the certainty they need. I urge House leaders to move forward with USMCA to create jobs, increase paychecks, and grow our economy.

Let's consider USMCA. Let's vote on USMCA. Let's ratify USMCA.

WE MUST GET USMCA RIGHT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and the need for commonsense change to see that our trade policies with Mexico and Canada better reflect the current economic conditions and the changes that have occurred since the initial act was put together over 25 years ago.

The administration's trade policies, though, currently with these tariff wars, I believe, are not only hurting consumers, but they are hurting our farmers, ranchers, and dairymen and -women. Let's be clear about it: These are hidden taxes that consumers pay and that agriculture pays as well.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, I think, would address these concerns if we get it right.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, opening new trade opportunities for agriculture is one of my top priorities. My home State of California is the number one agricultural State in the Nation, and nearly half of our ag products are exported abroad, over $20 billion a year.

I am a farmer, third generation. I understand the importance of our ability to trade and have a fair and level playing field.

Mexico and Canada combined is our largest destination for these products. Maintaining these markets is essential to ensure prosperity for our farmers and the viability of our ag economy.

We have had 25 years of a mostly successful trading relationship with Canada and Mexico since signing the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, but a lot has changed. It has also resulted in, let's be frank, a loss of jobs that has hurt American families here, and we need to address that. This is an opportunity to deal with the flaws that

Printed on recycled paper.

have existed in NAFTA for over 25 years.

Since 2002, Canada has been the United States' top agricultural export market, and Mexico has either been second or third. In 2018, we exported $143 billion worth of agricultural products to the two countries combined. The amount equaled over a quarter of total U.S. ag exports. That is significant.

The USMCA leaves in place, I think, the key wins for agriculture established under NAFTA. It updates key provisions pertaining to important issues like labor, technology, and the environment. It also provides some new access to Canada's protected dairy market, which I think is important.

The conversations between House Democrats and the administration to hammer out the remaining differences, I think, have been constructive. I disagree with some of the narratives that this has been a delay. We want to get it right. You must get good trade agreements right. Our negotiators are making good progress, including efforts to ensure that enforcement to the agreement is done.

But enforcement of labor standards continues to remain a concern. This is important. Labor in America doesn't want the same impacts that took place under NAFTA, so enforcement of the provisions is critical.

USMCA's labor chapter does reflect a strengthening of standards, including freedom of association and the right to organize in Mexico. We have had numerous delegations meet with our counterparts in Mexico. This spring, Mexico passed landmark labor legislation laying the legal framework for compliance with the United States-Mexico-Canada labor chapter. Now we must ensure that those labor standards are enforced. That is the critical area today.

House Democrats are working in good faith with the administration to put in place assurances that these standards are enforced over the long term.

The same goes for enforcement of environmental and biomedical standards. Commitments need to be made, and they have to be enforceable to make this a successful agreement.

If these issues are addressed, the USMCA would stabilize some trade policies that are otherwise unpredictable with this administration, including serious concerns that President Trump may, as he said, kill NAFTA and reject the deal if we don't pass this. We want to get it done ASAP for sure, but we need to make sure it is done right.

Sound trade policy should not be a partisan issue. I will continue to make sure that we can vote on USMCA as soon as possible. Once again, though, we have to have the assurances. I expect strong passage of an agreement if we can get those assurances, but there must be a way to address this so that we will get to ''yes.''

Then we can turn our attention to other trade matters. An agreement with China, obviously, is very important and in Europe with the European Union.

Let me say, finally, good trade agreements, I think, mean good-paying jobs. Let me repeat that. Good trade agreements mean good-paying jobs for all Americans. That is obviously what we want to do for our entire economy.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize American Education Week.

Every year, this week underscores the importance of access to quality education. It honors the teachers, instructors, and educational mentors who make a difference in the lives of our Nation's learners.

Working to ensure access to high-quality and affordable education for all students is of utmost importance. The American education system should be as diverse as our Nation's students, including learners of all ages, of all socioeconomic backgrounds, and from rural America, urban America, and everywhere in between. That includes students who choose to pursue a traditional 4-year college degree as well as those who choose to attend a trade school or an apprenticeship program.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, I have been pleased to introduce a number of career and technical education bills, alongside my fellow co-chair, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, which aim to restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity for every American.

Most recently, that includes H.R. 5092, the Counseling for Career Choice Act. H.R. 5092 ensures students have access to quality counseling resources that can help them make more informed decisions about their educational futures and professional career choices. By better equipping these students with the skills to succeed, we are one step closer to closing our Nation's skills gap.

The skills gap is the result of a lack of qualified students in STEM disciplines like nursing, energy, information technology, cybersecurity, and more. Career and technical education is working to empower students by equipping them with employable skills.

To directly address the workforce shortage in cybersecurity, I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 1592, the Cybersecurity Skills Integration Act. This bill would create a pilot program through the Department of Education to award grants to create or expand existing postsecondary CTE programs in cybersecurity competencies.

Career and technical education has support outside of the Education and Labor Committee as well. I also cosponsored H.R. 898, the Skills Investment Act of 2019. H.R. 898 enhances Coverdell Education Savings Accounts, which are tax-advantaged savings accounts for educational expenses. American workers can use the accounts to pay for skills-based learning, career training, and workforce development. In addition, both workers and employers receive tax credits for contributions to these accounts.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to addressing the shortage of our skilled workforce, we need to continue increasing educational access for students who are living with disabilities. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ensures nearly 7 million infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities have access to quality education.

Unfortunately, Congress has fallen short on our commitment to these individuals, and support for students with disabilities has remained underfunded. That is why I was proud to support H.R. 1878, the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach the full funding as promised by Congress when IDEA was passed and to do that by fiscal year 2029.

Lastly, there are many bipartisan bills that support quality education for American learners. I have always believed that we produce the best results for students when we work across the aisle. However, the partisan College Affordability Act, which would reauthorize the Higher Education Act, actually contributes to crippling college costs and widens our Nation's skills gap.

It is my hope that we can offer real solutions like the High-Quality Opportunities in Postsecondary Education Act, or the HOPE Act, which provides institutions with the tools they need to help students prepare for successful careers and successful lives.

This is American Education Week. Let's remember that students deserve better than a one-size-fits-all educational plan.

PASS USMCA BEFORE YEAR-END

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of resolving the outstanding issues needed to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA, before the end of the year.

More than 12 million American jobs, including 1.8 million jobs in California, depend on trade with Canada and Mexico. We simply cannot afford to keep the current rules in place if we are to secure our economic future and create better paying American jobs.

□ 1015

Addressing contentious issues in a trade deal are always difficult, but I am optimistic that we can come to a productive resolution if the administration continues to engage with House Democrats in good faith.

USMCA represents an opportunity to fix fundamental flaws in our trade policy, reverse the failings of NAFTA, establish strong, enforceable labor standards across North America, and promote growth in new sectors of each of our economies. Let's get it right this time.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL, and House Democratic leadership for their commitment to working families and for ensuring USMCA reflects our core values, and I ask for a vote on USMCA as soon as possible.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MS. JENNIFER T. GRAHAM

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Jennifer T. Graham for being honored by the Zonta Club of Savannah for her work helping single mothers throughout the Savannah area.

Ms. Graham galvanized a citywide effort that has significantly aided hundreds of mothers in our community. She founded Shelter From the Rain, which assists low-income mothers by providing food, job search assistance, baby supplies, mentorship, and more. Since Ms. Graham founded the organization in 2010, Shelter From the Rain has helped over 300 single mothers.

Her background in marketing and outreach, which includes earning a graduate degree in marketing and doing communications for a number of local healthcare companies has helped her maximize the number of mothers her organization reaches.

Thank you, Ms. Graham, for your work making our community a better place to live, and thank you to the Zonta Club for recognizing the important work she is doing. Keep up the great work.

NATIONAL HEALTHY SKIN MONTH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of November as National Healthy Skin Month.

Your skin is your body's largest organ, so it is critical to take care of it. Unfortunately, skin cancer affects around 20 percent of the population.

This month, I encourage everyone to think about ways to keep your skin healthy during your daily activities. For example, wearing sunscreen, moisturizing, washing your face, and protecting against blisters are all measures one can take to stay healthy.

Additionally, I hope everyone will consider visiting a dermatologist this month for a skin evaluation.

Thank you to the American Academy of Dermatology as well as dermatologists around the country for your work to protect this vital part of our health.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MS. MEG HEAP

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Meg Heap, who was recently honored by the Zonta Club of Savannah for her work to reduce domestic violence against women.

Serving as the district attorney for the Savannah area since 2013, she has spearheaded a number of programs in coastal Georgia to create greater equality for women. She created an early notification prosecutor position for domestic violence and an early notification process for the Victim Witness Program. Additionally, she created a one-stop Chatham County Family Justice Center.

In 2019, the District Attorney Association of Georgia selected her as the District Attorney of the Year.

From Savannah originally, Ms. Heap can be an inspiration to all of us about giving back to your community.

Thank you, Ms. Heap, for all of your work to make Savannah a better place to live, and thank you to the Zonta Club of Savannah for recognizing her achievements.

HAPPY 95TH BIRTHDAY TO MR. HOWARD YOUNG

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Howard Young, who turns 95 years young on November 25. He has lived in the Savannah area for over 30 years, and, during this time, he has spent countless hours helping others around the community.

After retiring in his 50s, he began to spend each day with a different organization volunteering. On Mondays he works with the Veterans Administration Clinic, on Tuesdays he works with senior citizens.

And the list doesn't stop at Friday. A World War II Navy veteran, he works with veterans to help them get medical benefits on Saturdays and serves at the Isle of Hope Methodist Church on Sundays.

I am proud to have a constituent like Mr. Young in the First Congressional District of Georgia. It is easy to be inspired by his work making the world a better place to live.

As he says: ''Each passing day is gone forever, so I want to spend as much of each day as possible helping someone who can't help himself.''

Happy birthday, Mr. Young.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF COACH MARVIN KEELEN

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart to acknowledge the life and legacy of Coach Marvin Keelen. Coach Keelen coached at Goretti Playground in New Orleans, Louisiana.

I met Coach Marvin probably when I was about 13 years old; and he started me out as a bookkeeper at the playground keeping score. Then I went on to be an umpire; then I went on to be a coach.

Coach Marvin passed away this weekend, but over his 34 years of coaching at Goretti Playground, he has touched the lives of so many young men. We have a Capitol Police officer here that Coach Marvin coached. We have myself and countless others that his direction, his mentorship provided a real pathway for a lot of our young men.

The other thing I would say about Coach Marvin is his family followed in his footsteps. Just two weekends ago, his younger son, Nick, won his first city championship. His other son, Marvin, won a couple of city championships, and Coach Marvin won about seven.

But it wasn't just about competing. It was taking our young kids and making sure that they understood their potential to be whatever they wanted to be, that they could be champions if they wanted to be, that they could actually be U.S. Congressmen.

So I just want to extend my condolences to his wife Jennifer Keelen; his daughter Nikki; his son, Nick; and his other son, Marvin, to let them know that their father has heard those words: ''Well done, my good and faithful servant.''

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JUDGE ANGELIQUE ''ANGIE'' REED

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Judge Angelique ''Angie'' Reed, who passed in the city of New Orleans.

Judge Reed was the quintessential judge. She was fair, but she was firm. She expected the best out of lawyers in front of her, and she demanded nothing less.

She was a proud member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, and, in honor of her, I am wearing my pink tie today. She was also a faithful member of Jack and Jill, that provides mentorship to children and communities all across the country, and she was a faithful member of the New Orleans Chapter of The Links.

Let me just say that her membership in all of these organizations really highlighted her love for New Orleans.

On the national level, she was a member of the Judicial Council of the National Bar Association, even co-chairing the event in New Orleans.

I first met Judge Angie Reed when she was just a young lawyer in the City Attorney's Office and I was a law clerk trying to find my way around. She took me under her wing and taught me life lessons that I would never forget about the practice of law: that it was not about trying to make money; it was not about you, but it was about your client; it was about making a difference; it was about righting a wrong.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in his speech, ''Give Us the Ballot,'' proclaimed that, if you give us the ballot in the South, we will elect judges and put judges on the bench that will love mercy and do justice. Judge Angelique Reed did just that, and she did it better than anyone else.

She leaves behind her daughter, Giana Warren.

And I would just say that the New Orleans community is better off because Angie Reed passed our way, and she will be sorely missed.

She also will hear those words: ''Judge Reed, well done, my good and faithful servant.''

SUPPORT THE K–9 HERO ACT

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced the K–9 Hero Act last week.

Military and law enforcement K–9s work in tandem with the brave men and women who serve our great Nation. Once these heroes retire from service, the medical treatment they need is often significant enough to create a financial hardship for the individuals who care for them.

The K–9 Hero Act creates a grant program to assist nonprofits that take in retired working dogs or provide financial assistance to the owners of retired working dogs. These grants will cover medical costs, such as veterinarian visits, medical procedures, diagnostic tests, and medications, which tend to average around $3,000 per year per dog.

As most know, just a few weeks ago, a K–9 played a crucial role in the capture and ultimate killing of ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. This K–9 took off, racing down an underground tunnel before cornering Baghdadi, leaving him nowhere to run. It is stories like these that inspired me to introduce the K–9 Hero Act.

These dogs assist our Federal Government in ways that no man or machine could, and it is unacceptable to me for them to live with inadequate medical care—or even be euthanized, in some cases—after sacrificing so much for our country.

This bill helps ensure these heroes are well taken care of during retirement and that their need for medical care never prevents them from finding a loving forever home. My K–9-loving colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I believe, should support this legislation.

STOP THE PRACTICE OF TELEABORTION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over the practice of teleabortion. This practice, which gets its name from practitioners conducting abortions over the phone or computer, occurs when chemical abortions are induced with no healthcare provider present.

This practice sounds simple, except the woman taking the drugs isn't in a medical facility, no certified medical personnel are present, and if the drugs don't work as planned and the baby is not stillborn, it may still end up in a dumpster and the mother may end up in an emergency room.

The obvious danger is why I filed H.R. 4935, the Teleabortion Prevention Act. This legislation protects women's health by making it a Federal offense for healthcare providers to perform a chemical abortion without first physically examining the patient, being present during the chemical abortion, and scheduling a follow-up visit for the patient.

Chemical abortions are induced using a two-step abortion pill regimen that can be taken up until the ninth week of pregnancy. Given the serious risks, the FDA has put regulations in place, but pro-abortion groups are looking for ways to get around the law.

If these FDA regulations are ever lifted, chemical abortion drugs could become available by prescription, enabling a single healthcare provider to mail chemical abortion pills to women and young girls across the country, regardless of State pro-life protections and whether they have seen a doctor and had an ultrasound performed. This legislation ensures these much-needed FDA regulations will not be lifted.

No doctor should feel comfortable prescribing a life-ending pharmaceutical drug without physically being there to administer it to the patient.

If the woman's health argument is really more than subterfuge that puts dressing on a tragedy, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4935, the Teleabortion Prevention Act.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MONUMENT ACT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise because yesterday I had the privilege of introducing the National Medal of Honor Monument Act, with my fellow Texan, Congressman MARC VEASEY.

Over the course of our history, over 3,500 United States servicemen and -women have been honored with our Nation's highest military decoration, the Medal of Honor.

The Medal of Honor is awarded to U.S. servicemembers who have distinguished themselves with extraordinary acts of valor. These men and women I am referring to went above and beyond the call of duty on the battlefield in order to preserve our families and way of life.

This legislation ensures that their contribution and patriotism are never forgotten. These heroic individuals deserve to be memorialized with a monument in our Nation's Capitol, among the other great Americans that have helped shape our Nation.

In Texas, we celebrate patriotism, American ideals, and our Nation's heroes. Earlier this fall, the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation chose my hometown of Arlington, Texas, as the location for the new National Medal of Honor Museum. This legislation makes it official.

Congratulations to Mayor Williams and the rest of Arlington's leadership for bringing it to the 6.8 million Dallas-Ft. Worth residents and the over 14 million visitors Arlington welcomes each year and, most importantly, the 1.8 million veterans and Active-Duty military that call Texas home.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Steven Abraham, Beth El Synagogue, Omaha, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, we stand before You in this sacred Hall to ask for Your blessings upon the Members of this House, the leaders of our country, and the citizens of this great Nation.

May You bless our leaders with the wisdom to follow Your teachings; to speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves; to protect the widow, the orphan, and the stranger.

May You bless our leaders with compassion to open both their hearts and their minds to places and ideas where they are currently closed.

May You bless our leaders with the courage to do what is hard, to do what is unpopular, but to do what is right.

Sovereign of the universe, continue to protect the men and women of our Armed Forces; watch over our elected officials; and continue to grant peace, freedom, and prosperity to the United States.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI STEVEN ABRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my appreciation for my friend, Rabbi Steven Abraham, and thank him for leading today's session

with the opening prayer. I would also like to welcome his family to this House that belongs to all Americans.

Rabbi Abraham has been the rabbi for Beth El Synagogue since 2013, after moving to Omaha to be the assistant rabbi in 2011. He graduated from rabbinical school at the Jewish Theological Seminary, where he also received a masters of arts in Jewish education. He is also an alumnus of the University of Baltimore.

Since I came to Congress in 2017, Rabbi Abraham has been a trusted friend and adviser for both my staff and me.

I call on all of us to heed the words offered in prayer by the rabbi. We must all humble ourselves to the wisdom of the Almighty, and let us always try to be a voice for the voiceless and serve with compassion and courage.

We face many challenges ahead, but with prayerfulness and good faith in one another, I know we can rise above the trials of today in search of a better tomorrow, all for the sake of our country.

Thank you again, Rabbi Abraham, for being a genuine leader and for being with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WORLD PANCREATIC CANCER DAY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, November 21 is recognized as World Pancreatic Cancer Day, a time to raise awareness and inspire action in the fight against this devastating diagnosis which touches too many families.

It is the third leading cause of cancer deaths in the United States, with a 5-year survival rate of just 9 percent. More than 1,000 new cases are diagnosed around the world every day, and it is estimated that pancreatic cancer will be responsible for 3,000 deaths in New York State this year alone.

The Pancreatic Cancer Action Network and its western New York affiliate have made it their goal to double pancreatic cancer survival. As co-chair of the House Cancer Caucus, I am proud to advocate for robust funding for cancer research to put goals like this within reach.

Recently, researchers at Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center announced promising findings on treatments aimed at overcoming pancreatic cancer's resistance to treatment, but continued funding on projects like this is critical to saving lives.

The need to increase pancreatic cancer survival rates is urgent, and it must be America's goal.

AMERICA APPRECIATES FARMERS

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, as we remember the first Thanksgiving when settlers broke bread with their Native American allies and shared fruits of their harvest, I rise today to thank our Nation's farmers.

As Thanksgiving approaches and we prepare to enjoy the holiday meal with our families, I would be remiss if I did not take time to thank the Americans whose labor allows us to put food on our tables.

Along with our military, our farmers are the hardest working, most skilled, and patriotic citizens in our country. They rise before dawn and work long after dusk to ensure our Nation can feed and clothe the world.

I urge this body to uphold its commitment to our farmers by passing the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and ensure American agriculture remains the strongest and most competitive in the world.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in giving thanks to America's farmers during this Thanksgiving season.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Native American Heritage Month.

Oregon currently has nine federally recognized Tribes, three of which I am proud to represent here in Congress: The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs. I work closely with these Tribal governments and with Tribal members, and I am proud to partner with them and support their work.

Oregon's Tribes do incredible work to protect precious natural resources, to save our salmon, to lift up Native youth, to keep our communities safe, and so much more.

I want to specifically thank Siletz Chairwoman Dee Pigsley, Grand Ronde Chairwoman Cheryle Kennedy, and Warm Springs Chairman Raymond Tsumpti for their leadership.

I also want to acknowledge that Grand Ronde, Siletz, and Warm Springs are confederations of Tribes that were terminated in 1954 in an insidious act that ended the government's recognition of Tribal sovereignty and dismissed the government's trust responsibility in western Oregon and across the country. Their restoration is only beginning.

Because of this, Congress must do more to ensure that we are honoring our commitments to Tribes and taking seriously our trust responsibility.

VETERANS HISTORY PROJECT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful that our office is participating in the Veterans History Project. This project is an ongoing effort by the Library of Congress to collect and preserve personal accounts by American military veterans and families.

I have had the opportunity to meet with local veterans in Aiken and the Midlands to encourage participation. The narratives recorded through this project keep history alive for future generations.

Coordinating the project is Purple Heart recipient Jeffrey Crosby. Across America, citizens can participate at website loc.gov/vets.

As a veteran, as the son of a Flying Tiger with service in India and China, and as the father of four sons who have served overseas in the Army National Guard and the Navy, I am thankful for the project.

Congratulations, President Donald Trump, with news today that his policies of creating jobs have led to South Carolina's lowest unemployment level in history at 2.6 percent—opportunities for all according to WVOC.

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

THE HOUSE IS CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the great work of the House of Representatives. For the last 10 months in the 116th Congress, the House of Representatives has passed 18 healthcare bills, 5 gun safety bills, 81 education bills, 47 national security and defense bills, 45 environmental bills, 36 immigration bills, 40 infrastructure and transportation bills, and much more.

My point, Madam Speaker, is that we are continuing the work of the American people. We never lost sight of our promise and commitment to the people of this great country.

We are constantly fighting back the White House's attempt to take away healthcare from millions of Americans, and we are working to lower prescription drug costs.

We will continue supporting our military and ensure that they have all the resources that they need to keep Americans safe.

We will not allow this President to keep us from fulfilling our duty to make our economy stronger, our

schools safer, and to protect us from tyranny.

SAVING RURAL HOSPITALS

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, instead of this laser focus on impeachment, we should be doing the people's work and passing a bill to help many Americans across this country who live in rural areas. My bipartisan Rural Health Care Access Act, H.R. 2990, would do just that.

Between January 1, 2010, and March 19, 2019, 102 rural hospitals closed in America. We are facing a crisis for rural America. These closures are increasing almost every year.

While so many of our senior citizens must utilize Medicare, Medicare is not reimbursing all hospitals in rural areas at a sustainable rate. We need to designate all our rural hospitals as Critical Access Hospitals.

Currently, this designation does not apply to those hospitals in rural areas that are slightly less than 35 miles from another hospital. My bill would get rid of this distance requirement, while maintaining all other requirements. It would help stave off the rapid decline of healthcare and protect vital jobs in rural communities.

I urge the Speaker to give my bill a chance.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuing the American Dream has become a daunting task for millions of Americans in need of a place they can call home. We must address affordable housing, as we are in the midst of an acute crisis, and it is sweeping across America.

From my district in Brooklyn, New York, to Portland, Oregon, families coast to coast are getting priced out of their communities and driven into poverty and homelessness. My newly introduced bill, the Affordable Housing and Area Median Income Fairness Act, will attack this crisis head-on.

My bill addresses the clearly flawed model that has been used to calculate area median incomes, which is the basis on which rental rates are set. This outdated model made it harder for our families to afford having a roof over their heads, meanwhile, lining the pockets of big developers.

The Federal Government cannot—must not—continue to be complicit in this travesty.

As cities grow and communities evolve, the ability to afford having a roof over one's head should not be relegated only to those whose incomes afford them luxury.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in this crusade for human dignity: affordable housing for all Americans, access to affordable housing.

FARMER OF THE YEAR STEVE KELLEY

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Steve Kelley of Carlisle County, Kentucky, for being named the 2019 Kentucky Farm Bureau Farmer of the Year.

It is with great pride that I can say this is the fourth year in a row that a farmer in Kentucky's First Congressional District has been recognized as Kentucky Farmer of the Year.

After receiving his bachelors and masters degrees in agriculture from Murray State University, Steve embarked on a decades-long career farming over 2,500 acres in Carlisle County. His solar farm, as well as his grain, livestock, and timber operations, sets Steve apart and highlights the ambitious future he sees for agriculture in the Commonwealth. He believes that it is his purpose to ''leave his farmland in better condition than when he received it.''

I am honored to congratulate the 2019 Kentucky Farmer of the Year, Mr. Steve Kelley, and his family on his unwavering work ethic, dedication to the Carlisle County Farm Bureau, and outstanding role in the agriculture community.

FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, don't let anybody tell you that all we do here in the House of Representatives is investigate the White House. We have passed 275-plus bipartisan bills for the good of the people.

For hardworking families, we have passed legislation to increase wages and protect pensions.

For American women, we have passed legislation to promote personal security and ensure equal pay for equal work.

For American communities, we have passed legislation to improve public safety by strengthening background checks.

And for our American veterans, we have passed legislation to improve transition assistance and access to mental healthcare.

Rather than govern, Senate Republicans have chosen to play politics. This Congress, they have refused to consider more than 275 House-passed bipartisan bills. Those are bills that have Republican support sitting on the desk of the Senate leader not being passed.

Madam Speaker, I remind Senate Republicans: Do your job. Let's govern wisely and get these bills passed.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Adoption Month.

This month we celebrate the life-changing act of adoption that has touched the lives of so many in our country. American families nationwide open their homes and their hearts to children in search of a stable environment and a forever home.

Despite the many parents that adopt, there are still so many children in the foster care system in search of a place to call home. In 2018, almost half a million children and teenage youth were in U.S. foster care. As a country we must always strive to help the most vulnerable citizens among us. All children in America deserve a permanent family that can provide them with the love, support, and encouragement needed to reach their full potential in life.

During this important awareness month, we recognize the unconditional love adoptive parents provide to their children, and we hope that all children will soon be welcomed into a loving family.

RECOGNIZING HEATHER GLEN FIRE FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, at around 3 a.m. on Sunday, September 22, a fire broke out and punctured the calm of an assisted living facility in my community, Pennsylvania Seven, at Heather Glen Senior Living in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

Firefighters answered the call, rushing into the building as flames gained force and tore through the roof. With extraordinary skill, they got to work saving the 82 elderly residents as the fire raged, carrying these men and women on their shoulders out of windows on to ladders. They brought all of the residents, as well as the five staff members working that night, to safety swiftly, while containing and ultimately defeating the fire.

In total, 45 agencies across four counties participated in this operation, coming together as a single unit in complete dedication to the mission at hand. In their example we see the best of the Greater Lehigh Valley and of our Nation.

Today, I ask my colleagues from across our country to join me in recognizing and honoring the service, sacrifices, and everyday heroism of these first responders.

Mr. Speaker, before our Nation, I want to thank them for everything they have done. They are the pride of our community.

RECOGNIZING NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Native American History Month and the contributions of Native Americans in my congressional district in central Washington.

With 29 Federally recognized tribes across the State, Washingtonians live alongside Native Americans who serve our communities through entrepreneurship, military service, and sharing their rich and storied cultural history. They are our friends, family, neighbors, and coworkers.

While we recognize that one month out of the year to remember the historical and cultural contributions of our Native friends, we must support them as they face a crisis that has affected Native women for decades. That crisis is of missing and murdered indigenous women.

In Washington, Native Americans make up about 2 percent of the population, but indigenous women account for 7 percent of the State's reported missing women. This includes 31 open cases on or near the Yakama Nation Reservation.

During Native American History Month, I challenge this body to honor the heritage of our Native friends by taking up legislation that will help ensure that missing and murdered loved ones are not part of the history of another generation of Native women.

THANKING CONGRESSMAN HOYER

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today for a very special purpose. I rise because this House on Monday passed H.R. 3702, the Reforming Disaster Recovery Act of 2019.

I rise today, because in thanking people on Tuesday, I neglected to thank one person who was extremely important in the passage of this legislation. The majority leader Mr. HOYER not only worked to help us bring the legislation to the floor, Mr. HOYER also improved the legislation. When it left our committee, it was a good bill. It had the unanimous consent of the committee.

Some things bear repeating. One hundred percent of the people on the Financial Services Committee supported this legislation.

Mr. HOYER helped us by infusing it with some additional language that deals with resiliency that will help us to rebuild better and stronger after there has been a disaster.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. HOYER for his leadership. Especially he is thanked for making a good bill a much better bill.

HIGHLIGHTING THE 7-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISAPPEARANCE OF KHALIL MAATOUK

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the 7-year anniversary of Christian human rights lawyer Khalil Maatouk's unconscionable disappearance at the hands of Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad.

The regime abducted Maatouk because he had been relentlessly defending Syrian democratic activists. He was last seen on October 2 of 2012.

Khalil Maatouk's ordeal serves as a stark reminder of the Assad regime's barbaric assault on religious and Christian heritage, blatantly violating international humanitarian law. According to a September report from the Syrian Network for Human Rights, the regime is responsible for targeting 61 percent of churches throughout the country.

The United States demands the immediate release of Khalil Maatouk, and I urge the administration to prioritize this case. We must stand up for those who fight for freedom, especially freedom of religion.

RECOGNIZING THE TAINOS AND CARIBS DURING NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, November is Native American Heritage Month, and I would like to share with you a story, one unknown to most Americans, but one that Virgin Islanders learn at a young age. It is the Caribbean story of Europe's drive for conquest and the resistance of the Native Americans of the Virgin Islands, the Tainos and the Caribs.

In 1493, Columbus and his men landed on Ayay, known now as Saint Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands. There they met a group of Taino people who had been taken captive by the Caribs. While en route back to their ship with these captives, Columbus' men encountered the fierce Carib villagers, and the first recorded violent conflict between Europeans and Native Americans of the Western Hemisphere ensued, killing one of Columbus' men.

Men and women fought with bows and canoes against gunpowder on ships. It is our story of Native pride of resistance, of remembering what is yours.

However, the Taino and Carib peoples have left us with so much more. When you use such words as barbecue, guava, canoe, hurricane, potato, maze, savannah, you are connecting with indigenous people who centuries ago journeyed from South America to settle in the archipelago that has given, and continues to give, much to this country and the world.

A STEPPING STONE FOR PEACE IN KASHMIR

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to share the facts and give an update on what is happening in the Jammu Kashmir region. Jammu Kashmir was given special treatment in the Constitution of 1947 in India. It was created by the ''Temporary Provisions with Respect to the State of Jammu Kashmir.'' It is known as article 370.

It was supposed to be a stop-gap measure because the government had not been formed yet. For 70 straight years, this temporary article has forced citizens of Jammu Kashmir to live under different laws than all other Indians; different rules for citizenship, property ownership.

Earlier this year, the Indian Parliament confirmed that article 370's temporary status should end. It ended. It gave the people of Jammu Kashmir the same rights as all Indians. It was a landslide, 125-to-61 in the Rajya Sabha and 370-to-70 in the Lok Sabha. This action is solely about equality for all Indians.

Hopefully, this can be a step toward peace in Kashmir.

IN FAVOR OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the American Dream; in favor of the bedrock of what has made America: capitalism.

Yesterday, while every cable news channel was transfixed by the Intelligence Committee, the Financial Services Committee was discussing a bill that strikes at the heart of American capitalism.

H.R. 3848, the companion legislation to Senator ELIZABETH WARREN's Stop Wall Street Looting Act, would add regulatory costs and harm job creators. It has a pithy title that is, unfortunately, misleading in purpose. I prefer to call it the stop entrepreneurship act.

This bill would curb private investments in Main Street companies, which would kill jobs, stifle innovation, harm consumers, and strike a major blow to the hallmark of capitalism.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, even a modest scenario would result in the loss of 6.2 million to 24.3 million jobs across the country. As a small business owner who benefited from private equity when growing my business, I know the value of these types of organizations that provide support and really give a way forward for companies trying to grow.

BRINGING ATTENTION TO HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS DURING NATIONAL HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS WEEK

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, each year during the week prior to Thanksgiving, communities across the country come together to bring awareness to the problems of hunger and homelessness.

Today, I want to recognize the Collin County organizations that work to end hunger and homelessness throughout our community.

Today, there are 42 million Americans facing hunger on any given night, and more than 194,000 people will sleep on the street.

While these numbers are sobering, we are incredibly grateful for those in our community who work to ease the suffering of others, organizations such as the Collin County Homeless Coalition, the Family Promise of Collin County, North Texas Food Bank, Minnie's Food Pantry, and Hope's Door New Beginning Center, Allen Community Outreach, and many, many others who work year-round to take care of those less fortunate.

Through these organizations, volunteers, businesses, and faith communities come together to provide necessities like shelter and nutritious meals. They go above and beyond to ensure those in need have access to basic medical care and hygiene products and even provide training and placement resources for those struggling with homelessness.

PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF CONGRESS SPENDING TAX DOLLARS ON A POLITICALLY MOTIVATED IMPEACHMENT CHARADE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, yesterday's public impeachment hearings produced some noteworthy facts. Representative MIKE TURNER's question of Ambassador Volker took apart the Democrats' entire case. Volker confirmed that President Trump never said that Ukraine must investigate the Bidens in order to receive defense aid from the United States.

Further, Representative ELISE STEFANIK's questioning of Tim Morrison showed there was no quid pro quo, no bribery, no extortion, and no mention of withholding aid in exchange for investigating the Bidens.

Witnesses have repeatedly stated that no quid pro quo, no bribery took place. These facts, which indeed clear our President, do not change. Meanwhile, President Trump continues to be denied basic due process rights.

Democrat leadership continues to put politics before the people obsessing over impeachment and refusing to work on policies that would actually benefit the American people: ratifying the USMCA, permanently extending the 2017 tax cuts for families, and lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

The people are tired of this Congress spending their tax dollars on a politically-motivated impeachment charade.

□ 1230

WE SHOULD WORK TOGETHER TO COMBAT CANCER

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, November is Lung Cancer Awareness Month, an important time for us to highlight the need for more research and better community awareness on this disease.

The statistics surrounding lung cancer are astounding. Approximately 541,000 Americans living today have been diagnosed with lung cancer at some point in their lives. While the rate of new lung cancer cases over the past 4 decades has dropped 36 percent for men, it has risen 84 percent for women.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 2222, the Women and Lung Cancer Research and Preventive Services Act. This bill would evaluate and identify opportunities for more research, preventive services, and public awareness campaigns.

Research shows that there is a disparate impact of lung cancer on women, especially women who have never smoked. More research is needed to understand why this is happening and what can be done to stop it.

Preventing cancer should never be a partisan issue. We should be working together to combat the scourge of cancer for the benefit of patients, families, and survivors. H.R. 2222 is a bipartisan effort that would do just that.

STOP IMPEACHMENT FOCUS TO DEAL WITH BORDER

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand first of all to thank President Trump for the work he has done at the border and for something that has been almost unpublicized since the mainstream media is busy focusing solely on impeachment.

In May of this year, over 100,000 people were processed at the border and placed in the United States. In September, that number has fallen to under 1,000, solely because of the efforts of President Trump to keep people who come to this country seeking asylum south of the border and because of agreements reached in countries in northern Central America.

However, we must ask this body to stop solely focusing on impeachment and deal with the southern border, making permanent the policy changes of President Trump. My fear is that if President Trump ever leaves, then the real motivation of this impeachment hearing will become apparent, and that is to return to the days of open borders.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 20, 2019, at 10:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1838.

That the Senate passed S. 2710.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4258.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION FOR HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 22, 2019, THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 713 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 713

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 22, 2019, through December 2, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of November 21, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule, House Resolution 713, providing for consideration of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order all 10 amendments submitted, and provides for a motion to recommit. It also provides standard recess instructions for next week's district work period.

Madam Speaker, there is an epidemic of violence against healthcare and social workers in the United States. Last year, Department of Labor statistics showed they were nearly five times as likely to suffer a serious workplace violence injury than workers in other industries.

The Government Accountability Office found that rates of violence against healthcare workers in hospitals, nursing homes, and residential care facilities are 5 to 12 times higher than the estimated rates for workers overall. Between 2011 and 2016, 58 hospital workers died as a result of workplace violence.

For me, this matter strikes close to home. In 2010, a Napa State Hospital technician in California, Donna Kay Gross, a constituent, was killed outside the State hospital by a patient under psychiatric care. Donna entered the profession to honor her mother, who battled mental illness and was a patient at that very hospital. She was the mother of three grown children and was raising her granddaughter. Her colleagues described her by saying: First and foremost, Donna was a human service-type person and loved being with people and working with people.

Donna's life was cut short when a patient brutally murdered her to steal jewelry and cash from her.

This story is just one of thousands of incidents that are on the rise. Sadly, violence has become so commonplace for healthcare workers that they think it is part of their job, resulting in only 30 percent of violent incidents being reported.

Some States have stepped up to enact laws to require employers to establish a plan to protect against workplace violence. Donna's story, for example, inspired action in California that I was proud to be a part of when I was chair of the senate labor committee. That action in California served as the basis for the bill before us today in the rule and tomorrow on the floor.

These workers deserve national action, and they deserve it now. At the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, these workers are not receiving the urgent attention they need. OSHA takes at least 7 years to put out a standard, but in some instances can take up to 20 years.

People like Donna Kay Gross cannot wait that long. To protect the people who dedicate their lives to caring for us, we need to move now. The longer we wait, the more people will suffer.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today, we are considering a bill that requires the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace violence prevention in the healthcare and social service sectors.

According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, workplace violence is any act or threat of physical violence, harassment, intimidation, or other threatening disruptive behavior that occurs at the worksite. It may be surprising to hear that acts of violence are the third leading cause of fatal occupational injuries. Of these incidences, approximately 8 percent were intentionally caused by another person.

When Americans go to work each and every day, they do not expect to face violence or other harm. The risk is especially high for healthcare providers and social workers. These caregivers can be subject to patients who may not be in control when under the influence of medications, or they may have a mental disorder, upset family members, ongoing domestic disputes, and even gang violence.

The rate of workplace violence resulting in days away from work for healthcare providers is, on average, four times higher than other professions. In addition, healthcare providers and social workers are less likely to report incidents. This may partly be due to the pledge to do no harm and the inclination to forgive patient-caused injuries as accidental. Regardless of the situation, all workers deserve a safe workplace.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is responsible for setting the standards to ensure the safety of American workers. Under the general duty clause of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, employers must provide employees with a safe work environment. Currently, there is no mandatory standard on workplace violence prevention. However, in calendar year 2015, OSHA published ''Guidelines for Preventing Workplace Violence for Healthcare and Social Service Workers'' and is currently working on a workplace violence prevention rule.

H.R. 1309 would require the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace

violence prevention based on OSHA's 2015 guidelines. An interim standard is required within 1 year of the passage of this legislation, and a final rule must be issued within 2 years.

While the goal of this legislation is laudable and important, the timeframe imposed on the Department of Labor and OSHA does exceed the norm. Between 1981 and 2010, the time it took OSHA to develop and issue safety and health standards ranged from 15 months to 19 years, but the average was more than 7 years. While no one believes we should continue to delay worker protections, OSHA has already begun the rulemaking process and is gathering stakeholder input.

According to the OSHA rulemaking process, a rule should take 10 years to complete. There are 7 stages comprised of 48 different steps. For example, one step is listed as ''continue discussion with stakeholders.'' The penultimate stage requires OSHA to send the final rule to the Small Business Administration before submitting the rule to Congress.

□ 1245

This last stage involves developing a small entity compliance guide responding to legal action.

This is bureaucracy at its finest. While it is important to ensure that any rulemaking does not adversely affect the people and industries it is meant to assist, the length of this process far exceeds other administrative rulemakings. Perhaps, rather than pass a bill to require the issuance of a single rule, we should be considering reforms to the entire OSHA rulemaking process. It seems like that may be overdue.

Despite the lengthy process of OSHA rulemaking, as written, this bill truncates established rulemaking procedures. But that is up to us. Until Congress changes this process, OSHA will follow the established framework to develop its workplace violence protection rule.

H.R. 1309 requires covered employees, including hospitals, outpatient facilities, residential treatment facilities—which includes nursing homes—and any other medical treatment or social service clinic at correctional facilities to develop and implement a written workplace violence plan within 6 months of the issuance of a rule. The plan must include identification of violence risks and prevention practices and incorporate reporting and emergency response procedures. In addition, the plan must delineate violent incident investigation procedures and training programs for employees.

Again, the importance of such a plan is undeniable. Six months may be a short timeframe within which to determine all of the required components. In order to produce the most effective plan to ensure employee safety, employers really should be granted adequate time to fully evaluate their workplace, gather input from employees, and identify the best procedures to ensure a safe environment. It is possible that, given the short timeline, workplace violence prevention plans could be hasty and, therefore, incorrectly assembled.

Here is the good news. There is middle ground. While OSHA's rulemaking process is lengthy, this bill's timeline is short. OSHA is currently gathering feedback from stakeholders and requiring an expedited rulemaking that will limit their input.

While OSHA rulemaking would ensure enforcement of workplace violence prevention policies, according to a 2018 American Hospital Association survey, 97 percent of respondents reported already having a workplace violence prevention policy in place. In 2009, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention stated that additional research was required to identify effective strategies to prevent violence, particularly in healthcare settings.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cost to private entities will be well over $2.5 billion the first 2 years of implementation and almost $1.5 billion annually thereafter. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment that will bring this cost down to $1.3 billion for the first 2 years and $700 million annually thereafter.

This mandate may make it difficult for rural hospitals and healthcare providers to continue effectively serving patients in their more rural locations.

Extending the implementation timeline of this bill may help reduce some of these concerns. We had an opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis—this is not a partisan issue—to solve a problem that we all agree needs to be solved. We are, instead, considering a bill that circumvents the established rulemaking process in favor of a swift outcome.

We can all agree that there is a need for OSHA to issue proper workplace violence prevention regulations to protect healthcare providers and social workers. I hope we are able to accomplish this goal, but we should recognize that we are placing burdens on entities through an expedited process that may require modification in the future to ensure a safe and effective workplace for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, for these and other reasons, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who has put so much work into this effort.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I would just note for the Record that Mr. DESAULNIER and Chairman MCGOVERN deserve great credit because this is basically an open rule. There were eight amendments which were offered to the Rules Committee, and all eight amendments were made in order, including a Republican amendment, which is somewhat in line with Dr. BURGESS' comments from Mr. BYRNE from Alabama, who is on the committee.

Again, I would just say this shows that the Rules Committee was serious last January when they said we are going to have a new era of bringing down the number of closed rules as much as possible. This is a perfect example of it.

In fact, Politico this morning wrote a story saying that this is actually the first bill to come to the floor that was a completely open rule that accepted every amendment that was offered by Members. I don't know if that is true, but certainly it is true that all amendments were made in order with the rule that is presented. I guess sometimes you sort of wonder: When do people take ''yes'' for an answer in this Chamber?

Again, Mr. BYRNE can have ample opportunity to make his arguments. I look forward to opposing it on the floor as I did in committee. And again, to me, it seems like a rule that all Members should really support.

So again, just to begin with Mr. DESAULNIER's description of the problem—and, again, Dr. BURGESS certainly did not quibble about the fact that this is a real problem that we are talking about. In 2013, former Congressman George Miller and I asked GAO to look at this problem. They took 3 years to study it. They used Bureau of Labor statistics, Justice Department statistics, they did surveys, and they found, in fact, that we have a really very scary problem in terms of the 15 million healthcare workers who go to work every single day: They are five times more likely to be the victims of intentional assault than any other sector in the U.S. economy.

And what is most alarming is the trajectory is going up. This is not a problem which is sort of level normal operations. It is something that is actually getting worse.

There is no secret why it is getting worse. The heroin-opioid epidemic and the behavioral health problems that exist out there in society make every ambulance call that EMTs are going out for an overdose, every emergency room patient who is coming through the door, every rehab patient who is going into a facility for treatment, all of these now are high-risk situations.

And, yes, there are some hospitals that have taken proactive steps. They have used the OSHA voluntary guidelines; they have looked at the Joint Commission on Hospitals, which has endorsed those guidelines and has, again, written strong advocacy in favor of having a national standard for this problem out there for many workers. And that is why we need to act.

Again, just so we are clear, OSHA, in 2017, as the Obama administration was leaving, put it on their regulatory agenda. They took too long.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to stipulate they took too long.

Since the Trump administration has taken over, in 34 months, they have not held one hearing in terms of stakeholder input. Yes, they scheduled two small business reg review hearings, canceled both, and they have not rescheduled. So, 34 months into this administration, there is nothing happening.

This bill, fundamentally, is about Congress, as it did with bloodborne pathogens, which addressed a crisis in hospitals back in the 1990s and early 2000s—which a Republican Congress, by the way, supported—put a deadline on OSHA to get a rule in place. We are a safer country because Congress took that action. That is what this bill does.

It is 42 months, by the way, in terms of the deadline for the rule and it is 1 year for the interim rule.

We accommodated Republican objections in the committee, made sure everybody gets a comment period on the interim rule, and we also carved out doctors offices, dentists offices, anybody who is not part of the healthcare facility. We shrunk the scope of this bill to healthcare facilities 200,000, which is going to reduce the mandate.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, the cost per facility, which Dr. BURGESS referred to, which was reduced because of the reducing of the scope of the bill, is $9,000 per facility per year.

So when we talk about the healthcare sector and how much money gets spent in it, how many patients come through the door—and these are not the small independent practice doctors offices. These are healthcare facilities. The fact of the matter is it is $9,000 a year for 2 years, then it goes down to $3,000 a year in terms of cost and expense.

What is the benefit? Lower workers' comp cost, less absenteeism, and trying to improve the morale of the people who are doing the right thing in this country in terms of providing care for those who need to be healed, consoled, and cured.

We need to pass this bill.

Again, we made Mr. BYRNE's amendment in order, but we need to reject that amendment which throws it back to OSHA, whose batting average is really a disgrace in terms of getting rules through the process.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, just so that we are technically accurate, the resolution in front of us today, point number one, it is a structured rule for H.R. 1309. This is not an open rule. I have served in the United States House of Representatives when we had open rules, and it is a different environment.

Mr. COLE last night in the Rules Committee did make a motion for an open rule on this, saying: If you are going to accept all these amendments, maybe we should open the floor up to all Members. This is an important topic. Let's get their input.

But the request for an open rule was voted down in the Rules Committee. It wasn't really a suspenseful vote. The Republican side lost 4–9, which is generally the way that works out in that committee.

I am grateful that so many amendments were made in order. I think that is important. But I also feel obligated to point out that under no circumstances should this be regarded as an open rule. It is anything but.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, healthcare and social workers are some of the most dedicated, least appreciated workers in this country. They are the workers caring for the sick, the elderly, and the most vulnerable Americans, while usually making just barely enough to get by.

A tough job is made even tougher by the fact that these workers who are treating workers in stress, often in private settings, are five times as likely to be the victims of workplace violence.

What does it say about our country that we can't protect those workers who have dedicated their lives to protecting our most vulnerable citizens? It is unfair, and the bottom line is this: No person should feel unsafe in their place of work.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA, has the authority to protect American caregivers and healthcare workers from workplace violence, but the reality is that there is no nationwide OSHA standard for how employers are supposed to protect their employees from workplace violence. Not just that, but in 24 States, nearly half the country, public-sector health and social service workers are not covered by OSHA protections.

We have the responsibility and we have the authority to protect America's workers, but we have not given our government or our businesses the tools they need to protect hardworking Americans from workplace violence. The underlying bill of this rule will change that.

The Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act would require OSHA to implement a standard for workplace protections for healthcare and social workers. It provides protections for public-sector workers where none existed before, and it identifies risks, solutions, training, and, importantly, protections from retaliation for those workers who report violence in the workplace.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this underlying bill and uphold our duty to keep every American safe.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 1869, the Restoring Investment in Improvements Act. This bill, which has 271 bipartisan cosponsors, would fix a technical error in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to allow qualified improvement property to depreciate over 15 years and be eligible for immediate expenses.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) to further explain the bill.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise to vote down the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the restoration of the 15-year schedule for qualified improvement property, or QIP, as part of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Healthcare and Social Service Workers Act.

Madam Speaker, there is strong bipartisan support to fix QIP, which affects restaurants, retailers, and other leaseholders in every congressional district in this country. There are 271 bipartisan cosponsors split nearly evenly between Republicans and Democrats on H.R. 1869, which I helped introduce to resolve this issue.

Fixing QIP is a commonsense solution that would unleash investment, create jobs, and help small businesses grow. However, it also requires urgency, and Congress must do everything in our power to address this issue as soon as possible.

I hope that we defeat the previous question to ensure that restaurants, retailers, and other small businesses are able to unlock the full benefits of tax reform and continue driving our Nation's economic growth forward.

Failing that, I sincerely hope that all sides can come together before the end of the year to enact this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

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

Just a couple of points to my friend from Texas. He is correct on the open process. However, we did allow for all 10 amendments that were submitted to be accepted, and the final vote was 2–9, understanding that that was a foregone conclusion to many of us.

I would just say that this is such an important issue in the urgency, and I would like to join with my colleague to fix the standard and the practice, and to add funding so that the Department can do it.

There is an urgency for problems like this to be solved. We can save money in the long run. When I was in local government, I was on the governing board of our county hospital. Two of our five floors were psych wards. We spent hours and hours in closed sessions dealing with liability issues on those wards.

So when I read this bill, I think that so much of what is in this bill, many of us have already done, at least from California at the local level and at the State level, and it is good business practice.

As somebody who is a former small business owner that had high workers' compensation in the restaurant business, cost avoidance is a good thing. My workers' compensation carrier came out at least once a year to inspect our facilities and see where we could avoid these incidents. So it is just a good business practice.

When I look at this, it makes so much sense. There is a cost to start this, but there is, clearly, in my mind, a fiscal savings and an emotional savings when you think of the lives lost. This is not new, but the demand in the changing trend lines say to me that this is urgent.

So I would like to agree with my friend from Texas and I would be happy to work with him, but with incidents like this, this Department really needs to be ramped up. It is a national embarrassment that it takes 20 years, or 7 years for the Department to do these rules, understanding that you have to work with stakeholders.

So I think there is an element of opportunity here for us. I do think that it is unfortunate, as we talked about in the Rules Committee last night, and Mr. BYRNE talked about, that we couldn't get across the finish line and come together completely as a bipartisan bill.

Having said that, as my friend from Texas alluded to, this is a bipartisan bill. We do have supporters, including Mr. COLE.

Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I understand that the gentleman has no additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments, and I would agree that the efficient functioning of any Federal agency should always be our highest priority. The efficient use of the taxpayer funding that goes into those agencies or branches of agencies should require our constant attention. We should always be looking to improve the service and the protection that those agencies provide.

I will also predict that this bill is likely to pass with a large margin and it will be bipartisan and will raise the question of why we are not considering it under a suspension of the rules. Nevertheless, that is what the majority has chosen to use their time doing this week, so we have the bill in front of us today.

Workplace violence is a threat that no American should have to face. The threat is particularly high for healthcare providers and for social service workers. These workers dedicate their lives to taking care of others, and they deserve to be taken care of in return.

I support the goal of this legislation. I believe it would benefit from further discussion to ensure that the timeline for issuing a rule and developing a workplace violence prevention plan will produce the most effective and safe outcome for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for his comments.

Democratic and Republican administrations have sat idly by while healthcare and social service workers are being beaten, abused, and killed. The problem is not going away. It is getting worse.

In the words of the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, he will be voting for the bill because it is better than what we have got. I certainly agree.

This bill does far better for our frontline workers who we ask to care for us every day. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 713

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except:

(1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and

(2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1333

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILD) at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 182) to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 182

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

SECTION 1. CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Effective September 26, 2018, section 8(a) of Public Law 87–126 (16 U.S.C. 459b–7(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2028''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 182, introduced by Representative BILL KEATING from Massachusetts, would reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission, which expired under current law in September 2018. This bill would reauthorize and extend it until 2028.

Since the national seashore was originally created in 1961, it was actually the first national seashore. It is the second most beautiful national seashore, but it was the first national seashore created.

The advisory commission has served as a main forum for consultation and coordination between local communities and the National Park Service. Comprised of representatives from the six towns within the park, Barnstable County, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the Secretary of the Interior, this advisory commission gives surrounding communities a voice in the management of the seashore.

I thank Representative KEATING for his leadership in introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 182.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 182, which extends the authorization of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission until 2028.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was established in 1961. It comprises more than 40,000 acres on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The enabling legislation also provided for an advisory commission comprised of six Cape Cod communities located within the seashore and the county to consult with the Secretary of the Interior about the development of the seashore. This is as it should be.

The Federal Government must be a good neighbor to the communities that its lands impact, and consulting them as partners is a fundamental point of this principle.

One of the unique aspects of this advisory commission is that the Secretary of the Interior cannot issue commercial, industrial, or recreational permits without the advice of the commission, as long as action is taken in a timely manner.

In addition, the commission meets regularly with the park superintendent to discuss specific seashore issues and to advise him about seashore programs, facilities, and activities, providing valuable local feedback to the national seashore. This feedback helps to promote sound park management, improve public access, and it ensures that the National Park Service is a good neighbor to its surrounding communities.

This is a model of how the Federal Government's land managers should be governed. My only regret is that its provisions don't apply to every community affected by Federal landholdings. I cannot help but note that the Federal Government owns just 1.2 percent of Massachusetts while giving great deference to its local communities. Meanwhile, it owns 46 percent of my State of California and often gives local communities impacted by its lands a dismissive brushoff, which is typical of the experience of our Western States.

In fact, I take this opportunity to ask my colleagues from Massachusetts to consider what would happen to their communities if the Federal Government took over half of the land in their State, removed it from the tax rolls, severely restricted any productive use of that land, and then thumbed its nose at the concerns and complaints of local communities.

Thankfully, this administration has taken a cooperative and supportive position in recent years and has improved conditions greatly, but that doesn't guarantee that future administrations won't revert to the Washington-knows-best approach that has produced no end of problems for the people of our Western States.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), who is honored to represent the second most beautiful national seashore in America.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 182, to reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chair from the Committee on Natural Resources for yielding, and I thank both of my colleagues from California for supporting this bill.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was created by President Kennedy in 1961. His vision was to preserve the unique landscape of the outer cape for recreation and enjoyment for all Americans forever. Today, more than 4 million people, both Americans and those from around the world, travel to Cape Cod every year to experience the natural beauty and recreation that the Cape Cod National Seashore provides.

However, when the Cape Cod National Seashore was proposed, it presented challenges to residents of Cape Cod unique to locating a national park on a peninsula with a limited area and with very small communities within that area. In many of the communities in the outer cape, the national seashore was designed to occupy as much as 80 percent of the available land, effectively foreclosing other economic development options after the park was established.

While the promise of President Kennedy's vision for the outer cape was realized, with the national seashore drawing millions of people from around the world to the cape, the importance of the advisory commission to the national seashore and its host communities is still important today, as important as it was almost 60 years ago.

The advisory commission was at the heart of President Kennedy's vision for the national seashore, as he recognized that the host communities would need a voice in the national seashore affairs after the park was formed. To this end, it was important that the host communities retained a formal structure to advise seashore leadership and the Park Service about how actions taken within the park would affect them and their communities.

The reasons for the powers granted to the advisory commission in its enabling legislation are just as persuasive today as they were in 1961. Since what happens on the seashore directly affects the lives of thousands of my constituents in the host communities, those decisions should be made with the input of those communities.

Some have suggested that the authority regarding the commercial activity granted to the National Seashore Advisory Commission in its enabling legislation is no longer necessary. This is simply not the case.

Suggestions that the value of having regulatory unity among the national parklands and the various advisory commissions are unpersuasive when one considers the unique nature of Cape Cod. That such a bureaucratic consideration could possibly outweigh the important benefits that the National Seashore Advisory Commission provides to my constituents is just laughable.

Today, just as in the 1960s, the unique nature of the outer cape presents the same challenges to those who live there with respect to the national seashore. The most effective way to address the concerns of the outer cape community is to ensure that a functioning advisory commission is sitting and can continue to play its important role in the community.

Long ago, President Kennedy envisioned what responsible self-governance looks like on the outer cape, a balance between the seashore, the towns, and a place where all parties could come together, again, in the spirit of sustaining the community as a whole. That is the vision of the advisory commission.

Over the past few years, the outer cape region has faced some of its toughest challenges. With climate change, coastal erosion, ocean acidification, and new concerns about sharks in the waters off Cape Cod, Cape Codders are grappling with some of the

most difficult issues that the communities have seen in years. Under these circumstances, the commission's absence is felt every day.

Madam Speaker, that is why I ask my colleagues to support this straightforward piece of legislation, a bill that has been passed by this House in the last Congress that will reactivate an effective tool that has provided an important role for the Cape Cod community, my community, for nearly 60 years.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask for adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I respectfully request an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 182.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG BEAR LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 255) to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 255

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 ''Big Bear Land Exchange Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means the County of San Bernardino, California.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 73 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service generally depicted as ''Federal Land Proposed for Exchange'' on the Map.

(3) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the approximately 71 acres owned by the County generally depicted as ''Non-Federal Land Proposed for Exchange'' on the Map.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map titled ''Big Bear Land Exchange'' and dated August 6, 2018.

SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to valid existing rights and the terms of this Act, no later than one year after the date that the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail is relocated in accordance with subsection (h), if the County offers to convey the non-Federal land to the United States, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land; and

(2) accept from the County a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the County in and to the non-Federal land.

(b) EQUAL VALUE AND CASH EQUALIZATION.—

(1) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The land exchange under this section shall be for equal value, or the values shall be equalized by a cash payment as provided for under this subsection or an adjustment in acreage. At the option of the County, any excess value of the non-Federal lands may be considered a gift to the United States.

(2) EQUALIZATION.—If the value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land to be conveyed in a land exchange under this subsection is not equal, the value may be equalized by—

(A) making a cash equalization payment to the Secretary or to the owner of the non-Federal land, as appropriate, in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)); or

(B) reducing the acreage of the Federal land or the non-Federal land to be exchanged, as appropriate.

(3) DEPOSIT AND USE OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM COUNTY.—Any cash equalization payment received by the Secretary under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; commonly known as the ''Sisk Act''). The funds so deposited shall remain available to the Secretary, until expended, for the acquisition of lands, waters, and interests in land for the San Bernardino National Forest.

(c) APPRAISAL.—The Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the land to be exchanged under subsection (a) in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) TITLE APPROVAL.—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the County.

(e) SURVEY OF NON-FEDERAL LANDS.—Before completing the exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall inspect the non-Federal lands to ensure that the land meets Federal standards, including hazardous materials and land line surveys.

(f) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of conveyance, any costs related to the exchange under this section shall be paid by the County.

(g) MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LANDS.—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) added to, and managed as part of, San Bernardino National Forest; and

(2) managed in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.; commonly known as the ''Weeks Act''); and

(B) any other laws, including regulations, pertaining to National Forest System lands.

(h) PACIFIC CREST NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL RELOCATION.—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws (including regulations), shall relocate the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail located on the Federal land to—

(1) adjacent National Forest System land;

(2) land owned by the County, subject to County approval;

(3) land within the Federal land, subject to County approval; or

(4) a combination of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(i) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize a map and legal descriptions of all land to be conveyed under this Act. The Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map or in the legal descriptions. The map and legal descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(j) APPLICABLE LAW.—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a).

(k) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any conveyance of Federal land under this Act shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights;

(2) the terms of this Act; and

(3) such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 255, introduced by Representative COOK, would authorize an equal value exchange between the U.S. Forest Service and San Bernardino County. This exchange would enable the county to build a resource conservation and recovery facility. This will increase efficiency and safety of timber processing and recycling in that area. In return, the Forest Service would receive an undeveloped inholding in the San Bernardino National Forest.

The bill is a perfect example of how, through a collaborative process, we can meet the needs of local stakeholders while continuing to protect our environment and public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank my colleague, Representative COOK, for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 255, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), authorizes a locally supported equal value land exchange between the Forest Service and San Bernardino County. The county has proposed to convey an inland parcel within the San Bernardino National Forest to the Forest Service in exchange for land further north to be conveyed by the county.

The land conveyed by the county will allow needed forest management infrastructure to be located closer to the forest and promote road safety by reducing the need to drive forest products down narrow, winding roads.

H.R. 255 also authorizes cooperation between the county and the Forest Service to relocate a portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, if needed, and requires that the trail relocation be completed before the exchange is consummated.

This legislation is the result of a Congressman who has listened to the voices of his community, an administration sympathetic to the plight of our forest communities, and community members and their local representatives putting forward a reasonable and workable plan that is fair to all parties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from southern California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California offering me some time, and I want to thank Representative COOK, as well, for his efforts.

I rise in support of the Big Bear Land Exchange Act.

My community in San Bernardino County experiences some of the highest levels of air pollution anywhere in the country, and, in order to combat this pollution, we must find ways to reduce emissions in our region. This bill will help us do just that.

This land exchange between the county and the Federal Government will allow the establishment of a recycling and recovery center in my neighboring district. This facility would decrease the long distances that trucks have to travel to dispose of waste and will allow us to divert this waste by repurposing recyclable materials.

This legislation is good for our communities and is a smart way to help mitigate pollution and combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative COOK, for his work in championing this bill and for his bipartisan collaboration. I have worked with Mr. COOK on a number of issues representing San Bernardino County. Nobody is more thoughtful when it comes to what our future direction holds. I know his heart is in San Bernardino County, as well, and no one will ever doubt that about his intent.

Just because he doesn't want to hang out here with us in this facility oftentimes doesn't mean that he isn't publicly driven and publicly minded in order to deliver for his constituents. This bill is one of those examples.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague the remainder of the next 12 months and in the years ahead, and I want to thank him for his efforts in this regard.

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

I share my colleague's high words of praise and warmth for our colleague, Mr. COOK, the author of this measure, and I am also somewhat annoyed with him for his decision to leave the Congress at the end of this session for the county board of supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for yielding his time.

I had my speech all prepared, but I am not sure whether it is a San Bernardino lovefest or a beat up on PAUL COOK because he is leaving this institution.

This is an example. Everybody knows that you can work together; you can put your differences aside and get things done. I pride myself on that. I am very, very passionate about certain things.

This bill sounds simple, the pollution going up and down that hill; but, more so, anyone who has lived in a mountain community knows how dangerous it is, particularly in the winter, and more so with a truck with timber on it, the number of accidents that we have on those roads up there—just the deaths—every year. We have always had problems, and it is something I am very, very concerned about.

I do want to commend working with the Pacific Crest Trail Association, working together so we could iron out some of these things.

The relocation, as I think was already mentioned, will include environmental review and will take care before the exchange takes place.

And we have got a lot of people on this: the city of Big Bear Lake, the Friends of Big Bear Valley, Big Bear Fire Department.

By the way, there are big bears up there. If you haven't met one there, stay off the highways.

Anyway, the Big Bear City Community Services Department, the water district, the community healthcare, the chamber of commerce, and the local Big Bear chapter of the Sierra Club—and they have been great on this.

It passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote. Last December, nearly identical language passed out of the House as H.R. 5513 with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I appreciate the comments—even the sarcastic comments—of my colleagues, and I truly am going to miss this institution.

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

I assure my friend, they are not sarcastic. He will be sorely missed in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure and urge my colleague to change his mind and come back next session, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to associate myself with the other comments about how much we are going to miss Colonel Cook. We respect him. We admire him. We are amused by him.

Let the record show he just called the Sierra Club great. I want that to be noted.

And although he has found a way, through this bill, to create an equal value exchange, something tells me that in the exchange of Colonel Cook, because we are losing him, the County of San Bernardino is making out a lot better than this institution. So I wish him well and urge a ''yes'' vote on his good bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 255, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 263) to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 263

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge was created in 1968. It is located on the north shore of Long Island in eastern Nassau County, is the largest refuge in the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge Complex, and receives the most public use of all the refuges in the Complex.

(2) The State of New York designated Oyster Bay a significant coastal fish and wildlife habitat. It is especially important for wintering waterfowl such as black duck, greater scaup, bufflehead, canvasback and long-tailed ducks. Management activities include wetland restoration and protection of the natural shoreline and vegetation.

(3) The refuge is unique in consisting solely of bay bottom and adjacent shoreline up to the mean high-tide mark. Ninety percent of New York's commercial oyster harvest comes from the refuge. Visitors enjoy fishing, wildlife observation, photography and environmental education. The refuge is truly a national treasure.

(4) Many visitors are unaware that were it not for the tireless work and advocacy of then-freshman Congressman Lester Wolff, this area would today be an 8.5-mile causeway and bridge across Long Island Sound between Oyster Bay and Rye, New York, connecting Nassau and Westchester Counties.

(5) The bridge was first proposed by Robert Moses, the well-known New York City Planner, to divert traffic from New York City. Former Governor Nelson Rockefeller signed into law legislation creating the bridge authorized by the New York State Legislature in 1967.

(6) Congressman Wolff, elected in 1964, quickly decided the bridge would be an intrusion in a pristine area, and that Long Island Sound was a very precious resource that was despoiled. The conservation threats in the mid-1960s were suburban development, wetland filling, and industrial pollution. The fight to preserve this land became an enormous political fight and is considered to be a turning point in New York State's environmental legacy.

(7) With State and local political and community leaders, and especially the North Shore leaders and the Committee to Save the Long Island Sound, Congressman Wolff arranged a meeting with Department of the Interior representatives and local leaders where the idea of creating a wildlife refuge from municipal and privately owned wetlands was created.

(8) The Town of Oyster Bay, in which one end of the bridge was to be located, deeded 5,000 acres of wetlands to the United States to be maintained as a Federal wildlife preserve. It was stipulated that if the Department of the Interior agreed to an intrusion of the property, it would revert to the town. Creating a Federal wildlife preserve provided the land with Federal protection.

(9) Because of the vision, dedication, and perseverance of Congressman Lester Wolff, all of us and future generations can enjoy the beauty and magnificence of this refuge.

SEC. 2. RENAMING THE OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE AS THE CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) RENAMING.—The unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System known as the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge and located near Oyster Bay, New York, shall be known as the ''Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System known as the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge is deemed to be a reference to the ''Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in New York as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

A long-time Congressman from Long Island, Congressman Wolff was instrumental in creating this refuge and protecting it from unnecessary development. Thanks to his hard work and vision, the Oyster Bay refuge is an important stopover for wintering waterfowl, and it is also a popular destination for outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

At 100 years old, Congressman Wolff is the oldest living Member of Congress. This bill is a fitting tribute to him for his years of conservation leadership, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my friend said, this bill renames the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in honor of Congressman Lester Wolff, former Long Island-North Shore Congressman.

It is certainly appropriate to recognize and honor Congressman Wolff's distinguished eight-term career representing the people of New York by adding his name to the wildlife refuge that he fought so hard to create.

This refuge has become a popular destination for many Americans to enjoy the wildlife and beauty of our outdoor spaces, and, at 100 years of age, Congressman Wolff has the distinction of being the oldest living former Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting we honor a man so dedicated and who has put so much of his life into fighting to protect and conserve this place and fighting for his constituency. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), who is the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN for allowing me this time.

I rise today in support of this bill that I have sponsored, a bipartisan bill, H.R. 263, which, as has been mentioned, would rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA. I want to thank, again, Congressman HUFFMAN and my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their work on this bill, as well as the members of the New York delegation, all of whom are cosponsors of and support this legislation.

Congressman Lester Wolff, who represented my district for 16 years, is our Nation's oldest living former Congressman, and, in January, he will turn 101 years old.

The renaming of the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in his honor is in recognition of his monumental contributions to the preservation and protection of our environment.

These precious wetlands, at Congressman Lester Wolff's urging, were protected in 1968. It was in 1967 that the New York State Legislature, at the insistence of then-Governor Nelson Rockefeller and the master planner, Robert Moses, authorized a bridge across the Long Island Sound.

Lester immediately saw the bridge would despoil this pristine and precious resource of the Long Island Sound and soon found himself at the center of an enormous political fight. Lester eventually won this fight, and the Oyster Bay Wildlife Refuge was born. Today, it covers over 3,200 acres of one of the most important areas for natural refuge anywhere on the north shore of Long Island and is home to many endangered species.

Not only was Lester a champion for our environment, he also served our Nation honorably in our military. Lester served in the Civil Air Patrol during World War II and commanded the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, rising to the rank of colonel.

In 2014, Wolff received the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian award.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to also support this legislation so we may honor this great Congressman whose efforts were an important part of our Nation's environmental history.

□ 1400

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will close by commending Representative SUOZZI for his bipartisan initiative to honor the legacy of Congressman Lester Wolff. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 263.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHARK FIN SALES ELIMINATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 737) to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 737

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 ''Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF SHARK FINS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in sections 3 and 4, no person shall possess, offer for sale, sell, or purchase any shark fin or product containing any shark fin.

(b) PENALTY.—For purposes of section 308(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858(a)), a violation of this section shall be treated as an act prohibited by section 307 of that Act.

SEC. 3. EXEMPTION FOR TRADITIONAL FISHERIES, EDUCATION, AND SCIENCE.

Section 2 shall not apply with respect to possession of a shark fin that was taken lawfully under a State, territorial, or Federal license or permit to take or land sharks, if the shark fin is separated from the shark in a manner consistent with the license or permit and is—

(1) destroyed or discarded upon separation;

(2) used for noncommercial subsistence purposes in accordance with State or territorial law;

(3) used solely for display or research purposes by a museum, college, or university, or by any other person under a State or Federal permit to conduct noncommercial scientific research; or

(4) retained by the license or permit holder for a noncommercial purpose.

SEC. 4. EXEMPTION FOR DOGFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be a violation of section 2 for any person to possess, offer for sale, sell, or purchase any fresh or frozen raw fin or tail from any stock of the species Mustelus canis (smooth dogfish) or Squalus acanthias (spiny dogfish).

(b) REPORT.—By not later than January 1, 2027, the Secretary of Commerce should review the exemption in subsection (a) and should prepare and submit to the Congress a report that includes a recommendation on whether the exemption should continue or be terminated. In preparing such report and making such recommendation, the Secretary should analyze factors including—

(1) the economic viability of dogfish fisheries with and without the continuation of the exemption;

(2) the impact to ocean ecosystems of continuing or terminating the exemption;

(3) the impact on enforcement of the ban contained in section 3 caused by the exemption; and

(4) the impact of the exemption on shark conservation.

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF RAYS AND SKATES IN SEAFOOD TRACEABILITY PROGRAM.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall revise section 300.324 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to include rays and skates in the species and species groups specified in subsection (a)(2) of such section.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SHARK.—The term ''shark'' means any species of the orders Pristiophoriformes, Squatiniformes, Squaliformes, Hexanchiformes, Lamniformes, Carchariniformes, Orectolobiformes, and Heterodontiformes.

(2) SHARK FIN.—The term ''shark fin'' means the raw, dried, or otherwise processed detached fin, or the raw, dried, or otherwise processed detached tail, of a shark.

SEC. 7. STATE AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act affects any right of a State or territory of the United States to adopt or enforce any regulation or standard that is more stringent than a regulation or standard in effect under this Act.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGET EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would make it legal to possess, buy, or sell shark fins in the United States.

Now, everyone knows sharks are in trouble. Around the globe, one-quarter of sharks and their relatives are threatened with extinction. They are being caught and killed on average 30 percent faster than they can reproduce, in large part due to the demand for their fins to fuel the global shark fin trade. The fins from as many as 73 million sharks enter the shark fin trade every single year.

As top predators in the oceans, they play a critical role in ecosystems impacting our fisheries, coral reefs, and tourism economies. The concern for declining shark populations and the impact of their loss and the impact that loss has on ecosystems and tourism alike has led to increased efforts to conserve sharks globally, including no-take marine reserves, species-specific fishing bans, and shark fin trade bans.

While the United States has banned the practice of shark finning, we have not banned the buying and selling of shark fins, which means that we are still a part of the problem.

States and the private sector are catching on. Already 12 States, three territories, 40 airlines, and 20 major international shipping companies and other corporations such as Amazon, Disney, Hilton, and Grubhub have all refused to partake in this trade that devastates shark populations around the world.

And just this year Canada passed a similar bill, in large part thanks to our efforts here. That is the intention of this bill. When the United States steps up to lead, others will follow.

H.R. 737 would build on the leadership of these States, territories, and companies by eliminating shark fin sales and possession in the United States.

In addition to its 287 bipartisan cosponsors, this bill enjoys the support of recreational fishing interests, aquariums, over 150 scientists, 150 chefs, over 300 dive businesses and over 130 nonprofits. With this overwhelming support and at a time when so many shark populations are depleted, it is of utmost importance that we pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressman SABLAN for his leadership and also Congressman MCCAUL for his leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a bumper sticker bill that purports to save the sharks, but in reality would damage shark fisheries, destroy American jobs, and increase the threats to endangered species.

Let's first define what we agree on. Killing a shark solely to take its fins is contemptible. It is immoral. Herman Melville called such wanton waste blasphemous.

But let us be clear: This practice is already illegal under Federal law. It has been that way since 1993. American fishermen are not the villains in this story, they are the heroes who are adhering to rigorous regulations that require them to account for the full use of their catches.

So what does this bill do? It does exactly what it purports to abhor. Proponents rightly denounce taking the fins and then throwing away the carcass, so they have come up with a bill that would take the carcass but throw away the fins. This bill makes it illegal to possess or purchase a shark fin. The fins are 50 percent of the value of the catch.

If you force shark fishermen to waste literally 50 percent of the value of their catch, you remove their margin and destroy their enterprise. And this does little to stop the illegal trade of shark fins, since almost all of the demand is in east and Southeast Asia, and that market will simply apply upward pressure on the illegal taking of shark fins.

The responsible management of our U.S. fisheries and the exemplary conduct of U.S. fishermen has resulted in a great success story. Since 2000, the domestic shark population has been growing. The index of shark abundance in 2015 was the highest in its 29-year history.

Now, if you force fishermen to throw away 50 percent of the value of each shark they catch, one of two things are going to happen. To stay in business, they will have to take more and more sharks to make up for their loss, or more likely for American fishermen, they will simply go out of business.

If it is the latter, we can expect an out-of-control explosion in shark populations with devastating consequences for endangered marine species, like the right whale. And in either case, American fishermen will suffer to the advantage of the unregulated illegal foreign fishing fleets.

This is an example of two developments that we have had to watch on the Natural Resources Committee since the Democrats took control.

The first is their tendency to cater to emotional pressure groups who have been successful at raising large sums of money by tugging at the heartstrings of gullible donors, but whose bromides end up doing enormous harm to the very populations they purport to protect. Indeed, the Wildlife Conservation Society recently submitted a letter warning of this signed by 60 of our Nation's leading scientific experts in shark science and fisheries.

The second is the tendency to blame Americans first for the excesses and predations of bad foreign actors.

Time and again, American fishermen, American growers, and American consumers have proven to be the law-abiding, conservation-minded, responsible practitioners of a sustainable practice. But the Democrats continue to impose punitive and destructive measures on them to atone for the irresponsible actions of foreign nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note, that in California, where I authored a very similar ban on the possession, sale, and trade of shark fins, the sky has not fallen, the world has not ended. All of the calamities that my friend just predicted have not taken place, and guess what, there continues to be a sustainable shark fishery for the meat without contributing to the global shark fin trade that is driving the decimation of shark populations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from The Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN), the author of this bill.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 737, the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act.

The act bans the buying and selling of shark fins in the United States, and this widely supported bipartisan bill has gathered 287 cosponsors. A companion bill, S. 877, has been introduced in the Senate as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the largest number of cosponsors for any ocean conservation bill so far in this Congress, and I want to thank my good friend and the distinguished Member from Texas, the Honorable MICHAEL MCCAUL who has worked tirelessly with me on the bill and brings with him the support of 68 Members from his side of the aisle.

This bill has such strong support because it represents an effective way to remove the United States from the devastating global trade in shark fins at zero cost, and because it does so without stopping those who want to fish for sharks and use them for their meat.

Mr. Speaker, sharks are absolutely critical to life in the ocean. As apex predators, they help maintain balance by keeping prey populations in check. They are also critical to the tourism economy off our coastal communities.

In Florida alone, tourists who go diving to see sharks generate more than 200 times the value of the trade in shark fins for our entire country, 200 times the value.

Despite their importance ecologically and economically, sharks are in serious trouble. Each year fins from up to 73 million sharks are sliced off and sold in a global marketplace. And largely due to this demand for fins, some shark species in the population have now declined by more than 90 percent.

Our Nation has wisely banned the inhumane practice of finning sharks and throwing them back into the ocean to drown and die, yet we still allow fins to be bought and sold here. And many of the fins we are buying and selling come from countries that simply do not have the same level of protection the United States gives sharks.

Now is the time for us to take the next step. Only by banning the shark fin trade once and for all within our borders can we ensure we are no longer supporting an unsustainable use of ocean resources. Recognizing this unsustainability, The Northern Mariana Islands, my home, was the first U.S. insular area to ban the trade of shark fins in 2011.

As an island culture 3,000-plus years old, the people of the Marianas understand and respect the important role that sharks play in maintaining the life of our oceans. And we are not alone. Twelve U.S. states and two territories have also passed their own shark fin bans.

But this patchwork of State laws can be challenging to enforce, and so this is why we need a Federal ban on the shark fin trade in the United States, and that is why I am asking for your support today.

A ban on the shark fin trade is supported by 45 domestic and international airlines, by 21 shipping companies, seven major corporations and more than 645 U.S. businesses and organizations.

A 2016 national poll found four of five Americans supported a national ban on the buying and selling of shark fins. Hundreds of scientists, chefs, fishers, dive, and surf businesses have written to Congress requesting passage of a national shark fin ban.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House to act. Please join me by voting ''yes'' on this critical bill. Vote ''yes'' to conserve our oceans and the all-important sharks that live in those waters.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from California says that, well, California's ban hasn't resulted in any calamities. What he forgets is that virtually all shark fisheries in the United States are found in Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina. Banning shark finning in California is like banning buffalo hunting in Rhode Island; there just isn't any.

My friend from the Marianas tells us that there are 73 million shark fins in the global market annually. That is a very misleading statement. It comes from a report published by Shelley Clarke. That report gives a range of between 26 and 73 million and makes no differentiation between legally and illegally obtained fins, which, unfortunately, is a defect in this bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, for a different opinion, however, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I rise in support of this bill to help end the inhumane practice of shark finning. After a shark's fins are removed, these majestic creatures are thrown into the ocean to die, and multiple species face extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Congressman SABLAN, for his courageous leadership to introduce this bill, which I strongly support.

The United States banned shark finning. Now we must end the shark fin trade. Major retailers, airliners, and shipping companies refuse to ship or sell shark fin products. And 12 states, including my home State of Texas have bans on shark fin trading. It is time for a Federal ban, Mr. Speaker.

The United States led in ending the trade of trafficking ivory and rhino horns, and now we must lead in the shark fin trade itself.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to end and close with a personal thanks to my wife, Linda, who is an oceanographer who spent many years serving our country in Naval intelligence tracking Soviet submarines, and now she tracks sharks by tagging sharks and following them around the world as they exist.

□ 1415

As she told me when she returned from Guadeloupe Island, on the very same boat that Peter Benchley went out on as he saw the majestic great white shark, in his words, he says that the greatest regret of his life was writing the book ''Jaws.''

I thank Delegate SABLAN, and I thank my wife, Linda, for great testimony before this committee. I stand in strong support, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us on this momentous day.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just another shout-out to Congressman MCCAUL and his wife, who was a fantastic witness at the hearing we had on this bill at the Natural Resources Committee, and also for the leadership of the State of Texas and so many other States, territories, and leaders in the

private sector who understand we have to end this terribly wasteful and cruel global shark fin trade.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, down in South Carolina's Lowcountry, we all understand the importance of a healthy ocean and healthy coastlines, and sharks are a part of that story. Unfortunately, many populations of sharks have severely declined due to the demand for their fins. In South Carolina, we have not imported or exported any shark fins in recent years, and a large number of constituents have contacted me in support of this legislation.

Support for this ban is growing across the country. Twelve U.S. States already have shark fin bans. Private companies are also refusing to ship or sell shark fin products.

Just earlier this year, Canada became the first G20 country to ban the shark fin trade. The United States has already banned the act of shark finning, but we continue to import fins from countries that don't have their own finning bans.

Disturbingly, in the United States, our own government data shows that less than 20 percent of our U.S. shark stocks are sustainably managed. It is time for the United States to end its role in the shark fin trade and stop contributing to the decline of our shark populations.

I am grateful to Delegate SABLAN and Chairman GRIJALVA from the Natural Resources Committee for their leadership on this issue. Also, I thank Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member MCCAUL for his leadership.

Ending the shark fin trade will require a death by a thousand cuts, and we have the opportunity to make a big cut right now. Let's pass the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas compared banning shark fins to banning ivory. Of course, the difference is that the U.S. was a major consumer of ivory. It is 1 percent of the entire global shark fin market.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be upfront. I have caught dozens of sharks in my life. I have released every single one of them intact. I have never gone shark fishing. It was unintentional catch. I have never eaten a shark, never had shark fin soup, nor have I any intention or desire to have any of this. But I do represent a State that does have a shark industry that sustainably harvests those.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is our obligation to actually go to scientists and to go to fisheries managers to get their opinion on what it is that we ought to be doing here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from our Democratic Governor's administration where they talk about this bill.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES,

Baton Rouge, LA, July 7, 2017.

Re Shark Fin Trade Elimination Act of 2017, S. 793, H.R. 1456.

Mr. ACY COOPER,
President, Louisiana Shrimp Association, Grand Isle, Louisiana.

ACY: As requested by you on June 7, 2017, the department has reviewed the text of Senate bill 793 and House Resolution 1456, also known as the ''Shark Fin Trade Elimination Act of 2017'' and the ''Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2017'', respectively. The bills, in their current form, would place unnecessary economic burdens on Louisiana shark fishermen. As long as responsible management is in place, which is currently the case for sharks in the Gulf of Mexico, there is no need for this legislation.

The purpose of these bills as stated by the authors is to ''curtail the act of 'finning' sharks while reducing the U.S. contribution to the global shark fin market.'' The practice of shark finning is already illegal in the United States and Louisiana and has been since the 2000s. All sharks landed in Louisiana must have their fins naturally attached until landed. Once a shark is landed in Louisiana, these fins may then be removed and processed separately.

Information available on NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service commercial statistics website shows that in 2015, 17,059 kilograms (37,530 pounds) of shark fins were exported from the United States to other countries while 24,016 kilograms (52,835 pounds) of shark fins were imported from other countries. The total estimated global shark fin trade, was an estimated 17,500 metric tons (according to a 2015 F.A.O. report on the state of the global market for shark products). These U.S. total imports and exports amount to less than 1% of shark fins traded globally. This bill will likely have little impact on the global trade in shark fins, especially the illegal trade of shark fins. The majority of shark fin exports do not move through the United States. The majority of fins exported from the United States, in the past, moved through California to the Hong Kong Market. However, since the California ban on shark fins in 2015, the shark fin trade now mainly flows through Mexico and Canada in North America. These bills will do little to reduce global trade or curtail illegal practices on the high seas, but will economically impact responsible U.S. fishermen. Data for 2016 were not yet available.

Sharks are indeed a vital part of the marine ecosystem, however those sharks harvested in the United States, along with their fins, are sustainably harvested in accordance with regulations and quotas established by the NOAA Fisheries Highly Migratory Species Division and the State of Louisiana. By eliminating a domestic market for legally harvested fins, this legislation will only have adverse impacts on Louisiana fishermen who legally harvest sharks and their fins as well as the coastal fishing communities where they live. These bills will create unnecessary regulatory waste of legally harvested shark parts by not allowing fishermen to sell fins from a legally harvestable shark species. These bills ban one part, the most valuable part, of an otherwise legally harvestable animal creating a situation in which an entire fishery would effectively be shut down. They will either not affect global shark fin markets, or at worst, will encourage further development of unregulated harvest to replace the regulated US landings.

The shark fishery is an important winter fishery in Louisiana as it provides a critical seasonal source of income to a number of commercial fishermen until other fisheries open later in the year.

Possible alternative measures to allow the legal shark fishery of the U.S. to continue to harvest and sell legally obtained fins while working to reduce illegal finning practices:

1) Legislation mandating tracking and traceability of legally harvested fins as opposed to an outright ban.

2) Provide for tracking and traceability measures of imported and exported fins to determine legal origin of those fins originating from or entering into the U.S.

3) Prohibit the importation or exportation of shark fins that can't be verified to have come from legally landed sharks.

Sincerely,

JACK MONTOUCET,
Secretary.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. They say: ''As long as responsible management is in place, which is currently the case for sharks in the Gulf of Mexico, there is no need for this legislation.''

They say: ''The practice of shark finning is already illegal in the United States and Louisiana and has been since the 2000s.''

''These bills will create unnecessary regulatory waste of legally harvested shark parts by not allowing fishermen to sell fins from a legally harvestable shark species.''

These bills ''will either not affect global shark fin markets, or at worst, will encourage further development of unregulated harvest to replace the regulated U.S. landings.''

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a National Geographic article from this year that has quotes from the Mote Marine Laboratory in Florida.

SHARK FIN IS BANNED IN 12 U.S. STATES—BUT IT'S STILL ON THE MENU

SHARK FIN BANS, INTENDED TO REDUCE INSTANCES OF SHARK FINNING, ARE DIFFICULT TO ENFORCE, LEADING SOME TO QUESTION IF THEY'RE WORTH IT

(By Rachel Fobar, Jan. 16, 2019)

But that would be against state law. California is one of 12 states that bans the sale of shark fins—measures to help prevent further declines of shark populations and to deter finning, which has been illegal in U.S. waters since 2000. Although demand for shark fins for soup is greatest in Asian countries, there's significant demand for them in the United States too.

A man who identified himself as the China Gate Restaurant owner's brother says the online listing is a mistake and denies that the restaurant serves the dish.

Finning involves slicing fins off live sharks and tossing the wounded animals overboard, where they sink to the bottom and, unable to swim and pass water over their gills, suffocate, die of blood loss, or get eaten by other predators.

''It's without doubt, the worst act of animal cruelty I've ever seen,'' says celebrity chef Gordon Ramsay in his television documentary on the shark fishing industry.

Every year, the Animal Welfare Institute, a Washington, D.C.-based nonprofit that supports a national ban on shark fin, updates its list of restaurants that serve shark fin soup and notifies the relevant state enforcement agencies.

But so far, according to the institute, the bans haven't stopped restaurants in at least 10 of the 12 states.

During the past two years, at least five bills relating to the country's shark fin trade have been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate. All five died before becoming laws, leaving the fate of sharks in the U.S. uncertain.

Many countries don't regulate shark finning, says Peter Knights, CEO of WildAid, an environmental group that strives to reduce consumption of wildlife products. What this means, activists say, is that Americans could be getting their fins from countries that catch and mutilate sharks, diminishing their already dwindling global populations.

Because of overfishing and the demand for shark fin for soup, more than a quarter of the world's sharks, rays, and chimaeras (a cartilaginous fish also known as ghost sharks) are considered to be threatened. In a 2012 study, researchers found the DNA of eight different sharks, including the endangered scalloped hammerhead, as well as vulnerable species like the shortfin mako and the spiny dogfish, in soup samples collected from around the U.S.

Shark fin soup has long been a status dish in Asian countries, notably China, where its use can be traced back to an emperor from the Song Dynasty (960–1279) who is thought to have invented the dish to show off his power and wealth. Shark fin eventually became exalted as one of the four treasures of Chinese cuisine, along with abalone, sea cucumber, and fish maw (swim bladders).

Today, it's a luxury dish served at weddings as a sign of respect for guests. Preparation of the soup involves boiling the fins and scraping off the skin and meat, leaving behind softened protein fiber, which is sometimes shredded before it goes into the soup.

What is a luxury to some is a headache to understaffed enforcement agencies in the U.S. states that ban shark fin. They say that cases against shark fin vendors in those states can be hard to make. Because the shark fin trade tends to go underground, it has been compared to the illicit drug trade.

''I know it's going on, I know it's out there,'' says San Francisco marine warden William O'Brien. ''But it's a very private matter—it's not the kind of thing that, you know, people are selling to the public.''

In addition, according to several law enforcement agents, fines and jail sentences for violating the shark fin ban are generally light and have little deterrent effect.

Knights says a U.S. ban on sales of shark fin would be a significant step forward because it would send the message that selling and consuming shark fin isn't acceptable anymore. The sale of shark fin, he says, ''continues to increase the sort of pressure on sharks worldwide.''

But, argues Robert Hueter, director of the Center for Shark Research at Mote Marine Laboratory, in Sarasota, Florida, given how difficult it is for some states to enforce their shark fin bans, a nationwide ban would just drive the shark fin market underground—as it's done in San Francisco.

California has about a third of the country's Asian population and is one of the largest consumers of shark fin outside Asia.

When the shark fin ban passed in California in 2011, San Francisco marine warden William O'Brien says he was ''charged up.'' He'd been keeping a list of restaurants to inspect once the ban went into force.

Almost immediately, he and his team received a tip about a supplier, and they confiscated more than 2,000 pounds of shark fin from a warehouse near San Francisco Bay. He estimates that the haul was worth at least $500,000. The accused, Michael Kwong, a shark fin wholesaler and vocal opponent of the shark fin ban who said his family had been in the business for four generations, pleaded no contest to violating the shark fin ban. According to court records, he spent 30 days in jail, paid a court fine, and received three years' probation.

Since then, O'Brien says, the leads have dried up. He suspects restaurants and market owners are now storing their shark fin supplies off premises—perhaps in their homes, which would be off-limits to law enforcement without a search warrant.

''Essentially, the market has gone so far underground that it requires more specialization than I have to dig it up,'' O'Brien says.

O'Brien's overall responsibilities include monitoring for illegal ivory, the pet trade, and illegal animal products in medication, and he must also check hunting and fishing licenses almost daily. He reckons that in any given month, he's able to devote only about two days to shark fin.

''It would be great if I was like, the shark fin guy, and that was all I did,'' O'Brien laments.

A complicating factor is that a restauranteur accused of selling shark fin soup may claim it's imitation or made from a species of shark exempt from the ban. Spiny and smooth dogfish sharks, for example, are exempt in New York State. It's possible to identify a species from a freshly cut fin, but once a fin is dried or absorbed in soup, the only way to prove it's a species in violation of the law is through DNA testing.

To ascertain whether a crime has been committed, authorities must establish whether the DNA in a seized sample of soup is actually that of a shark. The specimens Ashley Spicer tests and analyzes as a part of her work in the Wildlife Forensics Lab at the California Department of Fish and Wildlife vary from suspected shark fin soup in plastic to-go containers to frozen fins in vacuum-sealed packaging.

Spicer examined California's 2018 shark cases—all four of them. Only two of those cases were specifically shark fin; the others were a shark attack case and a poaching case. In all, the two shark fin cases she handled in 2018 involved about 20 different shark fins.

Low test numbers don't necessarily represent every California shark fin case that comes to the attention of authorities. If, for example, a case elicits an immediate confession on the part of the accused, authorities may decide that testing isn't necessary.

DNA testing proved successful in a recent case in Plano, Texas, one of the states where shark fin is banned. Mike Stephens, a game warden with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, went into a local dim sum restaurant—in uniform—with a colleague and asked for the ''special'' menu. And there it was: shark fin soup.

To assure them the shark fin was real, not imitation, the restaurant owner's wife led the wardens to a walk-in freezer where they found about six bags of shark fins. Stephens assumes that the owner, Qi Zhou, and his wife didn't realize the real reason behind the wardens' visit until it was too late. Before they left, Stephens says, Zhou's wife told them they weren't the only ones selling shark fin. The supermarket next door was offering it too, she said.

Sure enough, when the wardens went to the supermarket, Tao Marketplace, to investigate, they found nearly 40 shark carcasses, the tail fins removed, on display in the fresh fish aisle and in storage.

Wearing rubber gloves so as not to contaminate the evidence, they sealed the fins from both places in separate containers and overnighted them to a lab in North Carolina for DNA testing.

The case against the supermarket is still pending, but the restaurant owner was found guilty of selling shark fin and paid a fine: one dollar. The court also ordered Zhou to make a donation to the Animal Welfare Institute, which totaled less than a thousand dollars, Stephens says.

According to the institute, in Texas and most other states, prison sentences for shark fin transgressions are rare and usually don't exceed six months for a first offense. Fines are usually less than a thousand dollars. By contrast, a single pound of dried shark fin can sell for $400, and shark fin soup can command anywhere from $50 to $200.

''It's tough to get jail time on wildlife cases,'' says Jesse Paluch, a captain with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's Bureau of Environmental Crimes Investigation unit. In New York, he says, judges and prosecutors ''see so much crime, so wildlife crime is a little bit lower on the spectrum.''

In October 1988, when Robert Hueter was getting his start at the Mote Marine Laboratory, he heard from a colleague that a group of fishermen off the Florida Panhandle had been caught harpooning bottlenose dolphins, whose meat and blood they used to bait sharks. Killing bottlenose dolphins was and still is illegal under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. When the fishermen caught sharks, they sliced off their fins and threw the mutilated animals, still alive, back into the water.

This is sick, Hueter says he thought at the time. He'd never heard of shark finning, so he contacted Nelson Bryant, a reporter he knew at The New York Times, who wrote a pioneering story about the practice. Today, shark finning is the subject of documentaries, public protests, and Facebook posts.

Hueter says the fishermen were handed minor fines for killing the dolphins—and no penalty for finning the sharks. ''There was no crime in what they'd done with the sharks,'' he says.

Since then, Hueter has been an advocate for sharks. Which is why, he says, he's against a national shark fin ban.

''The folks that are pushing the fin ban campaign want to simplify it to this very simple message—that if we ban the fin trade in the United States, we save sharks all around the world,'' Heuter says. ''That is so simplistic and so wrong.''

He says that of course he's against finning and overfishing but that cutting the fins off a legally caught dead shark isn't cruel, and banning a specific dish won't stop shark finning because shark finning is already illegal in U.S. waters. But, he says, a ban will ensure that fins from dead sharks are wasted.

''It would cause [fishermen] to have to throw the fins into the dumpster. It goes totally against our doctrine of full utilization of fishery products—that when we harvest fishes from the sea, we don't want to throw stuff away. We want to use absolutely everything we can.''

David Shiffman, a marine conservation biologist with Simon Fraser University, in Vancouver, Canada, and the man behind the popular Twitter account @whysharksmatter, says it's unreasonable for people to criticize using shark fins for soup when they may eat shark meat in other forms.

''There are people who are outraged at the idea of consuming a bowl of shark fin soup who are not outraged at the idea of eating a mako shark steak on the grill,'' he says. ''From my perspective, as a shark conservation biologist, either way you've got a dead shark. Shark fin soup has sort of become this boogie man of ocean conservation.''

As an alternative to a national ban, in 2018 Hueter helped draft the Sustainable Shark Fisheries and Trade Act, which Representative DANIEL WEBSTER, a Florida Republican, says he plans to reintroduce this session. This bill, Hueter says, would allow imports

only from countries that prohibit finning and promote shark conservation.

But Susan Millward, director of the marine animal program at the Animal Welfare Institute, says a blanket ban is still the best answer.

''Even if you have a sustainable shark fin trade, there's still going to be a trade in shark finning,'' she says. ''There's always going to be people who want to flout it.''

Chinese basketball star Yao Ming pushes a white ceramic cup of shark fin soup across a table. In an aquarium tank to his right, a bleeding computer-generated shark sinks to the bottom. ''Remember,'' he says, staring into the camera lens, ''when the buying stops, the killing can too.''

Since 2011, consumption of shark fin soup in China has fallen by about 80 percent, both because of national bans on serving shark fin at government banquets and the effect of celebrity-backed awareness campaigns such as Yao Ming's, seen by millions of Chinese.

According to a 2018 WildAid report, when WildAid began its Chinese anti-shark fin campaign in 2006, 75 percent of consumers didn't realize the soup they were eating was made from shark, and many who did know mistakenly thought that sharks' fins grew back after they were cut off.

Many conservationists believe that similar awareness-raising efforts in the U.S. would curb demand. People generally don't give much thought to what they're eating, Millward says. ''It's just a lack of connecting the dots with where this product came from, how it started with a live animal and how much suffering was endured to reach this finished product . . . These animals are dying painfully, and their whole ecosystems are being affected—for what?''

Her question begs another: Why shark fin? It's widely known that the fin adds no taste or health benefits to shark fin soup; rather, it gives the soup a crystalline, noodle-like texture, which can be replicated almost indistinguishably with mung bean paste or melon. What's more, because shark fins are cartilage and rigid protein fibers, they need to be cooked for hours, even a full day, to soften them enough to be edible. ''If you cook my belt for 24 hours, it would be edible too,'' Knights says.

Ironically, as conservationists, chefs, and even consumers themselves acknowledge, the flavor of shark fin soup—a dish that has ignited international controversy, spurred people to write countless letters to the United States Congress, and led to a massive awareness campaign—comes not from the fins but from the chicken broth used as the soup's base.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. In fact, the director of shark research for that institute says, ''The folks that are pushing the fin ban campaign want to simplify it to this very simple message that if we ban the fin trade in the United States, we save sharks all around the world. That is so simplistic and so wrong.

It would cause fishermen ''to have to throw fins into the dumpster. It goes totally against our doctrine of full utilization of fishery products, that when we harvest fishes from the sea, we don't want to throw stuff away. We want to use absolutely everything we can.''

David Shiffman, a marine conservation biologist with Simon Fraser University, also talks about how this is a flawed approach. He lays out an alternative, which my friend from Florida, Congressman WEBSTER, and the Mote Marine Laboratory director of the shark institute there have advocated for as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this body who supports the concept of shark finning. But let's be clear on that. No one here supports this concept of finning a shark and just letting the rest of it drop to the bottom and die. No one does. But we have to understand that our entire fisheries management practice, the State of Louisiana having one of the largest commercial fisheries in the Nation, that this is part of the overall consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. This is part of the overall consideration. Yet this bill attempts to gut legally sustainable shark harvesting that is part of the overall fisheries management process and doesn't take into consideration what impact that will have.

In closing, this bill is not the right approach. I agree with the objective, but all we are doing here is pushing illegally harvested species to other countries, as opposed to truly stopping the problem. There are successful efforts out there that are demonstrated to work, whereas this simply, again, promotes illegal harvesting.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if this is a question that requires us to listen to the experts and the scientists about how to end the global shark fin trade, then it is not much of a debate, because over 150 scientists are on record supporting this bill. The same consensus exists among leaders at aquariums, academic institutions, and other places.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership and our friend from the Northern Mariana Islands for moving this legislation forward.

This is about leadership in terms of ending the global practice. My colleague from Louisiana understates the power that the United States has in terms of getting our policies right. Yes, we have outlawed shark finning in 2010, but the international traffic continues, and we need to take this next step.

This is a progression of efforts to try to deal with animal welfare. This is one of the first arguments we hear whether it is illegal poaching, the ivory trade, or other endangered species, we have been able to set the table on a global stage to be able to change the dynamics, to change the economics, and to change public perception.

Sharks are declining globally. There may be a species or two here or there, but, overall, this apex predator species—so important for the health of the ecosystem—is in peril, and the practice of shark finning is part of this.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard about de-finning while they are still alive and discarding them back in the water which is a very common practice. We know that my State of Oregon is one where people stepped up and ended this barbaric practice. We have mobilized voting initiatives where we deal with problems of trafficking with exotic species. It has proven that our action in 2010 prohibiting the taking of fins was not enough as long as this global trade continues unchecked. There still is a market for the fins in the United States and around the world, and it is fueled by imports sourced from all over the world, including locations with no ban. We are one of the top 15 shark fin importing nations.

Who knew?

As a result, it is highly likely that shark fins sold in the United States came from sharks that have been brutally finned.

I am pleased that we are taking action to do the right thing and ban the trade of shark fins. I hope the Senate takes this bill up quickly and passes it so we can get it enacted into law. This is one of the things we could actually agree with. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the bipartisan support evidenced here today.

But I hope that we can continue forward with an animal welfare agenda. There is a series of bills on a bipartisan basis, for example, the PREPARED Act, to help animals during natural disasters, the Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act to combat wildlife trafficking, and the SAFE Act to prevent horse slaughter.

We have these bipartisan pieces of legislation with major sources of cosponsors. They are teed up and ready to go. I hope this passes today with overwhelming support, and it is one more step as we implement an animal welfare agenda that is one of the areas where we can work together on a bipartisan basis to make the world a little better.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the letter signed by 150 scientists in support of this bill. We ought to point out that only 10 of those 150 scientists actually are scientists with expertise in shark fisheries. But every one of the scientists who signed the Wildlife Conservation Society letter in opposition to this bill is recognized as an active professional shark researcher and expert in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 737, the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act. As a Floridian and member of the House Natural Resources Committee, promoting shark conservation has long been a priority of mine. I am glad to see sharks receiving national attention.

Sharks play a crucial role in our ocean's ecosystem, and yet, they face a

grave threat: shark finning, a cruel practice of capturing sharks, clipping their fins, and casting the rest of it to a slow death in the ocean. This practice is cruel and inhumane.

I was a member of the legislature almost 30 years ago when Florida was one of the first States to ban shark finning. Since then, finning has become completely illegal in the United States.

Unfortunately, finning still occurs in unregulated waters around our globe. H.R. 737 will do nothing to protect sharks from being finned in those areas. Instead, it would require American fishermen who legally and responsibly land sharks to destroy or discard their fins, leading to terrible waste.

Many scientists, conservationists, and commercial fishermen have vocally opposed this bill and have said it will not advance shark restoration or stop the practice of finning.

This bill would have a devastating effect on responsible American fishermen, including many in my own district in Florida who have made sacrifices to conserve and rebuild our shark populations.

I offer a separate bill, an alternative, H.R. 788, one that has been sponsored and supported by Senator RUBIO in the Senate and is probably the key bill there for this particular issue. Instead of banning the sale of humanely sourced shark fins, my bill would encourage bad actors in the shark fin market to create science-based management systems for shark conservation.

□ 1430

My bill requires any nation seeking to export shark, ray, or skate to the United States to first be certified by NOAA that it has conservation policies in place that rise to the standards of U.S. fishermen and that forbid nations to practice shark finning.

The U.S. plays an important role on the world stage in fishing management and conservation. H.R. 737 would remove the U.S. from the shark fin market; it would silence the leading voice in shark conservation—my bill would amplify it—and ensure no finned shark fins enter into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make the best choice for sustaining shark populations long-term and oppose this deeply flawed bill before us today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WEBSTER for his engagement on this issue. I think his intentions are noble. I think he wants to help end the global shark fin trade. Unfortunately, though, his bill just won't work.

We did incorporate some of that bill, the part, frankly, that would not cost a lot of money. By doing so, we added skates and rays to the seafood import monitoring program. That is a good suggestion, because skates and rays are also not doing well globally, and they deserve our attention.

But the rest of the bill is expensive, cumbersome, and, frankly, it is just not going to work. It would require a complicated, expensive certification scheme that might sound good on paper, but we know the real world that we live in.

In the marine fisheries management in the United States right now, we are years, and sometimes decades, behind having the resources we need for adequate and timely stock assessments, even for the fisheries that we are already trying to manage right now.

So the idea that we would somehow be able to do this, be able to afford it, and also do it in a way that we could comply with in this country so we could hold other countries around the world to that standard, if we are unable to do all of that stuff, then requiring other countries to meet that standard would trigger a WTO violation and we would do nothing to help end the global shark fin trade.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this issue. I know that Florida has been said to be the heart of the opposition to this bill, but we should note that 19 members of the Florida delegation support this bill, including 6 Republicans in the Florida delegation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear: Killing a shark for its fin while throwing away the rest of the carcass is contemptible; it is immoral; it is wrong; and it has been illegal and banned in the United States since 1993. American fishermen don't do this. American fishermen are the good guys in this story.

This bill does something very different. It requires American fishermen to throw away the fins when they kill a shark. That is just as wasteful, just as despicable, and it is not going to stop foreign bad actors. It will kill American fishing. It will destroy the livelihoods of Americans who have followed the law and who are responsibly accounting for their entire catch. It is not going to help our domestic shark populations. They are doing quite fine.

NOAA currently manages 42 shark species, along with the commercial and recreational shark fisheries. None of these 42 species in the Atlantic are listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. As I pointed out earlier, the most recent results of the NOAA fisheries' longest running shark survey show our domestic populations increasing, with scientists capturing and tagging more than ever before.

It is a shame that we are here to blame American fishermen, who are following all of the laws and doing everything right.

And remember this: Under H.R. 737, sharks can still be legally caught in U.S. waters; however, they will be forced to cut off the fins and throw them into the garbage. Ask yourself: Is this right?

Congress has long supported the full utilization of landed seafood in order to obtain the maximum economic value of our limited marine resources, all consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This legislation will result in little more than wasted resources.

The administration opposes this legislation. It writes:

> We cannot support the Shark Fin Sale Elimination Act because of the bill's negative impact on U.S. fishermen that would outweigh its minimal benefit to shark conservation. This would hurt U.S. fishermen who currently harvest and sell sharks and shark fins in a sustainable manner under strict Federal management.

Industry opposes this legislation. They write:

> H.R. 737 would effectively put an end to all shark fishing. The revenue realized from fin sales can comprise up to 50 percent of a large coastal shark's value. Requiring the discard or destruction of shark fins is also wasteful, both as a food resource and an economic resource that helps sustain rural coastal fishing communities here in America. It has long been the policy of Congress to encourage full utilization of land and catch in order to obtain the maximum economic value of our limited marine resources.

And, finally, scientists oppose this legislation. Two of the leading scientists in the field write:

> If the shark fin trade in the United States were completely eliminated, the direct impact on reducing global shark mortality would likely be insignificant. The elimination of United States-supplied fins in world markets would open the door to increased market share for illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing nations not practicing sustainable shark fishing, including those that have not yet prohibited finning.

This legislation follows a familiar theme we hear from the other side: Blame Americans first for the world's problems. This legislation is the definition of a solution in search of a problem.

I am sorry that some of my Republican colleagues have been convinced to support this legislation, but I hope that today's debate has shined a bit of truth on the issue.

Let me just quote from the humane society quickly. Their reasoning for this legislation is that: ''The United States has a robust market for shark fins, many of which likely were obtained through finning.''

Let me state again, ''likely were obtained.'' This is the science and data that we are using to support this legislation, ''likely were obtained.'' Mind you, we make up less than 1 percent of the global market.

Shark finning will continue across the rest of the globe, and it will continue to focus on the market in South and Southeast Asia. We will have lost our ability to have managed our resources and support our local fishing industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this misguided and misconceived legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I agree with my friend: We should listen to the scientists—not the two who my friend

cited in his closing arguments, but how about the over 150 who are on record in support of this bill? We should listen to them.

We should listen to the many States and territories and other nations, including, recently, Canada, our neighbor to the north.

We should listen to the many corporate leaders around the world, all of whom have reached the inevitable conclusion that, if you are serious about ending this wasteful and inhumane and horrific practice of shark finning, then you have to tackle the shark fin trade; you have to ban the possession and sale of shark fins, because, if you don't, we know here in the United States we have banned the practice of shark finning for years, and yet we have continued to be part of and contributed to the global shark fin trade because we don't ban the possession and trade and sale of the fin itself.

That is what this bill does.

And in terms of U.S. fishermen who are, as my friend says, following the laws and doing everything right, well, the good news is they are going to be just fine under this law. We know that because, in States like California, Oregon, Texas, and other places, folks who want to continue fishing for shark meat have been able to do so, even though those States have passed bans just like this on the possession, trade, and sale of shark fins.

This is a good bill. It is an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill. It is a bill that includes support from 19 members of the Florida delegation, including 6 Republicans from that delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 737, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 925) to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 295

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 ''North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 7(c) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4406(c)) is amended by striking ''not to exceed—'' and all that follows through paragraph (5) and inserting ''not to exceed $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, a partnership-based program that leverages non-Federal funds to protect and restore wetland and associated habitat.

NAWCA has enjoyed bipartisan support in the past, and this bill is no exception.

The bill authorizes NAWCA for 5 years at $60 million per year.

NAWCA is considered one of the most cost-effective conservation programs. Each Federal dollar invested in NAWCA is typically matched by more than $3 from non-Federal partners at the local and State level, including corporations, private landowners, and nonprofits.

Thanks to NAWCA, almost 29.8 million acres of habitat have been protected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 925 reauthorizes conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, NAWCA, through fiscal year 2024.

I readily concede this is a popular program. Even without an authorization, the appropriators put $42 million into this last year. The sponsors of the bill, obviously, want more, authorizing $60 million a year. That is higher than any appropriation to date. I am concerned that, in a time where we are running record and perilous deficits, we ought to consider the level which some of these programs should be funded.

Much of the money under NAWCA is used to obtain conservation easements and wetlands outright to benefit migratory birds and fish. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the program has benefited almost 30 million acres of wetland habitat in North America since its inception 30 years ago. It is a very good thing.

Here is the problem, though: The Federal Government is already landlord to 640 million acres of the country and is doing a poor job of maintaining what we already have. For example, the National Park Service is facing a nearly $12 billion deferred maintenance backlog. The question I would raise today is whether we really need to authorize increased funding to buy even more land.

□ 1445

It would be one thing if Congress had taken strong action to address this backlog by moving H.R. 1225 by Congressman ROB BISHOP, the former chairman and currently ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

That was a favorably reported bill. It has overwhelming support with 329 bipartisan cosponsors. That bill would take excess funds from new energy development and target these deteriorating lands so that people as well as migratory birds and fish can enjoy them.

I recognize that H.R. 925 simply authorizes an existing program, but it is imperative to take into account the realities that our current Federal lands are facing. Acquiring more land when we can't take care of the land we already control is not a wise use of our resources.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 925, the North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman WITTMAN from Virginia, for coauthoring this measure with me and for his leadership on this issue; not just on this bill, but on this issue. He is a stalwart supporter and he works extremely hard on making sure our wetlands and environment are protected.

As members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Congressman WITTMAN and I have the privilege of evaluating and approving NAWCA-funded projects in the United States, in Canada, and in Mexico.

On that commission, we share a responsibility to ensure that everyone in America can use and can enjoy the natural resources that belong to all of us.

Since 1989, North American Wetlands Conservation Act grants have funded close to 3,000 projects, carried out by more than 6,000 partners. Every year, restoration and conservation projects funded by NAWCA support 7,500 jobs across our country, from fisheries biologists and engineers, to construction teams and supply retailers.

Federal NAWCA grants require a 10-to-1 nonFederal match, and over the past 30 years, $1.6 billion in Federal funding has been matched more than 3 to 1 with $4.7 billion contributed by nonFederal partners.

The result so far has been 29.8 million acres, an area the size of the State of Pennsylvania, of rehabilitated and restored wetlands. These wetlands support ecological health and biodiversity while providing outstanding opportunities for Americans to hunt, to fish, to hike, to bird watch, to farm, and to ranch. The resulting economic activity exceeds $5 billion every year.

Even those who don't use these lands directly benefit. Wetlands provide natural processes that allow us to have clean, plentiful water supplies. Wetlands protect the lands around them by absorbing flood water and storm surges.

H.R. 925 reauthorizes NAWCA so we can continue the critical work on North America's wetlands that offer tremendous ecological and economic benefits to each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to support NAWCA today to make sure that we continue to conserve our public land. Let's work together today on behalf of all Americans, now and for future generations.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in strong support of H.R. 925, the North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act. And I would also like to thank Mr. THOMPSON for his extraordinary leadership on this legislation and for his service on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

As he spoke about, he has a passion to make sure that we are preserving that habitat we all value and the wildlife that lives there—not just the migratory birds, but all of the other life that it supports. It is critically important that we continue this program. It is one of the truly successful stories in conservation in our Nation, and, again, I want to thank Mr. THOMPSON for his leadership.

This bill works to reduce wetlands disappearance and to conserve migratory bird habitat. The good part about it is that we, in setting aside this land now, predominantly use conservation easements as a mechanism to do that.

I understand the chairman's concern about more acres of land in the Federal inventory and the dollars that it takes to maintain that land. We absolutely have to address that. But the good news here is that many of these acres are in conservation easements, which means they stay in private ownership. They just have an easement from the Federal Government to maintain that critical habitat.

That really is the best of both worlds as well as leveraging private dollars with this. What a great example of how to leverage public dollars with private dollars.

Several years ago, the duck hunters, en masse, came and said: Listen, we want to increase the duck stamp fee so that we can make sure we have the necessary dollars to match the Federal dollars that go into this program. It was extraordinarily successful.

People who enjoy the resources, from bird watchers to hunters and others, have said: We want to put more of our dollars into it. And, again, we are using their tax dollars to leverage those private dollars for this critical habitat.

Our wetlands across the United States are Mother Nature's filter for the water that comes off the land and also Mother Nature's nurseries for all that critical wildlife that lives there, both fish, and birds, and other critters that are critical to these environments. They are disappearing at an alarming rate. This bill helps us stem the loss of those wetlands.

As I have said, the leveraging of private resources is critical. I think Congress should be doing more to identify these types of Federal programs like NAWCA that have proven to be successful. NAWCA matches funding that then contributes to conservation success in our communities. Let's do more of that.

Protecting and restoring and managing wetland habitats is critically important. I would argue, of all of the habitats out there, this habitat, on the scale of value, has the most value across, not just the United States, but across the planet. We have to do more to make sure we are preserving that.

It is critical that we invest efficiently to conserve these areas. Investing efficiently means leveraging that one public dollar to three private dollars, and we want to make sure that we are preserving these areas for use for future generations.

Unfortunately, wetlands continue to disappear at an alarming rate. This helps stem the disappearance of those wetlands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Representative THOMPSON and Representative WITTMAN for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and would inquire whether my colleague has any remaining speakers on his side. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is, undoubtedly, a popular program. It does well serve public recreation and use, the very purpose of our public lands, and I certainly don't oppose it.

But I do want to close with this warning: We are continuing to acquire more and more land while we are failing to take care of the enormous estates that we already hold.

LOUIE GOHMERT, my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, has compared our Federal lands policy to the old miser in town whose mansion is dilapidated, whose yard is overgrown with weeds, and whose paint is peeling because he spends all of his time and money plotting how he is going to acquire his neighbor's property.

I would like to hope that the bipartisan support for this bill will be accompanied soon with bipartisan support for Mr. BISHOP's bill, H.R. 1225, which would actually take the resources that we are generating from the public lands to assure that we are taking proper care of our public lands.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 925.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST INFANTRY RECOGNITION OF SACRIFICE IN THEATER ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1088) to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in Presidential Park in District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1088

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 ''First Infantry Recognition of Sacrifice in Theater Act'' or the ''FIRST Act''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION TO FIRST DIVISION MONUMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Society of the First Infantry Division (an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that code), may make modifications (including construction of additional plaques and stone plinths on which to put the plaques) to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in President's Park in the District of Columbia that was set aside for memorial purposes of the First Infantry Division, in order to honor the members of the First Infantry Division who paid the ultimate sacrifice during United States operations, including Operation Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom. The First Infantry Division at the Department of the Army shall collaborate with the Department of Defense to provide to the Society of the First Infantry Division the list of names to be added.

(b) NON-APPLICATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—Subsection (b) of section 8903 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Commemorative Works Act''), shall not apply to actions taken under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) FUNDING.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the activities of the Society of the First Infantry Division which are authorized by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill introduced by Representative MARSHALL would honor the heroism of the soldiers of the U.S. Army's 1st Infantry Division by authorizing the installation of additional plaques at the First Infantry Division Monument located in the National Park Services' President's Park just south of the White House.

These additions would include the names of over 600 1st Infantry Division soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation during Operation Desert Storm, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, ensuring that these fallen soldiers are not forgotten.

For over 100 years now, soldiers of the U.S. Army's 1st Infantry Division have embodied their motto: ''No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first.''

I am proud to rise in strong support of this bill and the brave soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division and I want to thank Representative MARSHALL for championing this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1088 offered by our colleague from Kansas, Dr. ROGER MARSHALL, authorizes the Society of the 1st Infantry Division to modify the First Infantry Division Monument here in Washington, D.C.

This society seeks to honor its members who died during combat in Operation Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The 1st Infantry Division of the United States Army has served our country faithfully with distinction and honor for well over a century now. 12,949 heroes of the ''Big Red One'' have fallen in the defense of our Constitution and the freedoms it guarantees. A grateful Nation remembers their names by inscribing them on a monument here in our Nation's Capital.

Every one of them has been faithful to the Division's motto of: ''No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first.''

It is time to update and add names to the monument to honor these American heroes and to serve as an inspiration and example to the generation whose freedom and security they gave their lives to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the author of this bill.

□ 1500

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today humbled and a bit emotional in support of the First Infantry Recognition of Sacrifice in Theater Act, also known as the FIRST Act.

The FIRST Act modifies the First Infantry Division Monument to include and honor the names of 660 brave soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country during Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The First Infantry Division Monument, located in President's Park, west of the White House, was first conceived by the Society of the 1st Infantry Division to commemorate the lives of soldiers killed serving our country during World War I. Over the years, a total of 12,949 names of fallen soldiers have been inscribed and commemorated on this monument, but it will now take an act of Congress to honor the sacrifices of those 660 recently fallen soldiers and give their families a hallowed place for remembrance.

Throughout history, when the President had decided to send troops into harm's way to protect American lives and uphold American values, he has almost always called upon the 1st Infantry Division.

Indeed the 1st Infantry Division, more commonly known as ''The Big Red One,'' has a heroic and storied past. Established in 1917, the Division celebrated their 102nd anniversary earlier this year, and since 1955, has called Fort Riley, Kansas, its home.

Over the years, the soldiers of The Big Red One have fought in World War I, World War II, the Cold War, the Vietnam war, Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the Balkans peacekeeping missions, the war on terror, and as of today, multiple operations around the globe.

Always first into battle, the Division fired the very first American shots of World War I, providing the United States its first victory in the war to end all wars at the Battle of Cantigny, France.

Despite suffering more than 1,000 casualties, the 1st Infantry Division bravely captured the village from German forces, defended it against repeated counterattacks, and bolstered the morale of the Allies. The Division returned home in September 1919 with 5 medals of honor.

Next, in World War II, the 1st Infantry Division led the way during the Allied invasion of North Africa, leading to the defeat of the Axis Afrika Korps and capturing over 250,000 soldiers.

The Division then departed for the invasion of Sicily, after a specific request from Lieutenant General George ''Old Blood and Guts'' Patton. There they faced fierce mountain combat and suffered heavy casualties, with some units losing over half their fighting strength.

The 1st Infantry Division would then return to England in preparation for the Invasion of Normandy. On D-Day, June 6, 1944, soldiers from The Big Red One would once again lead the assault on German forces in landings at Omaha Beach. They would then go on to fight a continuous offensive across France and into Germany, suffering over 20,000 casualties throughout the war.

After the war, the 1st Infantry Division provided protection for occupied Germany and maintained security at the Nuremberg trials. The Division played a pivotal role in World War II and would return home with 16 members being awarded the Medal of Honor.

The 1st Infantry Division has been active all over the world, assisting in combat and humanitarian missions for over 100 years. Since the Division's establishment, more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have lost their lives in battle. Today, soldiers from the Division stand at the ready in over 15 countries. We sleep peacefully here at home because they stand at the ready abroad.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to ensure these fallen soldiers are not forgotten by passing the FIRST Act and allowing the inclusion of the names of these 660 fallen soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

I am proud to represent them as they continue to exemplify their motto: ''No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first.''

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend Congressman MARSHALL for that very moving presentation and for the impressive history that he recounted of the 1st Infantry Division.

This is a great bill, an important bill, and I know we are all very proud to support it. I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1088, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal Land in President's Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1446) to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1446

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 ''Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION; REQUIREMENT TO SELL ALL STAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(c) of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (39 U.S.C. 416 note; Public Law 111–241) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''of at least 6 years,''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and ending not earlier than the date on which the United States Postal Service provides notice to Congress under paragraph (5)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REQUIREMENT TO SELL ALL STAMPS PRINTED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States Postal Service shall sell each copy of the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp that the United States Postal Service prints under this Act.

''(B) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—The United States Postal Service shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives when all copies of the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp printed under this Act have been sold.''.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on the day after the date of enactment of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–165; 128 Stat. 1878).

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1446. It is a bill that would require the U.S. Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp. It would require those continued sales until such time as the remaining stamps are sold.

Now, since 2010, these stamps have been sold by the U.S. Postal Service to support international conservation efforts, but the authorization for these sales has expired, leaving 49 million stamps unsold—printed, but unsold. Americans care deeply about wildlife, and by purchasing these stamps, they can support the Multinational Species Conservation Fund, which includes five grant programs that support the conservation of African and Asian elephants, great apes, marine turtles, rhinos and tigers.

Between 2011 and 2017, the stamp sales from this program generated $3.9 million, and that money went to conservation projects related to antipoaching, capacity building, community engagement and outreach, habitat restoration, and raising public awareness of wildlife trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, 49 million stamps have already been printed. They are sitting and waiting to be sold. This bill doesn't authorize the printing of any new stamps, but it does direct the U.S. Postal Service to continue selling the stamps it has printed until they are exhausted.

At a time when so many species are threatened with extinction due to climate change, habitat loss, and exploitation, we must do more to protect wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have another speaker at this point, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chair, Committee on Oversight and Reform, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIR CUMMINGS: I write to you concerning H.R. 1446 the, ''Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019.''

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1446 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

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

Sincerely,

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chair,
House Natural Resources Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1446, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to consider the bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1446 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLAY for this legislation and for his being amenable to changes that make this bill one that every Member can support.

This legislation raises money through the voluntary purchases of a special stamp that in turn funds valuable conservation efforts of iconic global species such as tigers, elephants, rhinos, great apes, marine turtles, and their habitats.

Anyone who wants to help these efforts can do so by purchasing these stamps; a small surcharge for which is then deposited in the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. These funds in turn provide grants for conservation work around the globe. To date, over $5.7 million have been raised

by this low-key and entirely voluntary effort.

While the authority to sell these popular stamps has expired, the stockpile of 49 million stamps still exists. Mr. CLAY accepted amendments to allow the stockpile to be depleted before new stamps are printed that prevents waste and protects taxpayers.

International conservation of these important species is a shared goal of both Democrats and Republicans, and this bill is a very good example of that seemingly rare opportunity for all of us to come together for the benefit of wildlife, their habitat, and, of course, the American people who enjoy both for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). It is good to have bipartisan support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1446, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMESTEAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1472) to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1472

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

SECTION 1. HOMESTEAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of the Act of March 19, 1936 (16 U.S.C. 450u), is amended by striking ''designated'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''designated the 'Homestead National Historical Park'.''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the unit of the National Park System known as ''The Homestead National Monument of America'' shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Homestead National Historical Park''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1472, introduced by my friend Representative SMITH from Nebraska, would rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, to the Homestead National Historical Park.

In 1862, President Lincoln signed the Homestead Act, and this enabled citizens to own a portion of the vast public lands across the Western United States.

To commemorate the first claim under the Homestead Act, Congress established the Homestead National Monument of America in 1936; serving as a lasting memorial to the over 1.6 million claims that built the American West.

Today, the Homestead National Monument of America consists of the first site successfully claimed under the Homestead Act, the Freeman School, a heritage museum, hiking trails, and 100 acres of restored tall grass prairie. Redesignating this important monument as a national historical park would provide a more accurate and appropriate description of the scope and complexity of the site's resources and would conform the park's designation to Park Service standards.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague Representative SMITH for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1472. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1472, offered by our colleague, Congressman SMITH of Nebraska, would redesignate the Homestead National Monument of America to simply the Homestead National Historical Park.

Congress authorized this commemoration in 1936 after acquiring the site of the Daniel Freeman homestead. It was set aside as a lasting memorial to the settlers who built the American West as a result of the Homestead Act of 1862 and its successors.

In total, 207 million, or 10 percent, of all land in the United States was settled under the Homestead Act. The name of the monument with the redundant qualifier ''of America'' has made it an anomaly within the National Park system. This bill simply removes that redundancy and conforms more clearly with the naming customs of the National Park Service.

Redesignating the unit as a national historical park will further clarify the unit's characteristics in keeping with the modern designations that the Park Service maintains.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the author of the measure who brings it to the floor today.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my colleagues and their support of our effort to change the name from Homestead National Monument of America to the Homestead National Historical Park. Obviously, some of the reasons have been outlined.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is supported by the entire Nebraska delegation, and even more importantly, by local stakeholders.

And as was mentioned, the Homestead Act of 1862 was signed by President Lincoln, and it absolutely helped shaped the American West. It allowed U.S. citizens to earn ownership of a portion of the vast public lands owned by the Federal Government across the Western U.S.

Ultimately, the Federal Government granted title to 10 percent of the land in the U.S. through this program. It gave millions a chance to build a new life for themselves, their families and for future generations.

In order to claim a 160-acre parcel of land under the Homestead Act, a homesteader was required to be at least 21 years of age or the head of a household, build a home on the land, improve and farm the land for 5 years, and pay an $18 filing fee.

□ 1515

The Homestead Act remained in place through 1976, with provisions allowing for homesteading in Alaska through 1986.

President Ronald Reagan said the Homestead Act ''ensured that the great western prairies of America would be the realm of independent, property-owning citizens—a mightier guarantee of freedom is difficult to imagine.''

We are very proud that the very first claim under the Homestead Act was made by a man named Daniel Freeman, near Beatrice, Nebraska, in Nebraska's Third District. To memorialize this milestone, as well as the 1.6 million other claims which built the American West, the Homestead National Monument of America was established, also near Beatrice.

Unfortunately, referring to this site as a monument brings images of a single, static monument, such as a statue, an obelisk, or even a natural feature like the Scotts Bluff National Monument near my hometown of Gering, Nebraska, not of an extensive park that celebrates the pioneering homesteaders of many years ago.

Homestead National Monument consists of a heritage museum, the Freeman School mentioned earlier, as well

as the tallgrass prairie, hiking trails, a forest, farming demonstrations, and much more.

Referring to this site as a historical park instead of a monument would far more clearly describe the opportunities to take in this living-history site. In fact, according to the Friends of Homestead, 89 percent of first-time visitors to the facility were confused by the name.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska and, particularly, the citizens of Beatrice and Gage County, Nebraska, I appreciate this opportunity to advocate in support of this proposal today.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the other gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank two of my good friends, Ranking Member MCCLINTOCK and Chairman HUFFMAN, for the cordial and elevated discussion today about something that might appear small in the big scheme of things, particularly with what is going on in Congress, but, nonetheless, is a good, working part of functioning government on this House floor.

This is important to us in Nebraska, and it is important to the rest of America. I am pleased that my good friend, Congressman ADRIAN SMITH, has been working on this effort to rename the Homestead National Monument of America to the Homestead National Historical Park to clear up some confusion. This small but important change will more accurately reflect the nature and mission of this unique National Park Service unit.

The Homestead Act of 1862, as we have heard, really did forever change the direction of our Nation. Let me take us through a few facts that have already been mentioned but I think worthwhile emphasizing.

In exchange for the $18 filing fee and just a commitment to improve the land, any U.S. citizen could farm 160 acres and own it outright after 5 years. Almost inconceivable to us today, but that is how this began.

The National Park Service unit dedicated to telling the extraordinary story of these incredible pioneers is located in Beatrice, Nebraska.

And I thank Chairman HUFFMAN for clarifying how it is appropriately pronounced: Beatrice, Nebraska.

Before redistricting earlier, I used to represent this area. It is only about 50 minutes from my home in Lincoln, so it is a part of the broad neighborhood of the First and Third Congressional Districts.

Homestead is located on the site of one of the first homestead claims in the United States, and it commemorates the lives and accomplishments of these early homesteaders. It also celebrates those hardy individuals who, through harsh storms, brutal drought, wind, snow, and isolation, actually helped grow this country.

This minor name change will clear up any confusion about this important site because the word ''monument'' generally applies to a single individual or a unique topographical feature. Homestead is so much more. It is a unique piece of open prairie, as we have heard. It houses the historical records of so many settlers, and many visitors come looking to learn a little bit more about their ancestors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to particularly recognize one individual, Mr. Mark Engler, who is Homestead's superintendent and a friend of the Nebraska delegation who sees us quite a lot, along with everyone else in the Beatrice community who have helped to maintain Homestead as a gem of the Midwest and a treasure for all Americans.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. The community of Beatrice—I just had to say it one more time because I like that pronunciation—is fortunate to be home to what will hopefully soon be America's newest historical park, the Homestead National Historical Park, and is also fortunate to have been represented over the years by these two fine gentlemen from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1472.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT STUDY ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1487) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in the State of California to evaluate alternatives for protecting the resources of the coastal area, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1487

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 ''Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act''.

SEC. 2. RESOURCE STUDY OF THE LOS ANGELES COASTAL AREA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' means the coastline and adjacent areas to the Santa Monica Bay from Will Rogers State Beach to Torrance Beach, including the areas in and around Ballona Creek and the Baldwin Hills and the San Pedro section of the City of Los Angeles, excluding the Port of Los Angeles north of Crescent Avenue.

(b) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) evaluate the national significance of the study area;

(B) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(C) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by the Federal Government, State or local government entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(D) consult with interested Federal agencies, State or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or any other interested individuals; and

(E) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(3) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the results of the study; and

(B) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1487, introduced by my colleague TED LIEU from California, would direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating a new national recreation area along the Santa Monica Bay coastline or incorporating the area into the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

Expanding the National Park Service to include this area would significantly enhance recreational and public lands access in one of our Nation's most congested, polluted, and park-poor regions, Los Angeles County.

Although our public lands belong to all Americans, many simply don't have the opportunity or the resources to visit these incredible places. H.R. 1487 would help us take an important step toward ensuring that public lands access exists for all Americans, and I thank my colleague Congressman LIEU for championing this proposal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1487 authorizes a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in California to evaluate alternatives for land management, including designating the coastal area as a unit of the National Park System.

While I do not oppose authorizing a special resource study of this area, I hope that Congress will exercise caution before adding significant amounts of coastline to the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, which is already struggling to manage its current resources and is increasingly beginning to resemble Lincoln's story of a farmer who said, ''I ain't greedy for land. I just want what joins mine.''

In 2018, because of bad land management, the vast majority of this same area burned in the massive Woolsey fire. More than 21,000 of the 23,595 National Park Service acres, about 88 percent of the land, were burned. This included most of the Western Town at Paramount Ranch, the 1926 Peter Strauss Ranch home, most of the joint National Park Service/UCLA La Kretz Research Center, two ranger residences, and an attached archives building.

Further, the National Park Service is already stretched perilously thin and facing a nearly $12 billion deferred maintenance backlog that we discussed in an earlier bill.

Although I recognize that this measure simply authorizes a study and doesn't transfer any land or jurisdiction, it is imperative that we take into account the realities that our parks are facing and the devastating consequences of a land management policy that can only be described as benign neglect. As we are discovering, the consequences are anything but benign.

Mr. Speaker, with that caveat, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HUFFMAN for his leadership and for supporting this legislation, and I thank Congressman MCCLINTOCK for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1487, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act.

In the 1970s, Congress established the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to preserve natural and historic sites and to provide recreational, educational, scientific, and public health benefits to our greater Los Angeles community.

Today, it spans more than 150,000 acres in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, including parts of the Santa Monica Bay Watershed in my congressional district. Much of the Santa Monica Bay Watershed, however, remains outside of the national recreation area. This includes several miles of beaches and acres of wetlands that stand to benefit greatly from Federal resources.

My bill would commission the National Park Service to conduct a 3-year special resource study to determine whether to expand the boundary of the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area or create a new national recreation area altogether.

The study would cover the entire Santa Monica Bay coastline, from Venice Beach to Torrance Beach, as well as the Ballona Wetlands, Ballona Creek, Baldwin Hills, and the San Pedro coastline.

While conducting the study, the National Park Service will consult with State and local government groups, community groups, nonprofits, and residents.

The study would become a basis for future congressional action to modify the national recreation area borders. Expanding the national recreation area would allow the watershed to benefit from available Federal, scientific, and infrastructure resources, enabling better conservation and recreational use. It would also help Federal agencies enter into cooperative agreements to manage the land and carry out improvement projects aimed at connecting trails, building wildlife corridors, and more.

Importantly, all of this would be accomplished without affecting private property rights or creating unfunded mandates on State or local governments.

The Los Angeles coastal region stands to benefit tremendously from increased Federal resources to preserve open space for conservation and recreation, and I am proud to have the support of many of my colleagues in the Los Angeles delegation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1487.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of the measure with the caveats I have already discussed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote with no caveats, and I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1487, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1838) to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is 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 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.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1838.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act today will once again demonstrate our support for the people of Hong Kong. The House passed our version of the bill several weeks ago, and this version passed the Senate last night as well, demonstrating, without a doubt, that the U.S. Congress stands with the people of Hong Kong even during a particularly troubling time.

We are seeing the escalation of violence in unprecedented ways, indiscriminate use of force against students, and troubling reports of Chinese forces directing and manipulating the security forces in Hong Kong.

However, as Joshua Wong said when he was last here with us on Capitol Hill just a few weeks ago, the ''people of Hong Kong will never walk alone.'' That is a quote. Never has this been truer than today.

Although the abuses and injustices that have been endured by the people of Hong Kong are clear and evident to everyone, the policy challenge that this presents for the United States is far more nuanced.

It is my expectation that, when implementing this legislation, the Secretary of State will understand congressional intent that this legislation is designed to help the U.S. Government and the U.S. Congress better evaluate the erosion of Hong Kong's autonomy and, ultimately, stem the tide of China's aggressive behavior toward the people of Hong Kong.

Our objective is not to punish Hong Kong, but to help preserve and protect Hong Kong's autonomy in the face of Beijing's flagrant disregard for ''one country, two systems,'' which they had promised. As such, we believe it is in the national security interest of the United States to protect the autonomy of Hong Kong.

It is with that intent that this entire legislative exercise has been undertaken. I hope that in evaluating how to apply the mandates in this bill, this administration, and any future administration, will give the best interest of the people of Hong Kong the highest consideration.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL, for their strong support for this effort, both bills that are up today.

And I would also especially like to thank the Speaker for her leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, since the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre 30 years ago, I have had the privilege of working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including, and especially, Speaker PELOSI, JIM MCGOVERN, my good friend—and he is the chairman of the China Commission, and I am ranking member—and Congressman Frank Wolf, a former Member who was tenacious in his fight for human rights, the rule of law, and democracy for the people of China.

We have always believed that every person deserves better than the brutality so many endure in the systematic violations of their universally recognized human rights. China's ruthless dictators do not agree, and they are driven—they are obsessed—to tighten their control.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Hong Kong is burning. The status quo is no longer. The brutal government crackdown on democracy activists has escalated. Tragically, under President Xi Jinping, human rights abuse throughout China has significantly worsened, including the pervasive use of torture, religious persecution, human trafficking, and genocide against Muslim Uighurs.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, President Xi ominously warned of even more brutal violence to come in Hong Kong, threatening ''crushed bodies and shattered bones.''

And the Hong Kong Government, itself, prefers bullets and batons over peaceful and political dialog that would address the Hong Kong people's rightful grievances.

That is a sad and disgusting reality, and it is what the Chinese Government, however, does best: suppress, repress, torture, kill, and censor.

With the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, the United States Congress is making it clear that beating, torturing, and jailing democracy activists is absolutely wrong. We stand in solidarity with the people of Hong Kong. There will be strong sanctions, other ramifications, for this crackdown, for this abuse of power.

The people of Hong Kong have feared for their freedom for a long time.

In 2014, Mr. Speaker, I met with Martin Lee and Anson Chan, two titans of Hong Kong's democracy movement. They and Scott Flipse, of the China Commission, and I met in my office for hours as we discussed the Chinese Communist Party's growing influence and their attempts that had already begun to degrade autonomy and human rights in Hong Kong.

That is, Mr. Speaker, the genesis of this bill and our 5-year effort to push back on Beijing's pernicious interference in Hong Kong.

In the midst of the 2014 Umbrella Movement, I first introduced, joined by Speaker PELOSI, the first Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. My CECC co-chair, Senator BROWN of Ohio, introduced the same bill in the Senate.

Over the years, in 2015 and 2017, Senator RUBIO and I upgraded the bill to reflect the kidnapping of book sellers, the disqualification of elected lawmakers, and the political prosecutions of Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, Benny Tai, and many others. However, every time, every single time we pushed for passage, there was vigorous opposition from diplomats, so-called experts, committee chairs, and U.S. business interests in Hong Kong.

So passage of this legislation is long overdue.

My House bill, cosponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend and colleague, and 46 other bipartisan cosponsors passed last month on October 15.

Today, we consider a final bill derived from working with our colleagues in the United States Senate. Specifically, the act directs the Secretary of State to report and certify to Congress, annually, whether Hong Kong continues to deserve special treatment under U.S. law, different from Mainland China, in such matters as trade, customs, sanctions enforcement, law enforcement cooperation, and protection of human rights and the rule of law.

It directs the State Department not to deny entry visas based primarily on the applicant's arrest or detention for participating in nonviolent protest activities in Hong Kong.

It requires, for the next 7 years, an annual report from the Commerce Department on whether Hong Kong Government adequately enforces U.S. export controls and sanctions laws, including on those goods and services transshipped to North Korea, Iran, or other countries relating to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, narcotics trafficking, and more.

It requires an assessment of whether U.S. origin items, including software, technology, and services, have been transferred from Hong Kong to China in violation of U.S. law and have been used by China for mass surveillance, predictive policing, or for the so-called social credit system.

I know some Members might be wondering: What is the social credit system? It is a ubiquitous, totalitarian, ''brave new world'' system scheduled for implementation by 2020 that uses public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business and use that data to monitor, shape, and rate financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

The bill requires the President to submit a strategy to Congress, to protect U.S. citizens and businesses in Hong Kong from the erosion of autonomy and the rule of law because of actions taken by the Chinese Government.

It requires the President to identify and sanction persons in Hong Kong or in Mainland China responsible for extrajudicial rendition and gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

The Chinese Government warns us repeatedly not to interfere in China's internal affairs, but the only interference we see is Beijing's meddling in the democratic freedoms of Hong Kong. All I see and this body sees, my fellow colleagues, is Beijing's failure to honor the promises made in the 1984 Sino-British declaration, an international treaty. All we see is Beijing's failure to honor the promises of Hong Kong's Basic Law.

We cannot avert our eyes to what is happening in Hong Kong. We cannot silence our voices when the rule of law, democracy, human rights, free speech, and autonomy are being threatened in Hong Kong. We must remain steadfast in support of the people of Hong Kong.

The whole world has a stake in a peaceful and just resolution in Hong Kong. The passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act is an important signal that this Congress, Democrat and Republican alike, House and Senate, considers Hong Kong's freedoms and autonomy a critical interest of the United States and the international community.

In Hong Kong, they encourage each other to keep pressing forward with the phrase ''Jia you.'' So today, I say to you, all of you in Hong Kong: ''Jia you.'' Your cause is a noble, one and you will not be forgotten.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Speaker of the House, who has been very, very active in Hong Kong freedom.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

I salute him and Mr. MCCAUL, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. To you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. MCCAUL, thank you for affording this opportunity to vote on the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

This is a proud day for the U.S. Congress, for our values of freedom and justice, and for the people of Hong Kong.

For 6 months, the people of Hong Kong have stirred the hearts of all freedom-loving people with their extraordinary outpouring of courage and their refusal to relinquish their demand for democracy, the democratic freedoms, and the rule of law which was promised more than two decades ago.

Today, the Congress is sending an unmistakable message to the world that the United States stands in solidarity

with the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong, and we fully support their fight for freedom.

We salute Chairman MCGOVERN, a leading voice for human rights in China and around the world, our Congressional-Executive Commission on China chair and also chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH, just listening to him talk about we are into our third generation of freedom-loving people in Hong Kong.

I am so glad Mr. SMITH acknowledged the work of our distinguished former colleague, Frank Wolf, who was so, so very much a part and still continues to be a spiritual leader to us in this regard.

We have worked with Martin Lee and Anson Chan way back when and—so late 1980s, early 1990s—then into this new century with another generation; and now, three generations, Martin Lee still being involved, but with Joshua Wong and Nathan Wong and all of the young participants who are there, because it is a sad situation.

In 1997, when the United Kingdom transferred Hong Kong to China, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the ''high degree of autonomy''—that is in quotes—''high degree of autonomy'' that they were promised. Today, it is beyond question that China has utterly broken that promise.

America has been watching for years as the people of Hong Kong have been increasingly denied their full autonomy and faced with a cruel crackdown on their freedoms and an escalation of violence.

Most recently, the violent attacks against students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University have shocked the world as unconscionable and unacceptable.

More than 1,000 young people were denied food, water, first aid. Scores were sent to the hospital for hypothermia after attempting to escape through a sewer, and hundreds now languish in jail cells.

Right now, frightened parents of the students who remain on campus are holding vigil outside, praying that their children will be safe, clutching signs reading: ''Save the kids. Don't kill our children,'' and, ''They are children of God. Let them go.''

In the Congress, Democrats and Republicans stand united with the protestors and with the people of Hong Kong. We have stood united in a bipartisan way.

It has been a very unifying issue for us, whether we are talking about the autonomy of Tibet that the Chinese are trying to destroy, the culture, the language, and the region of Tibet; the Uighurs, where 1, 2, 3, maybe 3 million Uighurs are under education camps, which the Chinese Government says they really enjoy being in—Oh, really?—or human rights violations, suppression of human rights throughout all of China.

□ 1545

If America does not speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out on human rights elsewhere.

Since Tiananmen Square, many of us in a bipartisan way have been fighting this fight, and we have seen that commercial interests always win the fight. It has always for them been about money.

To those who take the repressive Chinese Government's side, I say: What does it profit a person to gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?

Today the House is proud to once again pass the bicameral, bipartisan Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act to reaffirm America's commitment to human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in the face of Beijing's crackdown.

I see we have been joined by the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. I thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I acknowledged him earlier, along with our distinguished chairman, Mr. ENGEL.

We are proud to pass the Senate version of Chairman MCGOVERN's Protect Hong Kong Act to suspend sales on dangerous munitions to the Hong Kong police, and we also salute Senator MERKLEY in his leadership in passing that on the Senate floor.

The future of Hong Kong, the future of autonomy, freedom, and justice for millions is at stake. America must take a stand with Hong Kong. I am so pleased that we are making our statement in Congress in the House and in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans unified in speaking out for democracy.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on both of these bills.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

I rise today in support of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. Two months ago I had the opportunity to join a press conference with Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Chairman ENGEL, my colleague, CHRIS SMITH, and Hong Kong prodemocracy activists Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Denise Ho to denounce China's authoritarian brutality.

I said it then and I will say it again; today we stand here not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans united in our strong support for Hong Kong.

And I would like to take this opportunity to speak directly to the people of Hong Kong, who I know are watching this right now. America stands with you, and America will always support you. We hear you sing our national anthem. We see you carrying our American flag. This is a battle between democracy versus dictatorship, liberty versus tyranny, and freedom versus oppression.

This bill sends a clear message to China that there will be consequences to the ruthless and brutal actions. Congress, the United States, and the world will not stand by idly as the Chinese Communist Party fights for itself and not its own people.

Again, I want to thank the authors of this bill. I am proud to be a part of this movement, this cause. And we have seen quite a bit of response on social media on this bill coming directly from the people of Hong Kong to the Members who are on this floor saying thank you for standing up for us.

That is democracy in action. That is what this country stands for. And it is a proud moment, I think, for both sides of the aisle as we are going through this time in our history to be able to stand together for democracy and such a great movement and cause for freedom.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), an important leader on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1838, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

I want to say thank you to Speaker NANCY PELOSI for her incredible leadership in ensuring that the House made a timely and unequivocal statement in support of the Hong Kong people at this very important and vital time.

I would also like to thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, as well as Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for bringing this legislation to the floor today. I also appreciate the leadership of Senators RUBIO, CARDIN, and MENENDEZ for all that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the situation in Hong Kong has worsened as the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments have escalated repression against the protest movement and provoked more violence and chaos.

The recent attacks on university campuses, including last weekend against students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University raises disturbing questions on the strategy of the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments. Protestors were violently assaulted and not even allowed to escape without facing a barrage of tear gas and police brutality.

It is long past time for the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments to try a different approach that respects the people of Hong Kong and restores the people's faith in the autonomy of the government. That is what political leaders do, they use dialogue and negotiation to achieve their goals. The demands of the protestors are reasonable, and an independent inquiry into the police violence is more than justified.

In what was initially a positive development, this week the Hong Kong High Court decided that the government's recent facemask ban was unconstitutional. Unfortunately, the fierce

response by Beijing to that ruling and claim of sole jurisdiction over constitutional review almost certainly violates the basic law, subverts the rule of law, and further undermines whatever trust the Hong Kong people have left in their governing institutions.

If the Hong Kong court system is not sufficiently autonomous, then it is difficult, if not impossible, to argue that Hong Kong is sufficiently autonomous. It should be clear by now that Hong Kong's leaders are beholden to the Chinese Government, and the independence of the judiciary is being undermined.

The ''one country, two systems'' framework enshrined in the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration and Hong Kong's basic law has been rapidly eroding and has now reached a point when the United States has no choice but to modify its policy toward Hong Kong.

It is time we put the Chinese Government on annual notice that further erosion of autonomy or a crackdown will cause the city, which serves as an important financial haven for wealthy Chinese elites, to lose its special economic, financial and trade arrangement with the United States.

Further, the legislation authorizes sanctions against individuals who violate human rights, and states that Hong Kong visa applicants should not be denied entry to the U.S. on the basis of politically-motivated arrests due to their protest activities.

Today a Chinese official said that they will take strong opposing measures if the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy bill passes.

Well, I have a message for Beijing: The United States will not stand idly by while the Chinese Government stifles free expression and tightens its grip on Hong Kong.

Over the years, Hong Kong has prospered and become the financial center of Asia because of its strong commitment to the rule of law, good governance, human rights, and an open economic system.

We must use our leverage to help the people of Hong Kong in their struggle to secure a democratic future that protects Hong Kong's autonomy and way of life.

I am proud to support this legislation, which we will pass today with an overwhelmingly bipartisan majority.

I now call upon the President of the United States, who has been way too silent on this issue, to sign the bill into law.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), the ranking member of the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a shout-out to the bipartisan nature of this bill. Both sides are working strongly on this. Chairman ENGEL, thank you. Mr. MCGOVERN, thank you. CHRIS, thank you for doing what you have done. It is true leadership. And to see Speaker PELOSI down here, I think it speaks loudly to how America stands on this.

In September, I, too, had the honor of meeting with a few of the courageous leaders of Hong Kong student unions. They were advocating for peace, liberty, and freedom. These are basic innate human rights that have been taken away from Hong Kongers by the authoritarian overreach of the Chinese Communist Party Complex, which is comprised of Xi Jinping, the Politburo of the Chinese Communist Party, and leadership within the People's Liberation Army.

As protests in Hong Kong continue into the sixth month, Xi Jinping still refuses to take responsibility for this unrest. The cause is simple: theft of basic rights and freedoms, not a separatist movement or foreign influence. Members of this body have been accused of being the cause of the protests. Speaker PELOSI was named individually. Senator SCHUMER, MARCO RUBIO, and I were named as the cause of the Hong Kong protests.

This disdain was sparked by the introduction of the infamous extradition bill by Chief Executive Carrie Lam at the command of the CCPC and has grown into what are known as the five demands. Had Xi Jinping and his cohorts just honored the 1997 international agreement between Great Britain and China, which allows Hong Kong to remain a self-ruling, semi-autonomous province, none of this would have occurred.

Not upholding one's contract has consequences. Disregarding contracts breaks trust and dishonors the country, its leaders, and its people. The narrative that the Chinese Communist Party Complex has created for itself is that China cannot and should not be trusted and that the party will go to great lengths to dismantle free societies in their backyard.

The survival of democracy and freedom exposes the failures of communism. Xi Jinping, along with his cohorts' lack of acknowledgment of their failures, whether from deliberate denial or complete ignorance, was demonstrated by Mr. Han Zheng, China's Vice Premier, who said he believes antigovernment protests are damaging the ''one country, two systems'' formula, and again, are caused by a separatist movement and foreign influence.

While sitting next to Chief Executive Carrie Lam, he continued, ''We firmly support the Special Administrative Region Government to adopt more proactive and more effective measures'' to solve the social problems.

Since I wrote this, they have come out and said they expect to have brutality ramped up to bring these people under control. The proactive and more effective measures referred to by Mr. Han Zheng are intimidation, brutality, imprisonment and death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, as the international community is well aware, Beijing's standard procedure for dealing with unrest is well documented. In the end, Xi Jinping will leave no stone unturned in his quest to destroy democracy. The party will spare no one in their fight to protect communist ideals and power. Chief Executive Lam will be Beijing's sacrificial lamb and removed for two reasons: one, the Communist Party must save face and have a scapegoat; and two, Xi Jinping and the Communist Party must maintain their authority and not show weakness.

Communism fears free thought and cannot survive in it. And I am honored to stand with the Hong Kong protestors in their important cause. I urge my colleagues to also stand with the courageous individuals in Hong Kong and pass the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

''Jia you'' to our Hong Kong friends standing up for your basic human rights.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, my good friend, for yielding, and I have to thank him for his decades of service and leadership here for free expression and for liberty in Hong Kong.

I was moved by the Speaker's tribute and appreciate her 30 years of work there. I thank Mr. ENGEL for his leadership, and, of course, my good friend from California, who now is controlling the time for the majority.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act and stand in solidarity with the people of Hong Kong.

For 6 months, we have witnessed Hong Kong citizens protest for their right to live in a free and fair political system, an expectation they fully have. Over the last several weeks, we have witnessed the government become increasingly violent as it cracks down on protests. It is sad to see death and destruction come to this beautiful and energetic place.

For three decades, I have traveled to Hong Kong and witnessed their innovative spirit and their extraordinary work ethic. In fact, Hong Kong was the model for the post-World War II Asian

Tiger growth and prosperity now shared across the region. When a proponent of welfare statism queried progrowth economist Melvyn B. Krauss, ''But how many Hong Kongs can the world have?'' the professor responded, ''As many as the world will allow itself.''

The 7 million citizens of Hong Kong are looking to us for a voice and for leadership, and with today's vote, we will deliver. I call on President Trump to sign this important measure into law with expediency and show the world that America supports the people of Hong Kong, their right to free expression, and their democratic governance guaranteed under the five-decade arrangement agreed to in 1997 by the People's Republic of China and the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will close when the gentleman has closed on his side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the United States' and the world's response to the Tiananmen Square massacre 30 years ago and the massive crackdown that was unleashed after that, because of that weak response, has enabled unrelenting and pervasive human rights abuses ever since.

Had we been strong and predictable and said that human rights matter, had we linked it to MFN, most-favored-nation status, and stuck to it, we would have had a different China today that, at least more than it does today, would have respected the rule of law and human rights.

We cannot recommit that mistake by being weak and vacillating in the face of this terrible, terrible attack on the people of Hong Kong and on their autonomy.

Remember, what we are asking Xi Jinping, Carrie Lam, and all the other leaders in Hong Kong and in Beijing to do is just honor your promises; you made solemn promises that you are violating now with impunity.

We have to be very clear that if we enable that, if we look the other way, then we become unwittingly, perhaps, but complicit in this terrible degrading of the human rights situation for the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues as well, and I think we all know this, but this bill is the work of so many who deeply care, many Members across the aisle, bipartisanship at a time when that seems to be pretty much a rare commodity, but when it comes to Hong Kong, we are all there joined together arm-in-arm speaking out on behalf of these tremendous leaders who suffer and go to prison and endure tear gas and worse each and every day.

I want to mention some of the staff members, and there are many. When we had the bill up on the 15th, I mentioned even more. But these members were instrumental in working on the legislation over the past 5 years. Remember, this is the fourth time I introduced it, and I have worked with MARCO RUBIO and others. This is a bicameral and bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank former staff directors of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Paul Protic and Elise Anderson, for their important work on Hong Kong and China. I want to thank Piero Tozzi of my staff for his focus on human rights in China and around the world. I particularly want to mention the contribution made to this legislation by Scott Flipse of the CECC, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China.

In 2014, Dr. Flipse first convinced me. We had met, and he said that we have a problem in Hong Kong and that we need to address it. I was co-chair of the China Commission. Then we had meetings with Chinese leaders and Hong Kong leaders. We began to see that what was taking place in somewhat slow motion before our eyes was that there was a long-term Beijing plan to undermine Hong Kong's autonomy and that the U.S. needed to focus its efforts on countering that plan. He has been a stalwart advocate for the people of Hong Kong ever since, and I, again, want to thank him for his critical contributions to this legislation.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

We vote today on S. 1838, but this is not just a Senate bill. This is a bill very similar to the one introduced in this House by the gentleman from New Jersey. This House has already voted on this bill and supported it overwhelmingly. Today, once again, we show the world our commitment to the people of Hong Kong and to the preservation and protection of Hong Kong's autonomy, given China's aggressive attempts to undermine the ''one country, two systems'' approach.

With this important legislation, we send a clear signal that the United States will hold those undermining Hong Kong's rights and autonomy accountable and that the American people stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Hong Kong. With few exceptions, the people of Hong Kong have fought for their rights through peaceable protest, and we stand with them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will join me in supporting the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1838.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2710) to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2710.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Senator MERKLEY for his hard work on this legislation. The House a few weeks before passed a similar measure, the PROTECT Hong Kong Act, authored by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), whom I was about to refer to as the Chair but has now joined us here in the regular seats of the House.

Such bipartisan, bicameral legislation supporting the people of Hong Kong is a testament to the relationship between our two peoples, but it is also an indication of Congress' deep concern over the growing violence in Hong Kong.

In recent weeks, we have seen an escalation in the conflict between Hong Kong's security forces and the people of Hong Kong. The same police forces sworn to protect the people are now indiscriminately targeting people with tear gas, pepper spray, and water cannons. I am particularly heartbroken over the images of students under siege and parents begging the police not to shoot their children.

We have seen similar images before, just 30 years ago in Beijing. The fact that these horrors are now taking place in Hong Kong, a beacon of democracy and human rights, is worrisome. I am deeply concerned by the recent escalation of violence, and I call on all parties to exercise restraint and seek a peaceful solution to address the very legitimate concerns of the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure and ensure that U.S. companies are not contributing to the suppression of Hong Kong's people in their fight to secure their freedoms and their democracy.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2710, a bill that would prohibit the commercial export of covered munition items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank my good friend and colleague, Chairman MCGOVERN, for his legislation, which is pretty much a companion bill that passed a little over 1 month ago, again, on the whole idea of U.S.-originated equipment being exploited in Hong Kong against these protesters. I thank him for doing that. We have raised this at hearings, and his bill was a great bill.

As the largest protest movement Hong Kong has ever seen continues, major concerns have arisen about the Hong Kong police's independence and professionalism. The people of Hong Kong are rightfully furious about well-documented cases of excessive force, brutal tactics, and tolerance of violence against protesters. The Hong Kong police themselves are now a cause of the protests.

There has been widespread police misuse of crowd control equipment and less-lethal weaponry, including incidents that have seriously injured journalists.

I am glad this bill is before us. After it passes, it goes to the President, and I fully expect he will sign it into law.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will remember that, just a few months ago, we passed very similar legislation in the House to the bill that is in front of us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is an important leader on this issue. The gentleman wrote the House version of this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his leadership on this and so many other important issues to uphold a high standard of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2710, the Placing Restrictions on Tear-gas Exports and Crowd Control Technology to Hong Kong Act, otherwise known as the PROTECT Hong Kong Act.

I am proud to have introduced this bipartisan legislation, along with my colleagues CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey and RO KHANNA from California, in the House. Senator MERKLEY and Senator CORNYN introduced it in the Senate.

This bill responds to the excessive and unnecessary use of force by the Hong Kong police targeting those engaged in peaceful protests.

The PROTECT Hong Kong Act prohibits U.S. exports of police equipment to Hong Kong, including tear gas, pepper spray, grenades, rubber bullets, foam rounds, beanbag rounds, pepper balls, water cannons, stun guns, and tasers.

The Hong Kong Police Force is simply out of control. The reckless and escalating use of violence flies in the face of manufacturer guidelines and international standards on the use of force. In recent days, the world has seen eyewitness evidence showing protesters sprayed with tear gas directly in the face at short distances, rampant beatings and arbitrary arrests of people ages 11 to 74, police driving at high speeds into crowds, and unarmed protesters shot with live rounds.

The British Government already suspended export licenses for the sale of tear gas and crowd control equipment until concerns about human rights abuses are addressed. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights called for an investigation of the use of crowd control tactics in Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time for American companies to stop selling police equipment that is being used to suppress peaceful protests.

Mr. Speaker, today, we will cast votes on two pieces of legislation that will make it crystal clear to Beijing that we in this Congress in a bipartisan manner stand in solidarity with the protesters of Hong Kong, and we also stand with them in their demands, among which is there needs to be an independent investigation and inquiry into the brutal tactics of the Hong Kong Police Force.

It is absolutely outrageous. It is unacceptable. It goes beyond the pale. We have all seen the pictures, the photographs, and the videos that are on social media. Anybody who cares about human rights will stand with us proudly and vote for these two pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this PROTECT Hong Kong Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched as the Chinese Communist Party works to break down and undermine the ''one country, two systems'' framework that has paved the way for a strong relationship between Hong Kong and the United States.

This has motivated millions of Hong Kongers, the people of Hong Kong, to take to the streets for months to protest in defense of their basic human rights. These prodemocracy activists have faced tear gas, pepper spray, and rubber bullets by a police force sworn to protect them, and now they face lethal force as well.

□ 1615

The passage of this bill demonstrates, once again, to the people of Hong Kong that the United States stands with them in their protest of China's erosion of the autonomy and the way of life that was promised them back in 1997.

It takes a step to ensure that U.S. companies demonstrate a commitment to U.S. values in this regard, making sure that U.S. companies aren't facilitating violence against the protestors by selling what we, sadly, know can be lethal crowd control mechanisms.

This bill is an important part of Congress' response by the effort of Beijing to deprive Hong Kong of the autonomy and democracy that it was promised back in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from

California (Mr. SHERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2710.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 713;

Adoption of House Resolution 713, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 737,

S. 1838, and

S. 2710.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION FOR HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 22, 2019, THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 713) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from November 22, 2019, through December 2, 2019; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

YEAS—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—194

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cooper
Flores
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Lewis
McEachin
Porter
Richmond
Serrano
Timmons

□ 1647

Mr. KENNEDY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 205, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—205

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cooper
Flores
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Hudson
Lewis
McEachin
Porter
Richmond
Schakowsky
Serrano
Timmons
Vela

□ 1656

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 633.

SHARK FIN SALES ELIMINATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 737) to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 107, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—310

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—107

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bucshon
Byrne
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Comer

Crawford
Curtis
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Huizenga
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lieu, Ted
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Posey
Ratcliffe
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Spano
Stewart
Taylor
Thornberry
Van Drew
Walberg
Walker
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cooper
Flores
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Lewis
McEachin
Porter
Richmond
Serrano
Timmons

□ 1703

Mr. HUDSON changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1838) to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—417

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cooper
Flores
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Lewis
McEachin
Porter
Richmond
Serrano
Timmons

□ 1711

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2710) to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

YEAS—417

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright

Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cooper
Flores
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Lewis
McEachin
Porter
Richmond
Serrano
Timmons
Webster (FL)

□ 1722

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes on November 20, 2019 for rollcall 632, rollcall 633, rollcall 634, rollcall 635, and rollcall 636. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 632, "yes" on rollcall 633, "yes" on rollcall 634 (H.R. 737—Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act), "yes" on rollcall 635 (S. 1838—Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019), and "yes" on rollcall 636 (S. 2710—To prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force). I am proud to support the people of Hong Kong.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HUIZENGA, Michigan

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE PASSING OF MRS. FAHARI JEFFERS

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, SUSAN DAVIS, SCOTT PETERS, MIKE LEVIN, and Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor Mrs. Fahari Jeffers, who passed away on October 30, for her outstanding actions as a tireless civil rights and labor leader and motivator and as the cofounder of the United Domestic Workers of America.

In 1977, Fahari Jeffers and her husband, Ken Msemaji, formed the United Domestic Workers organizing committee under the mentorship of Cesar Chavez. It was the first known labor organization for domestic workers in the United States of America and only the third labor union in U.S. labor history to be founded by Latinos or African Americans.

Additionally, Mrs. Jeffers served as United Domestic Workers' secretary-treasurer and first general counsel until 2005.

Ms. Jeffers worked tirelessly as lead negotiator for all union contracts throughout the State of California, pursuing life improvements that helped millions of Americans in the State and nationwide.

Her model collective bargain rights law of 1999 is patterned across California and the Nation, where over 2 million home care workers enjoy union rights. Fahari regarded writing this legislation as one of her proudest accomplishments.

Asserting rights for our Nation's domestic workers gave way to the passage of the first-ever Federal Domestic Workers Bill of Rights in 2013.

Mrs. Jeffers used her skills and experience to represent and defend the rights of one of the most underrepresented and underpaid working groups in our society: our home care workers, who clean, cook, and provide personal care assistance to the sick and disabled.

In 2018, Fahari was inducted into the San Diego County Women's Hall of Fame.

At home in National City, the devoutly Catholic couple adopted 16 children over the years. Survivors include her husband of 44 years, Ken Msemaji; her siblings, Rose Glasford of Bermuda, Karama Broach of North Carolina, Joe Jeffers of Colorado, Vickie Jeffers of North Carolina, and Dr. Adam Jeffers of the United Arab Emirates; and her adopted children.

We would like to honor Fahari Jeffers for her dedication and lifelong commitment to civil rights, the labor movement, and the community.

I ask that Members and guests in the gallery rise for a moment of silence.

REBUILDING SMALL BUSINESSES AFTER DISASTERS ACT

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 862) to extend the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 862

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 ''Rebuilding Small Businesses After Disasters Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF SUNSET FOR COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SBA DISASTER LOANS.

Section 2102(b) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (15 U.S.C. 636 note) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''4 years'' and inserting ''7 years''.

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON DEFAULT RATES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report comparing—

(1) the performance, including the default rate, of loans made under section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) during the period—

(A) beginning on January 1, 2000; and

(B) ending on the date on which the Small Business Administration began making loans in accordance with the amendment made by section 2102(a) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–88; 129 Stat. 690); and

(2) the performance, including the default rate, of loans made under 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) in accordance with the amendment made by section 2102(a) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–88; 129 Stat. 690).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Entrepreneurship Month.

America has always been known as a land of innovation, and entrepreneurs combine innovation with capitalism.

But there is a group of future business leaders that need our help, the minority entrepreneurs. Many do not get the funds they need, based on bias in the banking and loan industry. Too many bank managers still refuse to see minorities as worthy of loans. When they do get them, minorities are charged higher interest rates on average than Whites. Many do not even fill out the loan applications because they know they will be rejected. Major banks have programs to deal with it, but clearly more needs to be done. We need to make sure loans are distributed based on credentials of the applicant, not the color of his or her skin.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, November is Alzheimer's Awareness Month. I rise to recognize the millions of Americans across this great country who are living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

Alzheimer's is a frightening disease that has impacted several individuals close to me. My Aunt Jane lost her battle with the disease, while my Aunt Virginia continues to fight it. Additionally, the legendary Pat Summitt, a friend of mine—she actually came to my father's funeral—who coached the University of Tennessee Lady Vols basketball team for 38 seasons, lived with and brought awareness to Alzheimer's disease before passing away in 2016.

I am especially thankful for the caregivers who assist those living with a memory disorder. Friends, family members, and trained professionals care for these patients and make sacrifices to ensure their comfort. These efforts must not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker.

Individuals diagnosed with Alzheimer's need to know they are not alone in their battle against this difficult illness. And while I remain optimistic about new treatments and ongoing research to find a cure, this November I encourage my constituents and colleagues to take a moment to think about those Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and say a prayer for them and their families and to show support for the caregivers who look after and advocate for them.

RECOGNIZING LATINA EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize Latina Equal Pay Day. I want to start by emphasizing that the gender pay gap is real, and it hurts Latina women and families.

We know that Latinas make only 54 cents for every dollar that a White non-Hispanic male makes for doing the same job. Let that sink in for just one moment. In 2019, Latina women get paid 54 cents for every dollar a non-Hispanic man makes for the same work.

In fact, a Latina must work an additional 35 years to catch up to the earnings of a 60-year-old man, averaging to about $1.1 million in loss of earnings during a 40-year career. Continuing to ignore this disparity has repercussions in many aspects of our economy, and it leaves over 40 percent of families that are headed by a Latina in poverty.

We must find a way to close the wage for the sake of our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, and our families.

RECOGNIZING SCOTT SEWELL

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Sewell for his 4 years of service as president of the Winston-Salem Police Foundation. When he steps down as president in December, Mr. Sewell will be able to look back on his term and be extremely proud of the successes he has had.

Mr. Sewell has led the foundation in a manner that truly gives back to the community. One such example is when, under his leadership, the foundation donated to the Winston-Salem Police Department the Operation Sweet Reads truck, which will be used to engage with local children with ice cream and promote literacy and education.

Scott Sewell has served his community well, and he will continue to do so even after his term has ended. He is an exemplary member of the community, and I am proud to call him a friend and to recognize his service.

HONORING MIKE MAROTTA, SR.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mike Marotta, Sr., an entertainment legend, a Monterey native, and a cornerstone of the Italian American community on the central coast of California in my district.

I am sorry to say, Mike passed away earlier this week at the age of 98. Mike was a family man, a businessman, and a civic leader.

But I have to say everyone who knew him knew that music was Mike's first and everlasting love. He taught himself how to play the accordion when he was 11 years old. He would then take the accordion down to the bay and play for the Italian fishermen coming back and unloading their catch.

His musical journey even led him to Hollywood eventually, where he played with stars like Roy Rogers and Dale Evans. During his military service during World War II, he entertained the troops throughout the United States.

Now, recently you could find Mike playing Italian songs with his kids and grandkids and even at the Paisano Club, but also you could find him continuing his tradition of playing for fishermen and our community at the Festa Italia Santa Rosalia, the premier Italian American festival on the central coast of California.

My condolences are with his family. Mike's civic-mindedness and his musical gift will be missed by our community, but his legacy and his love of music will be carried on by his family and friends through his everlasting songs played by his son, but most importantly, through the love in our hearts for Mike Marotta, Sr.

RECOGNIZING RITA BISHOP

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Roanoke Superintendent of Schools, Rita Bishop.

Superintendent Bishop has served the students of Roanoke City for more than 12 years and will retire at the school year's end. Her tenure is marked with significant accomplishments, and I applaud the passion she exudes for the students of her district.

During her time of service to the community, graduation rates improved from 60 percent in 2007 to now over 90 percent. Further, under her leadership, all schools have achieved full accreditation division wide, a feat that had never before been accomplished.

Additionally, Ms. Bishop was essential in launching Roanoke's summer enrichment program RCPS-Plus. This program seeks to address what is known as the ''summer slide'' by ensuring knowledge is not lost between school years. Last summer, a record 3,400 students enrolled in this program.

I want to thank Ms. Bishop for her dedication to improving the city's education system and wish her a happy, well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING LOCAL PAGEANT TITLEHOLDERS

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight three exceptional young ladies who reside in my district in south Jersey. They are pageant titleholders who work for the greater good of our community.

Madison Stiles is a Salem County native, who uses her title to promote mental health awareness. She is an avid volunteer through her community and is a fantastic advocate for the important subject of mental health.

Miss Vineland 2019, Marissa Marchese, who resides in Vineland, New Jersey, created a platform called ''Homeless Has a Face'' that allows her to educate individuals on the harsh realities of being displaced and share the stories of those who are not fortunate enough to have a roof over their heads.

Lastly, but certainly not least, Jaslene Candelaria, at the young age of 11, created a platform that collects stuffed animals, blankets, and inspirational cards for cancer patients of all ages. Her goal is to bring joy and smiles to patients, and she visits various hospitals throughout her community to make sure to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I thank them all for their selfless and benevolent work throughout their communities. Our future is in wonderful hands with them. They are our heroes, and may God bless them.

CONGRATULATING LAKELAND LINDER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lakeland Linder International Airport on receiving their second Department of Transportation grant, this time totaling $8½ million.

Lakeland Linder has over 125,000 aircraft operations annually and is becoming a central hub for major companies like Amazon.

The airport is also home to the NOAA Hurricane Hunters, the Central Florida Aerospace Academy, and Polk State College's Aerospace programs.

This grant provides the funding to make needed improvements to the aging runway and infrastructure that will further attract new businesses and jobs.

Well done to Airport Director Eugene Conrad and his team for their vision and hard work. He contributes significantly to District 15 and our economic growth, and we thank him.

SOMETHING HAS GOT TO GIVE

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, in our conversation about gun violence, one side sees the need for background checks. The other side prefers to ''enforce the laws we already have.'' Yet we do not have universal background checks, so we cannot enforce it. Meanwhile, our children are exposed.

This year there have been 45 school shootings in 46 weeks, 370 mass shootings by the end of October. That is more than one per day. Something has got to give.

Senator MCCONNELL said he will hold a vote on our background check bill only if President Trump says he will sign it.

So let me address the President directly from the heart: Sir, I have two granddaughters. Aubrey is eight; Ella is just one-month old. When Aubrey attends terrifying active shooter drills, what would you have me tell her? How about when she notices that we have laws barring certain people from owning guns, but that much of the time we don't bother to check who is who? Or when she realizes that her leaders could have put basic lifesaving safeguards in place, and they chose not to, what shall I say to her? What would you tell her?

President Trump, my granddaughters, your grandchildren need your leadership, and so does America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HONORING LOUIS BRINNER

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, Louis Brinner, a World War II veteran from Mississippi, will celebrate his 100th birthday.

Mr. Brinner served in the United States Army as a private first-class with the 645th MP Company. After enlisting at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, on May 8, 1941, he fought alongside Allied troops in Italy, which were successful in liberating Italian cities such as Rome and Naples in the Rome-Arno campaign.

For his service, Mr. Brinner earned decorations, including the American Defense Service Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, and a Good Conduct Medal.

Mr. Brinner was discharged from the Army on October 16, 1945, after more than 4 years of honorable service to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Brinner for his dedicated service to our country and to wish Mr. Brinner the happiest of birthdays.

□ 1745

HONORING FAHARI JEFFERS

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, my friend Fahari Jeffers' legacy as a civil rights and labor rights leader in American history had its beginning in the Black Power movement. She joined the San Diego chapter of the U.S. organization in 1967 and served as a teacher in the weekend School of Afro-American Culture for Children.

A dedicated civil rights advocate and cultural rights powerhouse, she became involved in labor union organizing, having convened the major African People's gatherings in the 1970s and worked with the NIA cultural organization in San Diego.

Fahari was proud of her roots in the Black Power movement. Her early work prepared her for the work that Cesar Chavez recruited and trained her and her husband, Ken Msemaji, to do in founding and building the United Domestic Workers of America. Today, over 200,000 California homecare workers and nearly 2 million nationally work under union contracts. Her model of collective bargaining rights law is now patterned across the Nation. On Sunday, March 18, 2018, Fahari Jeffers

was inducted into the San Diego Women's Hall of Fame for her work in cofounding the United Domestic Workers of America.

With her passing, the State of California and our Nation suffered a tremendous loss. She will be remembered for her ''si, se puede'' attitude and for exemplifying the meaning of her Swahili given name, Fahari, which means magnificent, and magnificent she was.

SUPPORT BIPARTISAN PATH FOR USMCA

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the continued effort by the U.S. Trade Representative and the Democratic working group to finalize the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the USMCA.

Oklahoma workers, families, businesses, and our Nation benefit from free and fair international trade. Every day, Oklahomans create and export world-class products, and two of our largest trading partners are our neighbors to the north and the south.

In 2018 alone, Oklahoma exported a total of $5.6 billion in manufactured goods. Nearly half of those went to Mexico and Canada. In the same year, Oklahoma agriculture exports to Mexico and Canada totaled $154 million.

A stronger trading relationship with Mexico and Canada means a stronger economy for Oklahoma. It is imperative that Congress finish negotiating and pass a strong trade agreement to restore certainty in our trading relationship with Canada and Mexico and support millions of American jobs in the process.

Though finding common ground is not easy, it is critical, and I support the USTR and lawmakers' work to find a bipartisan path forward for this important trade agreement.

HONORING TRACY SINGLE ON TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, today, on Transgender Remembrance Day, I rise to remember Tracy Single, who was killed in July of this year in my district, the 15th transgender woman of color murdered this year.

A music lover with an eye for fashion and an ear for music, 22-year-old Tracy moved to Houston to pursue her dream of becoming a rapper. Tension around her gender identity forced her out of her home, and she experienced a very hard time, but she was persistent and upbeat, always working to achieve her goals.

Her life reminds us that creative and vibrant people can thrive even in the most difficult circumstances. And her death reminds us that transgender people are under attack and must have equal protection under the law.

HONORING TOM VASQUEZ

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the memory of my dear friend Tom Vasquez, who passed away on July 23. Tom was one of the founders of our progressive movement in Chicago, and we were partners in many battles.

He was born in Matamoros, Mexico, and eventually found his way to Chicago, settling in the working-class community of Little Village. In the early 1980s, Tom was part of a group of young people who saw the disparities and lack of political representation in our community and sought to address these inequalities.

He stepped up, led the change, and helped create the Independent Political Organization of the 22nd Ward. He was a precinct captain for many years. He organized block clubs and he was involved in schools in the local community. On election day, he was always getting people to the polling places. He attended many community meetings and mentored many young people in the community. He did this all while holding a full-time job with the Chicago Transit Authority and being a member of a local union.

Tom's passing has left a gap not only for his family but for the entire community that benefited from his service and commitment to justice.

Tom, may you rest in peace.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to come to the House floor tonight to commemorate National Bible Week. This is an opportunity to celebrate the tremendous influence of the Bible on the freedoms we enjoy today in America.

We are truly blessed to live in a nation where we are free to worship and read the Holy Scriptures without fear of persecution. There are many places throughout the world where such freedoms do not exist.

Americans have the right under our wonderful system of government to respect and study the Bible or any other system of belief that they so choose or even none at all. That is the beauty of the American way, and I believe it goes all the way back to the Bible.

In 1941, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt declared the week of Thanksgiving to be National Bible Week. The National Bible Association and the U.S. Conference of Bishops have designated the specific days of November 18 to 24 as National Bible Week this year. This is the week set aside to recognize the Bible as a foundational building block of Western civilization, the Judeo-Christian heritage, and the legacy that motivated and shaped the founding of the United States.

In this hour, we will hear from Members of Congress from all throughout the United States from various faith traditions and denominations speak about what the Bible means to them. We are here, in keeping with tradition, to recognize National Bible Week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), who is a good friend and colleague.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to the gentleman from Colorado for bringing us all together tonight for National Bible Week.

Over the weekend, I finished reading through the Bible in a year, and I can testify that it has been the best year of my life in giving me perspective and quiet confidence for every day, reminding me to lead with love.

The Bible says to love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. The Word of God is the source of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, and self-control. Everything that we long for in life is found in the Word of God, the Bible.

So why haven't I been more faithful to read the Bible every day earlier in my life? Because, like a lot of people, I didn't always feel like I had enough time, or I struggled to relate to the language.

Why read the Bible? Why wake up 15 minutes early each day? Why go to all that trouble? That was my struggle for many, many years.

The Bible says in Psalm 90:12: ''Teach us to number our days, that we may gain a heart of wisdom.''

Psalm 103 says that ''our days are few and brief, like grass, like flowers, blown by the wind and gone forever,'' yet the Word of God endures forever.

It is the Bible that provides us answers to our questions about life more than any other book, seminar, or self-help program.

The Bible also offers words of encouragement and hope at a time when despair has come over our country. We have record suicides. A million people in America attempted suicide last

year, and 47,000 committed suicide. I grieve this loss.

The deaths of despair are skyrocketing: suicide, drug overdoses, opioids, alcohol, and drug abuse. People are giving up on life.

The Bible says in Matthew that not a single sparrow can fall to the ground without your Father knowing it. And the very hairs on your head are numbered, so don't be afraid, you are more valuable to God.

We need the truth and the wisdom of the Bible. As Proverbs 12:18 says: ''Careless words stab like a sword, but wise words bring healing.''

As I begin a second year of taking 15 minutes a day to read the Bible and then pray, I would invite each one of you to join me. Let's do it together. Let's agree that it cannot be business as usual. Let's see what God could do on Capitol Hill through Members and staff who daily walk the Halls of Congress—Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, men and women—if we all read through the Bible in 2020.

I am convinced the Democrats can't fix it. The Republicans can't fix it. Only God can fix it.

My daily prayer is 2 Chronicles 7:14: ''If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, and I will forgive their sin and will heal their land.''

Lord God, heal our land. May You bring order out of chaos. Lift the heaviness of misery and despair and busyness. Remind us that You are with us in everything we do.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her words of wisdom, her personal experience, and for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague for having this.

Since Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941, every U.S. President has declared the week of Thanksgiving to be National Bible Week. Next week, we will, once again, celebrate this beloved book, which continues to mold the lives of millions and even billions around the world.

It is fitting that we take time today to bring attention to the very book that was so influential in the founding of our Nation. The Holy Bible was perhaps the most accessible book to our Founding Fathers. Its principles gave them invaluable insights into human nature, civic virtue, political authority, and the rights of citizens.

Personally, I consider it a huge and great privilege to speak on the House floor today about a book that has had such a profound influence on my life and on the life of our country, and it continues to do so daily.

As a believer in Christ, the Bible has shaped the way that I have lived my life, whether conducting my business as a dentist in Woodville, Texas, raising my family, or serving the good people of the 36th District of Texas right here in the House of Representatives.

I believe that the Bible is more than a book of inspiration and comfort or a compilation of moral teachings. I believe that it really is the Holy Word of God that contains the truth and teachings of His love for us and His plan for redemption through faith in Jesus Christ, His Son.

In history's greatest love story, the Bible tells us that God sacrificed His Son to redeem us from depravity. In John 3:16, we read: ''For God so loved the world, He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.''

Centuries before, in one of my favorite passages, the Book of Job prophesied of Christ the Redeemer who is to come:

For I know that my Redeemer lives,
And He shall stand at last on the Earth;
And after my skin is destroyed, this I know,
That in my flesh I shall see God,
Whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold, and not another.
How my heart yearns within me.

Whenever I read these words, I am reminded of my Lord's steadfast love for me and His promise to always be with and guide me through every chapter of my life.

□ 1800

As we approach the 78th National Bible Week, I want to encourage my fellow Americans out there to take a moment to open the Bible and to read these profound words. No matter if it has been a while since you have read the Bible or you read it every single day, may each of us spend time reminding ourselves of the Word of God, especially during this season of thanks.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for sharing his heart with us tonight.

Throughout American history, many of our great leaders have turned to the Bible for guidance, faith, and hope.

President Abraham Lincoln once said of the Bible: ''I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good the Savior gave to the world was communicated through this book. But for it we could not know right from wrong. All things most desirable for man's welfare, here and hereafter, are to be found portrayed in it.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), as we go across the country and hear from folks all over this great country of ours.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my brother in the Lord from Colorado for hosting this Special Order tonight, during a special week where we commemorate the Holy Word, the Bible.

Mr. Speaker, since 1941, every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has declared the week of Thanksgiving as National Bible Week.

It is fitting that we celebrate this week along with the national day of Thanksgiving. Both the Bible and this annual holiday provide us with the time to reflect on what is most important in our lives: our faith, our creator, our family, and our love for one another.

Mr. Speaker, part of my family lineage can be traced back to those Pilgrims who set out for the New World in search of religious freedom. They endured both hardship and sacrifice at a heavy cost to be able to freely worship without persecution.

Forty-five of the 102 Mayflower passengers died in the winter of 1620 to 1621, and the Mayflower colonists suffered greatly during their first winter in the New World from lack of shelter, scurvy, and general conditions of hardship. They brought with them, though, their faith and several Bibles.

The event that Americans commonly call the First Thanksgiving was celebrated by the Pilgrims after their first harvest in the New World in October of 1621. This feast lasted 3 days, and, as accounted by attendee Edward Winslow, it was attended by 90 Native Americans and 53 Pilgrims.

Thanks to William Bradford's journal, we have knowledge of how these Pilgrims gave thanks. The question remains as to whom and why did they do this.

As people of faith, I would like to believe they were acting out the lessons of the Bible, such as that found in Psalm 107. This Scripture states the theme of God's loyal love and redemption. It is written for at the time of Israel in exile.

Wandering and overwhelmed by circumstances, I could see why these early Pilgrims could find solace in this Scripture. They also found themselves wandering and enduring hardship.

The Bible illustrated the power of giving thanks to the Lord, the importance of assuming thankfulness as a human attitude.

These words indicate not just a knowledge of, but also a recognition and a relationship through, the Word of God that the Bible offers.

I don't know if the Pilgrims referenced this Scripture in preparing or dealing with the hardships that they endured. I do know that the Bible and the Word within it was important to these travelers and early settlers.

The Bible has had a tremendous influence in my life and the lives of millions of Americans. The Scriptures inside serve as a guide for us in both times of trouble and in times of triumph. And, for that reason, it remains the best-selling book of all time.

During this week, I am thankful for the strong community of faith that I have come to know through weekly Bible studies and prayer service here in the United States Capitol and, certainly, back in my district and my home community. It is a time where we put aside differences and come together to share the love and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The words of the Bible unite people, nations, and even politicians as we

come together to celebrate faith, fellowship, and prayer.

As I prepare to close, let me share these thoughts.

God chose Israel; America chose God; and God's first love is Israel. Let's make America God's lasting love.

Mr. Speaker, let us also celebrate the First Amendment, which affirms our right to choose and exercise faith without government coercion or retaliation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his words, and I thank him for reminding us about the Pilgrim tradition, especially as we enter this week of Thanksgiving.

It is interesting, in American history, we have two different strains of life going on in this country: We had people starting in Jamestown looking for gold, looking to make money, putting up with slavery; but we had people in Massachusetts who wanted to just have religious freedom, and they had a whole different view of the world and of God and the Bible. They were the start of the abolitionist movement. So I am glad that Mr. THOMPSON brought us the Pilgrim tradition tonight.

Ronald Reagan, when he designated National Bible Week, said, when he was in office: ''When I took the oath of office, I requested the Bible be opened to II Chronicles 7:14.''

CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS mentioned this earlier. It reads: ''If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.''

This passage expresses my personal hopes for the future of this Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow colleague from Colorado, Representative LAMBORN, for hosting this Special Order tonight as we honor National Bible Week.

Every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt inaugurated the first one in 1941, every President has since declared the week of Thanksgiving as National Bible Week. It follows a long history, stretching back to the founding of our country, of our leaders turning to their faith and the Bible as guidance for our Nation.

This is just as important now as it was at our country's founding and in the midst of terrible world wars.

This week, I am reminded of a passage in Luke 17, verses 5 through 6: ''The apostles said to the Lord, 'Increase our faith.' The Lord replied, 'If you have the faith the size of a mustard seed, you would say to this mulberry tree, ''Be uprooted and planted in the sea,'' and it would obey you.'''

And also in Luke 17, verse 10, ''So it should be with you. When you have done all you have been commanded, say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done our duty.'''

In this passage, Jesus' apostles plead for more faith to make it easier for them to sacrifice and to do all that they have been asked to do. But Jesus answers them by pointing out that, if they had only the tiniest bit of faith—that, the size of a mustard seed—no task would be too difficult. This included even the apostles' seemingly impossible task to ''go out and make disciples of all nations.''

But instead of increasing the measure of their faith, Jesus tells his apostles to humble themselves and be steadfast in accomplishing all that was asked of them.

As public servants and representatives, I believe we, too, are called to humble ourselves and to be unwavering in serving our fellow Americans. The American people have put their trust in us to preserve our democracy, protect our God-given rights, defend our country, and champion the American Dream. This is not an easy task. But, as Jesus pointed out, anything is possible if we humble ourselves, do our job, and have faith.

I know for me, personally, I rely on teachings like this one in the Bible to better serve my fellow Kansans and our country.

I am also thankful to live in a country where we are free to practice our faith, as well as to all the Americans who have served to protect this freedom.

As we approach National Bible Week, I hope my colleagues and all Americans, regardless of their faith background, take some time to reflect on their own calling to serve, as well as the gift of religious liberty.

Like the Bible, public service and religious liberty are cornerstones of our country, and I am honored to recognize those here tonight and throughout National Bible Week.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, in the Nation's heartland, for sharing his thoughts with us tonight. I am going to share my own story.

When I was a freshman at the University of Kansas—also there in America's heartland—in the 1970s, someone approached me and asked me if I knew what the Bible was about. I said: Yeah, sure I know what is in it.''

But do you know what? I said that without ever having read any of it for myself. Kind of presumptuous on my part.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there are any people listening in here to us today who are in the same position. Maybe they think they know what it is about, but they have never looked at it for themselves.

The only honest thing I could do at that point was to read for myself. So I read the Gospel of John, and as I read it, I discovered that I didn't know what was in there at all. It was totally different than what I had expected.

And I found a man in there who said: ''I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father but through me.'' So I ended up discovering for myself a relationship with Jesus Christ, who became my Lord and Savior.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I know from personal experience. It is better to read the Bible for oneself and not just take someone else's word for it. For me, it made all the difference in the world. My life has been totally different as a result.

As David said in Psalms: ''The unfolding of your words gives light; it gives understanding to the simple''—Psalm 119:130.

So, as we celebrate National Bible Week, we remember the importance of faith in both our private and our public lives. We recognize the Bible's powerful message of hope. We cherish the wisdom of the Bible, and we thank God for providing this holy book that has truly been, in the words of Scripture, a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), another person from the heartland of America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me and for leading here on this National Bible Week.

I would like to start out with just a touch of levity, because we are called to address the Speaker, and I know that the Speaker happens to also be a man of God and a Bible scholar.

In addressing the Speaker, I enjoy revisiting Ecclesiastes 10:2, which says: ''A wise man's heart is at his right, but a fool's heart at his left.''

I couldn't resist that, and I pray that you forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for that bit of levity at this time.

I would move on to my favorite verse, which is Ecclesiastes 9:10: ''Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.''

It calls us not to just wander through this life and touch things gently and kind of let the flow of life go by, but we are given gifts by God. He fills us with skill sets that we haven't yet developed, whether it is intellectual, whether it is physical, but skill sets of the heart, and to put our vigor to those things that please Him.

So with that verse in mind each morning, I pray that God will loan me the measure of his wisdom, that He would have me use this day to go forth and glorify Him. And if there is time for a little extra blessing, let me do so with joy. That sustains me through every day.

Another verse that sustains me through these future days came to me this morning at our gathering. This is the first chapter of Jeremiah, verse 17, that says: ''Meet them undaunted, and they shall have no power to daunt thee.''

That says, in my vernacular, never let them see you sweat, but go forth with courage and with confidence. Do those things that God calls you to do, and do so with your might.

I also look back on a verse in James that has caught my eye for some time,

and it calls us, I think, in the right way, Mr. Speaker: ''Count it all joy, my brothers, when you meet trials of various kinds, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing.''

That fits with a prayer that I offered for years when we went through the farm crisis years of the 1980s. Things were falling down around us. The economy had essentially collapsed, and my neighbor's farms were being sold weekend after weekend in farm sales.

I was being tested in a similar way myself. Each day, I would pray that God would be finished testing me and start to use me.

□ 1815

And we should take joy in that test before we are made perfect in the tests that He provides for us. I know they are in the Book of James, which is one that has stood out for me for a long time, and that is: If you fail to do what you know is right, then you have sinned.

And I recall an issue that was going on in the Iowa State legislature. I was here in Congress, but I needed a bill introduced and moved in the State legislature. There were those who knew it was the right thing to do, but they didn't have the courage to introduce it because leadership was pushing against them, and it was going to be a big political fight.

But I found a young man who is my State representative today, and when I raised the issue with him, he said: I will do this. And I said: You understand the burden of this and the potential consequences if you step forward in this arena?

And he looked at me and he said: If I don't introduce this bill, I will not be able to receive final absolution.

Whoa, that told me something about the man and the character and the faith of this man. I don't know if this verse in James was something that had been branded on his heart. The meaning of it was—the words, I don't know—but he had to be thinking, if he failed to do what he knew was right, then he would have sinned.

But he stepped forward and did what he knew was right. And I appreciate Mr. LAMBORN, the gentleman from Colorado, speaking today about Western civilization and about the foundation of Western civilization. It is everywhere where the footprint of Judeo-Christianity laid the foundation, this Western civilization. The values in it are rooted in the Old and the New Testament.

America would not and could not be the great Nation it is today if we were not a nation that was rooted in Biblical values. And I think that is something indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring something to the attention of this Congress and people across this country that not a lot of people know. And this was in Jamestown in 1607. When they landed at Jamestown, the first thing that the settlers did as they arrived there, they erected a cross. They knelt. They took Communion, and they prayed.

The prayer is so profound, Mr. Speaker, that it should be hanging on the walls or somewhere around this Congress, and I don't know that it is. But here is their prayer, 1607, in this New World:

''We do hereby dedicate this land, and ourselves, to reach the people within these shores with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to raise up godly generations after us, and with these generations take the Kingdom of God to all the Earth. May this Covenant of Dedication remain to all generations, as long as this Earth remains, and may this land, along with England, be Evangelist to the world. May all who see this cross remember what we have done here, and may those who come here to inhabit join us in this covenant and in this most noble work that the Holy Scriptures may be fulfilled.''

If that doesn't speak to the American destiny, I don't know what does. It had to be the hand of God on them. There is no way a mortal would have understood the path that they were all to follow and all that follow them.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this topic, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Many of the early American settlers, we reference them many times. They came to the New World with the express purpose of following the Bible according to the convictions of their own consciences.

One of the first acts of Congress during the tumultuous beginning of our Nation was the authorization of an American published Bible. The war with the British had cut off any supply of Bibles from England.

Our Founding Fathers understood how important it was for the American people to have Bibles. Robert Aitken, a private citizen, brought this need to the attention of Congress. In his letter, he wrote: ''This work is an object worthy the attention of the Congress of the United States of America, who will not neglect spiritual security, while they are virtuously contending for temporal blessings.''

So in 1782, Congress reviewed, approved, and authorized the first known English language Bible to be printed in America. They passed a congressional resolution. I am not sure how many votes this would get if we brought this today. I know I would support it.

''Resolved: That the United States in Congress assembled, highly approve the pious and laudable undertaking of Mr. Aitken, as subservient to the interest of religion, as well as an instance of the progress of the arts in this country, and being satisfied from the above report of his care and accuracy in the execution of the work, they recommend this edition of the Bible to the inhabitants of the United States, and hereby authorize him to publish this recommendation in the manner he shall think proper.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN, my brother in Christ, and one of our spiritual leaders here in this great Chamber.

I so appreciate the gentleman leading this effort to pay tribute to God's holy, inherent, infallible, active Word, that Word that has created the heavens and the Earth. The Word that became flesh and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus, God's Son.

This Word of God, this Bible that we speak of, I don't know that there is any book that has had a greater influence on the world. It is no accident that the words behind me above our Speaker and our Nation's motto are ''In God we trust.'' And as we trusted God, God blessed us.

As I trust Him in my life, He blesses me. And when I depart as His child, as a follower of Jesus, and I say to Mr. LAMBORN that I have to confess, I depart from time to time. And when I do, I don't have that peace that surpasses understanding, that hope and that joy unspeakable, but because of this great gift of the Bible, I cannot only know the will of God, the mind of God, the character of God, I can actually have a relationship with God.

And that is mind-blowing. And the fact that I wouldn't run to the Bible every day first thing when I get up, and I wouldn't cling to it at night, every night, before I went to bed, is also mind-boggling, knowing the power and the richness, the depth of the wisdom of God in those Holy Scripture.

And one of my favorite things to talk about back home is—and I do this often with school children—I talk about what has made America great. Because like all of us, they have heard that statement over the last couple of years, and they, I am sure, have pondered that question. What has made America great? And how do we make America great again?

Well, I say America is great because America is free. And no other Nation in all of the world has been gifted with that freedom like the United States. And I say America is great because America is brave. It is the 1 percent in every generation that is willing to sacrifice everything for these liberties and the opportunities that we are blessed with. But, ultimately, what makes America great is the goodness of America.

Alexis de Tocqueville who set out to study what makes America great, said these words, and I think they are important for us to reflect on. He was a French philosopher. He came over here for a year, kind of a sabbatical, and his thesis was: What makes America great?

He said: ''I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers—and it was not there . . . in her fertile

fields and boundless forests and it was not there . . . in her rich mines and her vast world commerce—and it was not there . . . in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution—and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, she will cease to be great.''

So I say this from my own personal perspective in my own life, and I say this to this great Chamber and to this amazing country we have been blessed to live in; we must return to the Bible and our relationship with God, so His goodness, through the power of the Holy Spirit will flow through us, so we can love our neighbors, serve our communities, and we can make America great again.

Amen. God bless America. And I thank the gentleman for this great opportunity to share in this tribute to the Bible, God's Holy Word.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ARRINGTON for his heartfelt comments and for being here tonight and sharing with us.

One reason many people respect the Bible is that so many prophecies for telling future events have come true exactly as foretold. It is one of the reasons I look at whenever I ask myself: Is the Bible really true? Is it just a collection of stories and legends, or is it rooted in history and fact?

So when I look at the prophesies of the Bible, that gives me the answer. In the Old Testament, there are many predictions that were given to prove that the speaker who claimed to be divinely inspired really was or not. If, and when, those predictions or prophesies came true, it validated the words of that speaker.

In the Book of Daniel, for instance, there are scores of detailed prophesies that were literally fulfilled. So skeptics who want to criticize the Bible have fallen back on the position that Daniel must have been written of after the facts about which they talk about.

But, the Book of Daniel is found in its entirety in the Greek Septuagint and partially in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which were discovered in later years and now we know predated the events that were talked about in the Book of Daniel. So Daniel gave prophesies that came true in history.

So the critics of the dating of the Book of Daniel are the ones who are not being honest. The rise and fall of empires, the capture and destruction of cities, the destiny of kings, all of these are prophesied about in minute detail, and history has literally confirmed hundreds of such prophesies as having come true.

So that is one of the reasons I believe in the Bible and know it to be true, and not just a nice collection of stories.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Bible Week and thank Congressman LAMBORN for the time tonight to recognize the importance of honoring God's Word.

As was said, 7 or 8 years ago, FDR declared National Bible Week just before the start of World War II. Just as it was then, the Bible is God's gift to us, standing the test of time, and serving as our guide during times of both joy and hardship. It is the way that God speaks to us.

I was born in rural America in Georgia and as most youngsters, I was baptized at an early age because I believed in John 3:16:

> That God who gave us his Son, His begotten Son, that who shall ever believe in Him shall not perish but have eternal life.

What an amazing gift.

And almost 20 years ago—and of course, there are many highs and lows during my time since then—but some 20 years ago, in one of those times of despair, I made a covenant with God. And that covenant was to put Him first.

And that meant an intense study of His Word. And He actually showed me how to change my priorities and put Him first because I had this thirst for His Word as soon as I got up in the morning. In fact, I would wake up and I would be quoting His Word because of something I thought of during the night.

I learned that my strength and abilities did not come from myself, but through Him, and Him alone.

□ 1830

In this great country, we pride ourselves on freedom, and that freedom is knowing that God is our strength and His grace has no limits.

I often pray that thy kingdom come on Earth as it is in Heaven, and the Bible reveals to us that we already have a glimpse of what that is like.

Genesis 1:26 through 28 shows us that, from creation, we were all made in God's image and likeness. Now, wouldn't the world be a much better place if we treated each other, our relationships, as if we were with God himself in those relationships.

Our country's very foundation comes from Judeo-Christian values, and these principles are woven throughout our founding documents.

The Bible says we were created for God's purpose and God's image and in His likeness.

If we study His Word and put it into action to value all people, even those we disagree with, I am certain that the division and hurt in this country would heal.

We are a divided nation, and we have a divided government. You know, Jesus prayed for us in John 17:21 that we would be one, just as He and the Father are one.

The enemy divides; God unites. And if we trust God, as His word says—and just above me, above the flag, says, if we put our trust in God, it would unite all of us here around those important issues that our Founders and the American people care about.

I believe that if we actually, in this Chamber, debated what the Scriptures say about the very issues that divide us—and they are very divisive issues that we deal with on this floor every day—if we took the Scriptures and debated what the Scriptures say about those issues, that we would all come to agreement that God is correct and that his way is the only way.

In fact, his instruction in Joshua 1:8 was: ''Do not let this book of law depart from your lips. Be careful to do what it says; meditate on it night and day, and we will be prosperous and successful.''

America stands as a beacon of hope for the rest of the world and can truly be a shining city upon a hill that God described if we treat each other with the dignity and respect that God shows us how to do through His Word.

I pray that God gives me the strength and humility to serve Georgia's 12th District so that more people come to know and love Christ, the truth, so that the truth will set us free.

God bless America. God bless His great Word.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his words and for being here tonight.

We have been on the Pacific Coast. Now we are with Georgia on the Atlantic Coast. We have been hearing from Texas, people from Texas down at our Mexican border, and we are about to hear from someone from Wisconsin, our border with Canada in the north of our country. And as Mr. GROTHMAN comes forward, I want to just say a word about archaeology.

It is a historical fact that there are archaeological discoveries that have validated accounts in the Bible, which gives trustworthiness to the Bible that we acknowledge during this National Bible Week.

Time and time again, archaeology has shown that Biblical personalities, locations, and events actually existed in time and space. They weren't just made-up stories.

Claims by critics that a Bible statement was simply made up have been debunked by later archaeological discoveries more times than we can say. The Jewish archaeologist Nelson Glueck has said: ''It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted or controverted a Biblical reference.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address National Bible Week.

The Bible is very important in this country. In part, it is important because it is the Word of God, and that makes it the most important book, but it is a particularly important book in America, and it is a book that everybody should familiarize themselves with because I don't think you can understand either the Declaration of Independence or our Constitution without reading the Bible.

You have to remember what America was like in its founding and probably

at least the first 125 years after its founding. People learned to read by either learning to read the Bible itself or maybe learning to read another book, such as ''The New England Primer,'' which had many excerpts from the Bible in it, or ''McGuffey's Fourth Reader,'' which had 10 chapters, which were solely parts of the Bible and also included the Sermon on the Mount.

The Puritans, of course, who were such an important factor in the founding of America, encouraged everyone to read the Bible. In 1782, the U.S. Congress even commemorated an American Bible. The reason they commemorated an American Bible is, at that time, there was somewhat of a crisis in America. We had a Revolutionary War going on. It was difficult to get Bibles from England. So somebody else had to get a Bible or they had to get Bibles in other ways, and Congress talked about that. But when you think about that, you realize why, for so many early Americans, the Bible was so important to them.

It is kind of funny nowadays where they pretend that there is a separation between church and state in America, because John Jay, who was the first Chief Justice of the United States, was also president of the American Bible Society; and I could go on at length from early Supreme Court decisions in which they talked about the importance of God and made reference to the Bible.

Other important Americans early on, Andrew Jackson, the Bible is ''the rock on which our Republic rests.''

We can take two things out of this: First of all, we could remember that the great Andrew Jackson felt the Bible was very important, and, secondly, remind people—because a lot of people around here don't know it—that we are a Republic.

Abraham Lincoln, of course, was known as our greatest Biblical President. There are all sorts of lessons in the Bible.

I think in First Samuel it is interesting to read when the Lord did not like Israel turning from Him and viewing Him as primarily their king over Israel, but instead they wanted kind of a strong central government under a king—example one of many lessons that I think our forefathers read when they designed our wonderful country.

But in any event, I think, for National Bible Week, what every one of us should do is take some time to read the Bible, particularly the parts of the Bible in which Israel was formed, because I think it was very important for our forefathers because they envisioned our country as a country which would be pleasing to God, and they wanted the type of country that God would love and bless. I think we have been given that love and blessings not so much because of the way we behave today, but because of the faith of our forefathers.

So, again, my encouragement for whoever sits at home and listens to this, maybe say: Can I read the book of Deuteronomy or read First Samuel and learn a little bit of the Bible, not only the Bible for its own right, but to remember the type of books that were being read by our forefathers when they wrote our Constitution, when they wrote our Declaration of Independence, and those books which created their view of the world.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GROTHMAN for his words tonight, and I appreciate him being here.

Listen to what President Harry Truman said during his address at the Attorney General's Conference on Law Enforcement Problems: ''The fundamental basis of this Nation's law was given to Moses on the Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days.''

He continued: ''If we don't have the proper fundamental moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the state.''

Now, we have been hearing from people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian to the Mexican border. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my friend and colleague from the Nation's heartland.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is great to be here tonight.

I just came from the Library of Congress, and there are a lot of books there, but there is one book in particular that is there, and it is in the homes of many American families right now that I would call the most dangerous book in the world.

It is a book that people are being put in prison for just having possession of. It is a crime in many nations for people to own this book, to read this book. There are thousands and thousands of people in prison right now in other parts of the world who are being tortured and killed because they possess this book.

I was reading earlier today about a country where there are people in prison who have friends who tear this book up into little pieces, and they smuggle it into the prison. And that person takes them, and they piece together those pages so that they can not only read this book, but they can memorize it. Because as one of the prisoners said: ''Even though they can take the paper away, they can't take away what's hidden in your heart.''

And there is another story from another country where parents, if they have the privilege of getting one of these books, it is so precious they read it at night to their families and then they hide it.

But the schools and the government trick their children in playing a hide-and-seek game, and they trick the children into telling their teachers if their parents have that book and where it is. And they are given candy if they win this ''game,'' and then, sadly, they realize their parents are taken away to prison camps as a result of that.

So what is this book that I think is really one of the most dangerous books in the world? It is the Bible. It is the Bible. It is what we are commemorating this week.

But why is it so dangerous? Why are governments around the world so threatened by it? It is because it is the Word of God. I will say that again: The Bible is the Word of God.

Now, that seems radical. I mean, some people would view that as radical, but people who have read this book, whose lives have been transformed by it, who have experienced the power of it, who have been set free from difficulties in their life and the chains of either sin or the chains of bondage of a government that is trying to oppress them will tell you it is the most precious book in the world. And that is why governments fear it, and that is why people seek it, and that is why everyone should take advantage—especially in America—of reading it. That is why it is such a popular book.

By far, it is the world's most popular book. There is no other book, fact or fiction, which comes close. Most estimates place the number of Bibles printed each year at 100 million.

Mr. Speaker, 20 million Bibles are sold each year in the United States alone. The American Bible Society estimates that 9 out of 10 American households—or almost 9—87 percent of American households own a Bible. In fact, they say the average American family owns three Bibles.

My question tonight to all of us is: Are we reading it?

Having a Bible and not reading it would be just like being frustrated that you need to go somewhere and having a car in the garage but just not taking it out, or complaining about the room is so dark when you just don't go over and turn the light switch on, or having no idea how to go somewhere when you can just turn on your Google Maps on your phone.

The Bible is the source of help; it is the source of power; and it is the source of direction in our lives—and it is right there in our homes, too many times, sadly, gathering dust.

In my own life, I started off going to church with my parents as a child, but I never read the Bible myself. It was something, we used it on Sunday, and the pastor would share a verse or two, and that was it.

And then I went to camp when I was 13. It was a Youth for Christ Camp. I learned that we could read the Bible ourselves and how powerful it is to, every day, start your day off reading from God's Word, talking to Him through prayer, listening to Him through prayer, and getting inspiration and guidance for your life.

And it was a revolutionary idea, so I started doing that when I was 13, continued that through my teenage years

to the present. And I can't tell you what a difference that has made in my life.

Day after day, I would pick up the Bible to read, maybe 15 minutes before the schoolbus came, and what I read that day would be something that later on, a couple hours later, I would face at school. Whether it would be something dealing with one of my classmates or a hard test or being sick, it doesn't matter.

□ 1845

They say the Bible is living and active, and it really is. That is one thing that makes it so special, because it is very, very powerful.

There have been many instances in my life where the Bible has made a difference for me. But I want to certainly say the most important verse is not just because it is the word of God; it is because it points me to how I can have a personal relationship with him. And that is John 3:16.

I don't know about you, but I love football. Many times when you watch a football game, somebody is holding up a poster that says, ''John 3:16.'' I hope you go and read what that says because it is so powerful. It says, ''For God so loved the world.'' That is what makes this different than other religions. God is a god of love, and because He loved the world, He gave His one and only Son that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life. It goes on and says, ''For God did not send his Son to condemn the world but to save the world through him.''

I believed that when I was 9 years old, and I am so thankful to have the privilege of knowing God and that God has made a way for each one of us to know that.

I would, this week, encourage all of us to get our Bible off that shelf, dust it off, open it up, and experience knowing God, hearing from Him, and receiving the hope, healing, and help that only God can provide.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her passionate and powerful words.

Our last speaker now before we conclude our hour is from the great State of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, John Adams, our first Vice President, such a prominent fixture within the Continental Congress, Declaration of Independence, so important to our founding, such a strong antislavery personality—and he was very, very learned, constantly reading—said: I have examined all the religions, and the result is that the Bible is the best book in the world.

Patrick Henry, who gave the stemwinding speech that moved so many to support the Revolution, said: The Bible is a book worth more than all the other books that were ever printed.

Benjamin Rush, also a Founder, a dear friend of John Adams, said: ''By renouncing the Bible, philosophers swing from their moorings upon all moral subjects. . . . It is the only correct map of the human heart that has ever been published.''

And I love what C.S. Lewis said in his book ''The Case for Christianity.'' He was discussing dualism, this idea that there are two equal forces in the universe and that they are at war, and we don't know how it is going to come out.

He said there is a war going on, but it is not between two equal forces. It is between a master and a rebel, and we happen to live in rebel-occupied territory. Basically, he goes on to say, can you imagine being behind enemy lines and getting a message from your home headquarters and you don't even pick it up and read it?

Those of us who are Christians, we believe that God gave us this book of messages, just like C.S. Lewis said. Unfortunately, many don't pick them up.

It is well known that Thomas Jefferson, though he was not a deist, believed the Bible, not all of the miracles. But the story is told that he was coming down—and CRS has verified he came to church every Sunday here in the Capitol. He usually rode his horse. When Madison came every Sunday—he was here in D.C.—he came down to the Old House Chamber.

But someone asked Jefferson: Where are you going this Sunday morning?

He said: I am going to church in the Capitol.

He had a big Bible under his arm.

He said: But you don't believe everything they do.

He said: Sir, I am the highest elected magistrate in this country. It is imperative that I set the proper example.

I thank my friend for setting that same proper example.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his words, and I thank him and all the others who have spoken here tonight from all over this great country of ours for their heartfelt comments.

It has been an honor and a pleasure for me to commemorate National Bible Week this evening. I am grateful to my colleagues who joined me to honor, respect, and commemorate the Word of God.

Mr. Speaker, the prophet Isaiah, thousands of years ago in this book right here, the Bible, in Isaiah 40:8 says: ''The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God stands forever.'' Those are powerful and true words.

Civilizations have risen and fallen, generations have come and gone, yet here today, on November 20, 2019, we are still celebrating the enduring Word of God given to us starting thousands of years ago.

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

TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Rita Hester, a Black transgender woman killed in the Massachusetts Seventh District, for whom Transgender Day of Remembrance was established in 1999.

I rise today because, 20 years later, many more lives continue to be stolen. This year, we have been robbed of at least 22 transgender people because of hate, fear, and vitriol—22 souls, the majority of whom are Black transgender women; 22 people whose families, friends, and partners are forever marred by grief; 22 experiences of secondhand trauma for transgender people everywhere.

Among them we remember: Dana Martin, Jazzaline Ware, Ashanti Carmon, Claire Legato, Muhlaysia Booker, Michelle ''Tamika'' Washington, Paris Cameron, Chynal Lindsey, Chanel Scurlock, Zoe Spears, Brooklyn Lindsey, Denali Berries Stuckey, Tracy Single, Bubba Walker, Kiki Fantroy, Jordan Cofer, Pebbles LaDime ''Dime'' Doe, Bailey Reeves, Bee Love Slater, Jamagio Jamar Berryman, Itali Marlowe, and Brianna ''BB'' Hill.

May they rest in peace and power.

Today, we remember still others not included on this list because their missing persons reports remain uninvestigated or because they are misgendered and deadnamed after their death because the people closest to them refused to recognize their truths.

We remember those who die from preventable illnesses, poverty, and violence as a result of discrimination in healthcare, employment, education, and housing.

We remember transgender women Johana Medina and Layleen Polanco, victims of an unjust and cruel immigration and criminal legal system.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, the transgender community deserves to be seen safe and celebrated. However, due to this administration's policies that continue to neglect, unfairly target, and commit violence against them, this is not the case.

However, so as not to define the transgender community only by their trauma, today, I also rise to lift the talents and strengths of this community.

I honor you, my transgender friends, for your bravery to honor your truths, for intentionally creating a beautiful and rich community, and for being role models as leaders of social change.

I stand before you committed to listening to your needs, to recognizing and centering transgender lives, not just today but every day, and to being your partner in ending this devastating crisis.

Last week, I introduced the People's Justice Guarantee, a resolution that reaffirms our collective right to live free from injustice. I rise today resolved in the fight to ensure our rights to dignity, liberation, and justice—justice for transgender people, justice for all in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I know the gentlewoman has read the names of the Black trans women who were taken from us far too soon due to bigotry, hatred, and transphobia that is running rampant in our country, but if she will permit me, I will also enter their names. I will read them aloud. I believe we should honor them not just once but many times over.

So, I rise in honor of Dana Martin, Jazzaline Ware, Ashanti Carmon, Claire Legato, Muhlaysia Booker, Michelle ''Tamika'' Washington, Paris Cameron, Chynal Lindsey, Chanel Scurlock, Zoe Spears, Brooklyn Lindsey, Denali Berries Stuckey, Tracy Single, Bubba Walker, Kiki Fantroy, Jordan Cofer, Pebbles LaDime ''Dime'' Doe, Bailey Reeves, Bee Love Slater, Jamagio Jamar Berryman, Itali Marlowe, and Brianna ''BB'' Hill.

These are the names we know of transgender and nonconforming people who have been killed in America in the year 2019, so far.

We cannot ignore this epidemic that is plaguing the trans community. We cannot forget their stories. We cannot stop fighting to protect trans lives.

On this Transgender Day of Remembrance, we remember their names.

I would like to say also that I appreciated that our Speaker met today with actress and activist Ms. Ross, who is quite a champion of transgender people. Our Democratic Caucus chairman, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, led a roundtable. Many Members of Congress appeared at that roundtable to listen to the needs of the transgender community. I thank them for showing their support today.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those powerful words. Like the gentleman, I agree that we cannot say those names enough.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the great State of Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her work in this area, which is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on today's Transgender Day of Remembrance.

For 20 years, November 20 has marked a solemn day in the LGBTQ-plus community. Vigils are held in communities nationwide in honor of all the transgender people who were senselessly and dementedly killed for simply being who they are.

I told my transgender friends and families: Never seek to change who you are. Be exactly who you are.

Transgendered women of color are especially vulnerable to violence and are 4.3 times more likely to become homicide victims than all women, according to the Human Rights Campaign.

This year alone, at least 22 transgender and gender-nonconforming Americans have been killed in the United States. Ninety-one percent of them were Black women.

I am sad to say that three transgender people of color were murdered in the greater Kansas City area, two in my congressional district.

Brooklyn Lindsey was a 32-year-old Black transgender woman. Those who knew her say she was intelligent, had a good sense of humor, and was loved by many. By many accounts, she was outgoing and happy. She enjoyed dancing, helping others, and wanted to be a life coach.

On June 25, she was found shot to death on an abandoned porch in Kansas City, Missouri.

□ 1900

Jamagio Jamar Berryman, also known as Ja'leyah Jamar, was 30 and a Black gender nonconforming person. Ja'leyah was passionate about fixing and working on cars, designing hair, and spending quality time with family.

They were shot and killed in Kansas City, Kansas, on September 13. They left behind a 5-year-old daughter named Ja'Mya, their parents, seven siblings, nieces and nephews, and many others who loved them deeply.

And most recently, Brianna ''BB'' Hill was a 30-year-old Black transgender woman who was fatally shot in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 14. Brianna was a beloved member of her community, a fan of the Kansas City Chiefs, and loved spreading joy by sharing funny videos on her Facebook page.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has removed requirements for applicants for homeless funding maintain antidiscrimination policies and demonstrate efforts to serve LGBTQ-plus people and their families.

The Department of Defense has implemented a ban on transgender troops.

These are just a few instances that shows that the United States of America—at least the administration—is in the midst of a nervous breakdown.

Change is still needed to protect the LGBTQ citizens nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the for gentlewoman for allowing me to speak.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those words and for telling us more about those we were prematurely robbed of all that they had to contribute to this world. It is important that we continue to bring their names into this well, into this august institution, so that we are compelled to continue to do this work, understanding that this is—behind every number—this is not about statistics. These are about people, people of flesh and bone who loved and were loved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), my friend and sister in service.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and for leading in this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight to remind my colleagues and the world that our transgender community needs us.

Bigotry, hate, and violence against transgender people has reached a level that requires a whole day devoted to simply remembering everyone who has lost his or her life. This year alone, over 300 have been murdered.

That is to say nothing of the transgender people who were bullied or harassed to the point of taking their own lives just simply for accepting every part of themselves.

There is no doubt in my mind that an administration that has endorsed hate at every turn and outright exclusion of our transgender friends and family is part of the problem. Our actions in this body need to be part of the solution.

I am proud to be a part of the Equality Caucus Transgender Equality Task Force, and I am determined to see us continue to take real steps that will protect the rights and the freedoms of all people.

As a founding chair of the Congressional Caucus on Black Women and Girls, I am committed to recognizing the value and need of our transgender sisters.

As the chair of the CBC's Emergency Task Force on Black Youth Suicide and Mental Health, I am actively working to ensure transgender youth receive the support and the care and the love to overcome the hate of our society.

This is a community in dire need, and I join my colleagues and so many others in stepping up and speaking out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for always fighting for those too often ignored, left out, and left behind. We are grateful for her.

Now, just as I close, as we wrap this Special Order hour, Transgender Day of Remembrance is about remembering lives we have lost too soon, but it should also be about remembering the bravery of transgender people everywhere. I rise again to acknowledge the contributions, often overlooked, of transgender women of color who have been champions of social change.

It was transgender advocates in my district who established the first Transgender Day of Remembrance in 1999 in honor of Rita Hester, a Black

transgender woman described as vivacious, outgoing, and loved by many people.

On this day, I rise to remember the transgender women of color who were catalysts for the LGBT rights movement in the United States and around the world. We remember the bravery of Miss Major Griffin-Gracy and the late Sylvia Rivera, and Marsha P. Johnson in the face of the police who violently raided the Stonewall Inn in New York City in 1969, detaining and arresting people simply for being themselves.

When faced with compounded transphobia, racism, sexism, and homophobia, transgender people have marched and resisted. When confronted with structural barriers, transgender people have organized and advocated.

I remain committed, along with the dedicated members of my team—and I want to issue a special thanks to Jenny Curt for her contributions to today's Special Order hour—committed not only to lifting the stories of those lives lost, but to working in partnership, legislating boldly. I see their power; I honor their activism.

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

NATIONAL TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Representative PRESSLEY for dedicating this time in honor of the Transgender Day of Remembrance and, of course, naming many of the victims of violence who have met this fate simply for being who they are. As a member of the Equality Caucus, I am proud to call her my colleague and my friend.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise tonight with a degree of sadness because we have this day, this national Transgender Day of Remembrance.

It is a sad thing such that you have to have an occasion such as this. You should never have to set aside time annually to remember those who have lost their lives to violence. But because it happens, we must be here.

What Dr. King reminds us was right then and is right now: ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' Injustice against the trans community is a threat to every community.

It seems that murder of Black transgender women is becoming almost a crisis in this country. Fatal antitransgender violence in the United States is on the rise, and most of the victims are Black transgender women: the largest number of transgender homicides, a record number in 2017, 29 killed; last year, 26 killed, most of them Black.

Why is this happening? Well, one reason might be because this administration tends to promote a narrative that marginalizes people who are already being marginalized. Such a narrative has a means of trickling down.

The tone and tenor of society is set by those at the top. Those at the top have to be mindful of the messages that they send.

So I am honored to observe this day, and I would like to speak very tersely about someone whose story cannot be told in 5 minutes.

Itali Marlowe was my constituent. She was found in the driveway of a local residence, shot multiple times, the 19th trans person to die by violence in our Nation this year. All but one of these victims has been a trans woman of color.

This day allows us to memorialize those who have been murdered as a result of transphobia. But I pray for a day when this day will no longer exist, when all people will be accepted in a society that proclaims liberty and justice for all.

INCOME INEQUALITY AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, tonight, we find ourselves at a troubling time for all workers across the country: Income and wealth inequality are at an all-time high, and union representation is at a historic low. These facts mean that all workers have a harder time making ends meet.

It is time to reset the balance of power in our economy between working people and corporate interests.

For decades, collective bargaining rights have been under relentless assault, especially by the Republican Party, in an effort to disempower working people and hand our democracy to corporate America. Tonight, I am proud to bring together my colleagues from the Congressional Progressive Caucus and our friends to talk about the PRO Act.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is a landmark step to restore the rights of working people to join unions and collectively fight for fair wages and working conditions.

The PRO Act rebalances the scales between workers and corporations by enacting strong enforcement measures against employers who violate labor laws, strengthening the right to negotiate and organize unions, and empowering workers to report abuses of their rights.

I thank my colleagues for joining me to stand up for workers and their right to organize.

I also want to recognize the true creators of wealth in our economy, the working men and women of America.

To begin tonight's deeper conversation, I call on a person who represents a district that has been at the heart of growing the economy and driving the economy for average Americans over a long period of time. He comes from trade union organizing and represents an overwhelmingly working-class district in the great State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the great State of Illinois for organizing this special session to talk about what I consider to be the single most transformative piece of legislation that we are considering right now, the PRO Act, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

And why would it be so transformative? Because, as Representative GARCÍA mentioned, inequality of wealth and income has grown to proportions we have not seen in 100 years in this country.

From 1980 to 2014, income for the bottom half of earners, the whole bottom half of American workers, grew 1 percent; whereas, income for the top 1 percent grew 205 percent.

And why? Because workers have lost all voice and power in this economy. Workers do not have the freedom to form unions.

At its high-water mark in the late forties and early fifties, a third of American workers had collective bargaining, and they built the middle class in this country over the post-war decades. Today, 6 percent of workers in the private sector—6 percent—have collective bargaining, have unions, and so they have no real ability to get their fair share of the American pie and to rebuild the American Dream.

The PRO Act would do so much to change this.

Truly, it reminds me of my days organizing nursing home workers, kind of a long time ago, in the 1980s, in Michigan and Indiana and Massachusetts and Rhode Island. It was so hard for workers to form a union. Their employer could do almost anything, and that is true to this day.

□ 1915

So, for example, your employer can make you go in a room, and if you refuse to attend, they can fire you. And the sole purpose of the meeting is to tell you how bad forming a union would be for both of you. They can make you individually go into their office and tell you that the union would be a bad thing.

This kind of intimidation tactic has led to a crisis in our economy. And people like to talk about free markets and capitalism. All I want to see is a free market for worker organizing in this

country. And all the best research suggests that if we really had one, about a third of workers would, again, be in unions, and it would completely transform the economy.

So let me just hit a couple of the things that the PRO Act would do that would be so important.

First of all, it would recognize the realities of the 21st century economy. Workers could organize and bargain with whatever companies share control of their employment. So, hello, McDonald's franchises, hello, Courtyard by Marriott. Any companies that have franchises, both the franchisee and the franchisor could be joint employers.

Employers could not prevent workers from organizing and could not avoid the responsibility for workers by misclassifying them as independent contractors. That is rampant in today's economy. Employers under the PRO Act would not be able to just call their workers supervisors willy-nilly to deny them the right to organize. And workers' rights to organize would be recognized in all the electronic formats that we use to communicate today.

Another thing that is key is that at long last, the PRO Act would end the right to freeload, a disease that has been spreading in this country since the late 1940s that says that in our system, even though a union has to represent all the employees in a workplace, it prevents union employers from negotiating contracts that simply say that all the workers have to pay their fair share for administering the contract. We would end 60 years of efforts to destroy the labor movement simply by allowing what I learned in law school as the freedom of contract. An employer and a union are free to negotiate that all the workers pay their fair share.

The list of improvements in the core area of an organizing campaign is really impressive. Just to pick a couple of them.

Employers couldn't gerrymander the bargaining union to pick out who is for or against the union, so to choose the voters in a sense. Elections would have to happen much faster. If a worker is fired for organizing a union, as I saw happen so many times, the NLRB would have to go for an immediate injunction to get them reinstated. If the workers felt intimidated by having an election on the employer's work site, then the NLRB could have it at a neutral location. So many commonsense things just to allow workers to organize freely.

So let me just sum up and say, I would love to talk about all the provisions, but it would take me all night, and I want to yield to my colleagues.

All we are asking for is that workers in this country have their rights recognized across the globe in the international labor organizations provisions so that they can have freedom of assembly, freedom to organize, and freedom to bargain a contract. And, Representative GARCÍA, that would do more to make our country more just and beautiful than anything else we could do.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand up tonight for the PRO Act, and I thank Representative GARCÍA for his leadership in making this happen.

Mr. GARCÍA of ILLINOIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LEVIN for sharing that story, his own personal knowledge and experience of working to empower working people so that they have good wages, good working conditions and very critically what is at the heart of the PRO Act, organizing to have leverage to level the playing field and to arrive at what is the best contract for workers in a worksite setting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who happens to be the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to speak in support of H.R. 2474, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or the PRO Act.

The PRO Act was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor on September 25, and it is the most comprehensive legislation in recent history to strengthen workers' rights to organize and bargain for higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Labor unions have long fueled our Nation's prosperity. Wage growth and worker productivity rose steadily together when union membership was at its peak, around 30 percent, between the end of World War II and 1973. Union members earn significantly higher salaries, they are more likely to enjoy better benefits and also much more likely to work in a safe workplace. This had the effect of creating an economy where most working families could achieve a basic standard of living. But unfortunately, in the last 4 decades, union membership has plummeted, and income inequality has soared.

Despite the clear benefits of strong unions, just one in 10 workers currently is a union member and only 6 percent of private sector workers are union members.

Low union membership certainly does not mean that American workers have given up on unions. In fact, according to a poll of workers across the country conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 48 percent of nonunion workers say they would vote to join the union if given the opportunity.

Regrettably, what is keeping workers from joining unions are weak labor laws, aggressive employer opposition to unions, and relentless political attacks that have dismantled workers' rights to organize.

To that point, the PRO Act would deter employers from violating workers' rights to form a union in five key ways:

First, the PRO Act puts some teeth into the law by authorizing civil monetary penalties for companies that inflict serious economic harm on employees by violating the National Labor Relations Act, in doing things such as firing union supporters for engaging in protected activities. This would update the current law, which provides no civil penalties today for employers who violate the NLRA, leaving no meaningful deterrent for employers who choose to violate workers' rights.

Second, the PRO Act would streamline procedures and guarantee swift remedies for workers. Currently, if workers prove that they were unlawfully fired for organizing, they may have to wait years before being reinstated and receiving back pay. The PRO Act would guarantee temporary reinstatement for workers whose cases are found to have merit while their cases are being adjudicated. This would also make the National Labor Relations Board orders immediately applicable to all parties involved in proceedings, just like those of other Federal agencies.

Third, the PRO Act would protect the integrity of union elections by providing remedies when employers interfere with union representation elections. It also establishes mediation and arbitration procedures to encourage employers and unions to reach a first collective bargaining agreement after the union is formed.

Fourth, the PRO Act would modernize labor law by clarifying exactly which employees and employers are covered by the National Labor Relations Act. Too often employers misclassify their employees as independent contractors or anything but employees. This tactic allows employers to avoid their legal obligations to their workers. The PRO Act safeguards against these practices and also protects workers' First Amendment rights to engage in peaceful picketing and other free speech activities.

Finally, the PRO Act fosters transparency, so employees know their rights under the law. Other labor laws require employers to post notices of employee rights like Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, the Family Medical Leave Act, and OSHA. The PRO Act will similarly guarantee the employers notify the employees of their rights.

At its heart this legislation is about restoring workers' rights to organize and restoring balance to the economy. By passing the PRO Act, we can take an historic step towards improving the quality of life for workers and families across the country.

So I thank the Progressive Caucus for sponsoring this Special Order and giving us the opportunity to promote the PRO Act.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT, who, of course, is also the Chair of the Education and Labor Committee. Part of the reason why he knows so much about the bill is he happens to be the bill's chief sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear from another part of the country, and

we are going to the West Coast to get a better understanding of why representatives in this House from all over the country are uniting behind this important piece of legislation.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and also chairs the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to join the voices of the working men and women of our country demanding better wages, better working conditions, better benefits. I rise for working families, for those working multiple jobs and struggling to get by while CEOs are making multiple millions of dollars and reaping the benefits of their labor.

And this is all during a time over the past several decades where productivity of the American economy has gone up while wages from those who have created that productivity have stayed flat. And if we want to achieve income equality or less income inequality, the answer is in giving workers leverage on the economy.

So I rise to defend workers' rights, their right to rise up in their workplace and use their collective power to demand better from their employer. That is the leverage that I am talking about.

Right now employers and corporate interests are doing everything they can to strip workers of their protections. In fact, they have already done that. They have already participated in weakening our labor laws and made it more difficult for workers to organize. And Representative LEVIN of Michigan started to explain the complex ways in which organizing is made more difficult; how elections can run forever; and how employers have an unfair advantage in those elections; and how the will of the workers in the workplace to organize and unionize can be thwarted.

And once unions are formed, there are many efforts to bust unions and silence the voices of workers, which, let me be clear, is illegal. And that is why we need to pass the PRO Act to make sure that penalties are enforced. We do have laws on the books, but there is not enough enforcement. We need to put an end to these antiunion activities.

If we want to reduce economic inequality, support working people and working families and ensure that the American Dream is within reach for all, then let's pass this bill. It is time to reaffirm our support for working people in America.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. Before we go to the East Coast and hear the voices of working people there and why they support the PRO Act, I would like to share with you a brief story about myself in Chicago.

When I was growing up in Chicago, both of my parents were proud union members. In fact, they were both Teamsters. My father worked at a cold storage facility, and my mother worked at a candy factory on Chicago's West Side. Both relied on their union jobs to raise our family, and they retired on their union pensions, which enabled them to purchase a comfortable home for their family.

There will be more stories from Chicago, but right now I would like to go to the East Coast and hear from another member of the Progressive Caucus. He hails from the State of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of the Protecting the Right to Organize, or as we know it, the PRO Act.

□ 1930

We heard several of my colleagues talk about the pros of what literally is taking place and how difficult it is. As many people know, and as we have heard here, there are 218 lawyers in Congress, but there is only one electrician and one electrician who spent his career not only doing the electrical work but representing workers.

I have spent 37 years in the IBEW, literally having to retire from that as I came here and took my oath of office to represent the people of the First District.

When we look at what is happening today in this country, it is the end of a long line of abuses, those things that have happened over the course of the last three decades in particular, the decline of union membership. Many of those on the other side of the aisle like to say that it is because people don't want it. This couldn't be any further than the truth.

Today, close to 80 percent of employees would vote for a union if they could—80 percent. This is quite a different figure than the 6 percent that you heard representing private employers, Mr. Speaker. That is because it has been rigged. I can say that because I am one of the few Members who speak on this floor who have been to the National Labor Relations Board and who has conducted elections. I have done it repeatedly. I see the cheating that takes place. That is why we have the PRO Act.

Earlier this year, we voted on something that I thought would have been unanimous, the Raise the Wage Act. The minimum wage in this country hasn't been raised in over 11 years—11 years—$7.25 an hour.

Tell me out there, can you live on $7.25 an hour?

We change that.

Predictably, over the next 7½ years, that would raise to $15 an hour. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: They don't need a raise.

That is how unbelievable some of this is. Tell me, can you live on that?

The PRO Act is simply listening to the people whom we work with who want a voice and who want to be able to grow the business that they are working for so that they can share in those wages. That is where the PRO Act comes in.

I mentioned I was an electrician, and I still am. I am not doing much work the way I used to, but as I told my kids, I am an electrician with a tie now. But I saw firsthand people who would say: I want the chance to do better. I want the chance for us collectively to bargain.

They would come to see us and say: Can you help me?

We said: Sure we can.

We gathered together, and we speak with one voice, go to the NLRB, which is the labor relations board that makes the rules, and say: Here is a bargaining group of 8 to 10 men and women who want to become part of the IBEW, or speak collectively as we call it. Then the fight begins.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, you would have a contractor who says: Do you know what? After talking to them, I think this is a good way of working together to try to grow my business and to take care of my employees.

Unfortunately, for those who want to cheat the system, they start to say: Well, he is an independent contractor. He just started here. He is an apprentice.

They try to break up the groups. When they talk about bargaining groups as my colleague, Mr. LEVIN, talked about, it is about breaking that apart.

All this does is level the playing field and make it fair so those workers who want to vote to collectively bargain can do it in a fair and open way so the elections aren't rigged. Fair and open, we hear that so much today.

The PRO Act protects workers because the other thing that the employer will do is fire the one who spoke up: We will take care of the one who is causing the trouble.

I am trying to do better for my family, and I talked to my employer about a raise, and he doesn't want to do it, so I call up the union and say: Can you help me? And I get fired for that.

There is no recourse for bad actors. The PRO Act would change that and level the playing field so there are penalties when you break the law. It is like having speed limits with no police on the road. That is what it is like now. They are free to do whatever they want.

The PRO Act restores the fairness of the economy against those workers who are rigged. Workers win, but just as important, business wins. They grow together. It is just not a one size fits all. We understand working together is what this does.

We see so often the tragedies of what happened from the same crew who won't vote to raise the minimum wage in 11 years and who are the same ones fighting this.

Together, we can do better. Raise the level of fairness so that all employees will have a voice at their workplace.

Again, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together. I look at my colleagues out here who understand this on a gut level. To the Representatives who are listening tonight, go home and talk to the average guy on the street and say: Do you want to make it better, to raise your family, to have a decent wage? Then you will hear yes.

I recommend voting ''yes'' for the PRO Act.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for sharing that wonderful story.

Women in this body overwhelmingly support the PRO Act for good reason. The PRO Act would help level the playing field and move all of us toward a greater sense of economic justice.

This evening, we are very fortunate to hear from a voice also from the East Coast who will get to the crux of why this is such an important tool for economic justice in our country. She is a member of the Progressive Caucus of this body and someone who is passionate and compassionate about providing equal opportunity for everyone in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank the gentleman for taking on this Special Order hour and leading it.

Organized labor has always been the foundation of good-paying jobs that support a thriving middle class. That is why it is vital that we support legislation like the PRO Act, finally empowering the National Labor Relations Act to do the important work of protecting workers' rights.

Since the day that law was enacted in 1935, big businesses and their allies in the Republican Party have worked to weaken it. Their efforts have brought us to a point where union membership has cratered, and not coincidentally, inequality has grown.

The PRO Act implements penalties for employers who illegally fire workers because they try to form a union or are simply pro-union in their thinking. Today, we see employers out in the open on Twitter flagrantly violating the NLRA and threatening their employees if they even think about forming a union.

The PRO Act will allow workers to stand up and say to their boss: Joining together with my co-workers is right, and you will not threaten me with cuts to my hours, my pay, or my job.

This law will put an end to the practice of company bosses dragging their feet in collective bargaining negotiations in order to break the spirit of workers and avoid their legal responsibility to honor the wishes of their workers.

The PRO Act also recognizes the changing face of workers and ensures that those working multiple jobs do not lose their right to organize when they change shifts.

The part of this bill that I find most energizing is its protection of that most fundamental right of workers, the foundation of worker power from which all labor power is derived, the right to strike, the right to stand with your fellow worker and say: We will not accept these conditions another minute. We will not work another day until our demands are heard and our rights are respected.

The right to stand with your union sisters and brothers and withhold your labor is finally recognized under this bill.

If workers can put their sweat into building the greatest country in the world, how dare we say to them that they cannot join their fellow workers to demand a fair share of what they built?

This bill is the most important labor rights bill in years, and today, I am proud to be a member of the party of the working men and women, the Democratic Party, as we pass this bill. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire how much time is remaining in the Special Order hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Texas). The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Before I introduce and as a prelude to the remarks that we will hear from the following speaker, I would like to share a story about the great city that I hail from and the great State that I represent here, the State of Illinois. It has a proud labor history that is filled with stories of courage and sacrifice by workers striving to organize.

Since the 1800s, workers organized in mines and factories fighting the abuses of powerful industrial interests. Chicago earned the reputation as a city of big shoulders, a working-class and hardworking city. Workers were killed in the Haymarket massacre of 1886, a struggle that led to the 8-hour day and the end of child labor.

The country's first national strike started in Chicago when train workers across the country joined a strike that began in Pullman, Illinois. Federal troops were sent in to break up the Pullman Strike, but it was so significant that Congress created Labor Day shortly afterward.

One of the Nation's most deadly mine disasters happened in Illinois in 1909. The tragedy prompted better enforcement of child labor laws and advanced the movement for workers' compensation.

Working people joining forces in unions helped lift up all workers across the country.

With that opening remark, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield next to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), who also happens to be one of the cochairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for all the work that he has done on behalf of his constituents, the people of Chicago, and really the people of the entire country.

I know this is the gentleman's second event today alone on behalf of workers, and I thank the gentleman for his outspoken representation on behalf of people who need a voice in Congress. I think we heard earlier tonight there are about 200-plus lawyers in this body. A majority of Congress are millionaires. Not to say that if you are a millionaire, you can't empathize with working people, but it is another thing to come from a background like I do.

I had a union specialty printing shop, a small shop for nearly three decades, a member of International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, IUPAT, for nearly three decades.

I can tell you the benefits that have happened for my family and the people I work with by having good, union-supporting wages and good, union-supporting benefits and why that matters so much.

The problem we have right now in this country and the problem that we have across so many States is an organized effort going after working people by going after their ability to have a voice in their workplaces by having unions. We have watched attacks across the country, including in my home State of Wisconsin, where States have gone to a so-called right-to-work law. What that is often referred to as a ''right-to-work-for-less'' law because when you get these laws often, on average, people lose over 3 percent in pay in States that do this. But we have watched those laws happen across the country.

Federally, under the Trump administration, we have watched laws that make it harder for working people who win the legal right to form a union, through a union election. They run into all kinds of stumbling blocks. All too often, there is no legal recourse against an employer who violates the rules or stacks the deck against people and doesn't allow that vote to actually form that union.

That is the real problem that we are facing. That is what we are talking about tonight with the PRO Act. That is what we are trying to address in Congress.

What I think is so very important to raise is the reason people want to have a union is because it will help not only their family but their communities by lifting up everyone. When you have a union job, you are more likely to get more pay and better benefits than people who are not in union jobs.

That is why the public support is so strong right now for unions with 64 percent support for unions, one of the highest percents we have seen in this country. And 67 percent of people 18 to 34, millennials, even more than the population as a whole, see this as a way to have a voice in their workplace.

□ 1945

Here are some of the things they support: expanding union rights, banning right-to-work-for-less laws, ensuring a first contract for new unions—if you

vote for a union, you should be able to get a contract for your union—making so-called independent contractors employees, and protections for workers on strike.

All of those things I just mentioned are included in the PRO Act. All those things could be possible for workers across the country.

We know that when we have had the least amount of income inequality in our country, back in the 1950s, is when we had the greatest representation of people in unions. Now that we have got one of the smallest amounts of people—about 11 percent, nationwide, in public and private employee unions—we have the greatest gap in income that we have had in this country.

There is no surprise there is a lot of pushback from not only people on the other side of the aisle, but from the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is not your local business in your chamber of commerce, but it is the big businesses in this country that don't want to take care of their workers. Instead, they want to send all the profits up to their shareholders, so very few get a lot and everyone else gets the crumbs that are left over.

Just to give you an idea of some of the actions we see by these companies: 75 percent of private-sector employers hire outside consultants to run antiunion campaigns when workers try to form a union; 63 percent force their employees to attend closed-door meetings to hear antiunion propaganda; and over half of employers threaten workers in these meetings, they threaten their jobs.

You have a one-in-five chance, if you are a union organizer, of losing your job because, right now, you can get away with it with this administration and how they enforce our labor laws.

But here is the reality. If you don't have a union in your company right now, this is what you get when you have a union:

Health insurance: 75 percent of people in a union participate in job-provided health insurance versus about 48 percent nationwide;

Pensions: 70 percent of people versus 13 percent nationwide;

Paid sick leave: 91 percent of people who are in a union have paid sick leave, and the median weekly earnings are $207 more a week. That is $11,000 a year more if you are a member of a union, in a similar job, than if you are not.

That is the real reason we see the attacks on working people trying to have a voice in their workplaces, and that is why we see people not trying to lift this bill.

This is so important that, in this Congress, we take this bill up in the House of Representatives and we pass this bill and we give, finally, an edge to help push a little more assistance to workers who want to have a say in the workplace than what employers have had because of this administration, because of States that have passed bad laws, that make it harder, again, to have a say in your workplace.

This is an important piece of legislation. The Congressional Progressive Caucus has made this issue a priority. We are going to make sure there will be a vote this session in Congress. We are going to try to make the Senate take this up as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Chicago. His help on this and so many issues has been so very important. We are going to do everything we can to get this done this session.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

So what is the essence of the Protect the Right to Organize Act? We have heard from my colleagues today about the many ways that unions have made America strong. From the 8-hour day to building the middle class, we have a lot to thank the labor movement for. Unions are an integral part of increasing wages and addressing income inequality.

Still, special interest-funded attacks on labor laws have eroded union membership for years. For too long, greedy companies have used extreme measures to stop working people from exercising their right to join together and negotiate for their rights and their working conditions.

While the economy is working very well for the wealthy, our middle class continues to shrink. The cause is simple: policy choices, especially by Republicans in the House at this time, in the Senate, in State legislatures, and the Presidency that have stripped workers of the power to stand together.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is a historical proposal that restores fairness in the economy by strengthening the Federal laws to protect workers' rights to organize.

We need the PRO Act at a time when Trump wages war against the labor movement. We need the PRO Act to build an economy that works for all working families and not just the wealthy.

The lessons I learned from unions—that individual justice is only as good as collective justice—continue to inform my career in public service, and I hope every worker can have the opportunities that unions gave me.

I got a chance to work at a young age. I joined a union. It helped me pay for my college education. I did well in the community that I still live in. That is why I approach banding together for the welfare of working people.

Tonight, you have heard from people from coast to coast, all over our country, from the South and from the heartland. These are individuals who are fighting for working people to, again, level the playing field and create a real purpose of economic justice to lift everyone up in our country.

As we move forward with the PRO Act, I call upon the American public to understand that it is time for economic justice and it is time for prosperity for all. And, with that, I ask them to call on their Representatives in the U.S. Congress to make this law a reality for all working men and women across the Nation.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really haven't ever become friends with General Michael Flynn. He doesn't object to being called Michael Flynn, even though he earned the title of ''General,'' even though he has not been treated fairly at all and has actually been treated unjustly.

There is an article today from Margot Cleveland in The Federalist. It talks about Michael Flynn's case, and I am learning some things.

I think the world of Sidney Powell. She is an amazing attorney. She is a friend. But there is a motion pending before Federal Judge Emmett Sullivan on a motion to compel and motion for sanctions that attorney Sidney Powell had filed.

''Powell's motion seeks to force Federal prosecutors to provide Flynn an array of documents withheld from his attorneys and to sanction government lawyers for their failure to provide relevant evidence to the defense team in a timely manner.''

Now, as a former judge—and I have prosecuted, I have defended, and I have been a chief justice, but nothing is more infuriating to me, when it comes to our justice system, than prosecutors who are unjust, who lie, who misrepresent. And it looks like all of that has been occurring in Michael Flynn's case or with deference to, like Colonel Vindman, General Michael Flynn.

This article points out: ''Then, mere days after the final briefing came in,'' to Judge Sullivan, ''Federal prosecutors found themselves forced to admit that, for nearly 3 years, they had wrongly identified the authors of the handwritten notes taken by the FBI agents during their January 24, 2017, interview of then-National Security Advisor Flynn. Prosecutors had told defense counsel, and the court, that the notes written by Peter Strozk had been compiled by FBI Agent Joe Pietka, and those taken by Pietka had been written by Strozk.

''This embarrassing mea culpa surely added strength to Powell's plea for access to other withheld evidence. After all, if Federal prosecutors made such a basic blunder concerning key evidence, what other mistakes lay buried in the undisclosed evidence?''

This goes on and points out that, at a minimum, things that are being set out now ''would also support the withdrawal of Flynn's guilty plea—something Powell does not appear to be considering at this time—including''—and

here is the circumstance that is just phenomenal, that, in a Federal district court we could have Justice Department attorneys who are this flagrantly abusive of the process.

So, ''Flynn's original attorneys had a conflict of interest preventing them from representing Flynn in the criminal case; Flynn did not intentionally make false statements to the FBI agents; the FBI agents entrapped Flynn; Flynn's purported misstatements were immaterial to the investigation into supposed Russia collusion and, thus, no crime occurred; the government engaged in selective prosecution and charged Flynn solely because of his relationship to Trump; prosecutors used threats to induce Flynn's plea; the prosecutors' failure to timely disclose exculpatory and impeachment evidence invalidates Flynn's plea; and that egregious prosecutorial and government misconduct mandates dismissal of all charges against Flynn.''

If you go down further, more revelations.

''The government had pushed Flynn's previous attorneys at Covington and Burling LLP, in February 2017, to quickly file a registration statement under the Foreign Agent Registration Act, FARA, for Flynn Intel Group, FIG. Federal prosecutors later obtained indictments against Flynn's FIG business partners for supposed Foreign Agent Registration Act violations, and still later, the prosecutors branded Flynn a co-conspirator in the FARA case. There was a clear conflict of interest, which the government failed to mention to Judge Sullivan.

''Further, since Flynn last appeared before Sullivan, the government's FARA case against his FIG partners has imploded. Following a 6-day trial, a jury had convicted Flynn's former business partner, Bijan Rafiekian, of acting as an unregistered agent of Turkey, conspiring to act as an unregistered agent of Turkey. . . . ''

It says: ''But Federal Judge Anthony Trenga stepped in and tossed the guilty verdict, concluding that no 'rational jury could conclude that Rafiekian conspired with Alptekin or anyone else.' Judge Trenga further held that 'there is no evidence of discussions or suggestions, let alone any agreement express or implied, to either avoid filing under FARA or to cause the filing of a false FARA registration statement.' ''

□ 2000

''That the government's FARA case against Flynn's business partner proved bogus should also trouble Sullivan because, according to Powell's earlier court filings, the special counsel's office had informed Flynn's 'counsel in the summer of 2017 that it was going to indict the FARA case then, had obtained authorization to target Michael Flynn, Jr.—who had a newborn—and had seized all his electronic devices.'

''The threat was clear: Plead guilty and cooperate or we will prosecute your son. And given Judge Trenga's conclusion in the Rafiekian case that there was no evidence of a FARA crime, there is an added postscript: We will prosecute your son on bogus charges.''

Unbelievable. It also should be quite scary to someone situated as Michael Flynn, General Flynn, that the Federal Government, the DOJ—especially when they use unscrupulous and unethical means—they can convict anybody, even when there is no evidence whatsoever as Judge Trenga found, there was no evidence whatsoever.

I don't know these people, but I know the Federal judge said there was no evidence whatsoever. And, yet, the jury came back—I am sure the judge was just thinking: I will let the jury find there is no evidence because there is none.

And when they came back and convicted, wow, the judge is going: I have got to throw this out. This is totally bogus.

''The threat also wasn't a one off: After Powell took over representation of Flynn, federal prosecutors attempted to force Flynn to testify at Rafiekian's trial that Flynn had knowingly made false statements in the FARA filings—something Flynn denies. When Flynn refused to lie, federal prosecutors abruptly added Michael Flynn, Jr. to the witness list for the Rafiekian trial, but then never called him to testify.''

Total intimidation. Total effort to intimidate. Very unethical.

''The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly, even though the younger Flynn was represented by counsel.'' Also quite unethical.

Boy, the unethical conduct in this Department of Justice hasn't gone away. It hasn't stopped with Strzok and Page, being gone—Bruce Ohr, all of these others that appeared to conspire to defeat a Presidential candidate, and then to try the coup to take him out.

''The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly.

''These maneuvers corroborate the prosecutors earlier use of Flynn, Jr. as a pawn to pressure his father to plead guilty.''

I mean, this stuff is just amazing. And if they can do this to someone who spent over 30 years dedicated to the defense of his country, all kinds of decorations for heroism, and powerful friends in Washington, they can do this to him, it is difficult to think about the terrible situation of someone without money, without friends.

If these people can be this unscrupulous to people with some power, it just bodes very poorly for this little experiment in self-government when the judicial branch, or I am sorry, the executive branch's prosecutorial wing is this abusive. Absolutely incredible. A bit frightening, actually.

So I would like to also touch on some of the testimony that has gone on in yesterday's hearing, the part where we had Jennifer Williams and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman.

He said, I think, that he has been in over 20 years. Didn't make Colonel. And I have known people, you know, my 4 years in the Army, we saw those folks. They were so self-righteous on the one hand, maybe they didn't get a promotion they thought they deserved. Maybe it was because they did something like Vindman did and was trashing the United States to Russians when he was overheard by a superior that reprimanded him for it.

Sometimes it is just because there is a mean superior that doesn't want somebody promoted. But for whatever reason, he didn't become a full Colonel. Here he is, harping after he had been called Lieutenant Colonel over and over by my friend, DEVIN NUNES, he interrupts and demands—and I notice he didn't always call people Congressman. That didn't bother me, but it is just quite interesting that he has such a double standard for himself and for others.

But when you look at the testimony, especially page 2, it is interesting—and actually, this is from our friend ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF—''Colonel Vindman, we have seen''—and I guess it should have been Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—''we have seen far more scurrilous attacks on your character, and watched as certain personalities on Fox have questioned your loyalty. I note that you have shed blood for America, and we owe you an immense debt of gratitude.'' So that is the case, we owe him a debt of gratitude for defending our country.

I do love history and I point out down the hall when we are in the rotunda to groups, we have got General Gates standing there accepting surrender from the British, and he was not the real hero of the Battle of Saratoga, and that was the biggest victory since December 24, 1776, probably.

And it was a big one, but it wasn't Gates. I read another book on the Revolution just months ago, and this book was saying Gates never got out of his tent, whether it was cowardice or whatever, he never would get out of his tent. But there was this great, brave, courageous, young major that just knew they could defeat the British there at Saratoga if they get on going and attack them. Gates wouldn't give the order, so this major rallied folks, and they went down and they attacked the British, and they defeated them.

So the real hero of Saratoga wasn't General Gates. It was this major, a tough, strapping guy. He took them on, and he was wounded. And he carried a limp with him probably the rest of his life. He was wounded. He was hurt severely. But we owe that guy a debt of gratitude for his defense of his country.

Of course, later on, he got upset that he had been slighted and didn't get a promotion like Gates' immediate subordinates, and then that caused him to

fall prey to the British talking him into helping them because they would pay him, and they would appreciate him a whole lot more than Washington and others. And, of course, then he ended up setting up Washington to be kidnapped by the British.

But I am amazed how many people don't know that we owe a great debt of gratitude to Major Benedict Arnold, because without him, there is no victory at the Battle of Saratoga, and that was a huge victory, so very important to our becoming an independent country.

So anyway, it is just interesting when you think about history and people who demand to be given respect, and if they are not, they get rather snippy.

And I don't know that I have ever met Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, but to find out that he was trashing the United States to Russians, and it was just intriguing to go through his testimony.

For example, he said this about the investigation into the 2016 elections, Bidens, Burisma.

''I stated to Ambassador Sondland that this was inappropriate and it had nothing to do with national security. Dr. Hill also asserted his comments weren't proper. Following the meeting, Dr. Hill and I agreed to report the incident to the NSC's lead counsel.''

So it is interesting. Further, he was asked by Mr. Goldman: ''On September 10, the Intelligence Committee requested the whistleblower complaint from the Department of National Intelligence.''

He wasn't aware of that. But it is just, wow, so September 10, they obviously knew all about the so-called whistleblower complaint.

But when you get over here to part of the questioning by Congressman NUNES: ''Did you ask or encourage any individual to share the substance of the July 25th phone call or any matter associated with the call with any member of the press?''

''I did not.''

And he goes on like that. And then he said:

''Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, did you discuss the July 25th phone call with anyone outside the White House on July 25th or the 26th, and if so, with whom?''

And he said: ''Yes, I did. My core function is to coordinate U.S. Government policy, interagency policy, and I spoke to two individuals with regards to providing some sort of readout of the call.''

NUNES says: ''Two individuals that were not in the White House?''

Vindman: ''Not in the White House.'' And that is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman. ''Not in the White House, cleared U.S. Government officials with appropriate need to know.''

''And what agencies were these officials with?''

Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: ''Department of State, Deputy Assistant Secretary George Kent, who is responsible for the portfolio, Eastern Europe including Ukraine, and an individual from the office of—an individual in the intelligence community.''

And that is where NUNES says: ''As you know, the intelligence community has 17 different agencies. What agency was this individual from?''

And that is when Chairman SCHIFF said: ''If I could interject. We don't want to use these proceedings''—and then cross talk—''we need to protect the whistleblower.''

And what is really interesting, of course, is when he calls out Congressman NUNES. ''It's Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, please.'' So I want to make sure that I don't slight him.

He says—and he is under oath—''I don't know who the whistleblower is. That is correct.''

And yet, he gets down to there is two people. He identifies one, and Chairman SCHIFF interrupts and doesn't want him to out the other person, because that would be outing the whistleblower.

And, yet, Chairman SCHIFF and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman say they don't know who the whistleblower is, but it must be that one that he has been told not to answer because that would give away the whistleblower's identity.

And yet, they say, we don't know who the whistleblower is, but we are down to one person, but we don't know who it is. Even though if he gives the name, it will out the whistleblower. It is just really amazing when you look at this stuff.

And it is actually rather tragic. There was a question Mr. Castor says: ''And are you aware, and George Kent testified a little bit about this last week, that under the Obama administration, the U.S. Government encouraged Ukraine to investigate whether Zlochevsky used his government position to grant himself or Burisma exploration licenses. Are you aware of that?''

And Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: ''I would defer to George Kent. He's a fount of knowledge on Ukraine, much deeper knowledge than I have. If he attested to that, then I'd take his word for it.''

Well, isn't it interesting that Mr. Kent knew that the Obama administration was trying to get to the bottom of corruption about Burisma, and, yet, he freaks out, not Kent, but Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, freaks out over Burisma being brought up, that that is some kind of crime for an impeachable offense, basically, for President Trump to bring up the corruption and including Burisma.

But isn't that interesting? He didn't bring up there is a problem with the Obama administration bringing it up, just President Trump.

□ 2015

But Ranking Member NUNES also brings up that, I asked Ms. Williams about this, about, if she had ever accessed, without authorization, colleagues' computers. She answered no. And he goes on through some of that.

But you get down here and then it is turned over to JIM JORDAN. Congressman JORDAN said, ''Mr. Morrison said this: 'I had concerns about Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's judgment. Among the discussions I had with Dr. Hill—that is Fiona Hill—in the transition with our team, its strength, its weaknesses, and Fiona and others had raised concern about Alex's—he should have said Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's—judgment'. When Mr. Morrison was asked by Mr. Castor, 'Did anyone ever bring concerns to you that they believe Colonel Vindman may have leaked something,' Mr. Morrison replied, 'yes.' ''

They thought he was a leaker well before this all happened.

So your boss had concerns about your judgment—your favored boss, Dr. Hill—had concerns about your judgment, your colleagues had concerns about your judgment, and your colleagues felt that there were times when you leaked information. Any idea where they might have gotten those impressions, Colonel Vindman?

He calls him ''Colonel.'' He gave him a promotion.

But Vindman says ''yes.'' And then he raised an OER that was somewhat glowing, but actually the answer should have been ''no,'' if he was being truthful, because he later says, ''I can't say why Mr. Morrison questioned my judgment.''

But Congressman JORDAN goes on: ''Colonel, it's interesting, we deposed a lot of people in the bunker, in the basement of the Capitol, over the last several weeks, but of all those depositions, only three of the individuals we deposed were actually on the now-somewhat-famous July 25 phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky. There was you, the individual sitting beside you, Ms. Williams, and then there, of course, was your boss, Mr. Morrison. . . .''

''When we asked Ms. Williams who she spoke to after the call, about the call, she was willing to answer our questions, and Chairman SCHIFF allowed her to answer the questions. When we asked Mr. Morrison who he spoke to after the call, about the call, he was willing to answer our question and Chairman SCHIFF allowed him to answer our question. But when we asked you, you first told us three individuals at the NSC, your brother and two lawyers. And then you said there was a group of other people you communicated with, but you would only give us one individual in that group, Secretary Kent. And the chairman would only allow you to give us that name. When we asked you who else you communicated with, you would not tell us. So what I want to know first, how many other people are in that group of people you communicated with outside the four individuals I just named?''

''Mr. JORDAN, on a call readout''—this is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—

''on a call readout, certainly after the first call, there were probably a half a dozen or more people that I read out. Those are people with the proper clearance and the need to know. In this case, because of the sensitivity of the call, Mr. Eisenberg told me not to speak to anybody else. I only read out, outside of the NSC, two individuals.''

So very interesting there. And it is interesting, too, that, you know, the fact is if Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, say hypothetically he leaked—as he had been suspected of in other case or cases—say he leaked in this case to people that didn't have proper clearance, he probably would try to assert: I was named as a whistleblower, and once I had that status, you can't prosecute me. And then there would be a motion to dismiss, this kind of thing.

And ultimately, the courts would say: Wait a minute. The whistleblower statute does not protect the whistleblower, because to protect a whistleblower, the person being complained about has to be within the department or agency from the person complaining. The President is not in the Intel agencies or department, and so it just wouldn't work. And, of course, previously you had to have direct knowledge.

And I would submit, if you look, treason is something the President can be impeached for, but under the Constitution, that requires two people with direct knowledge as direct witnesses, not hearsay—can't be hearsay—direct witnesses to a crime. They have to testify. If you don't have two, you can't prove treason under the Constitution. It is out.

And I would submit, the Senate would do well—if this is sent down there—to require the same thing of whatever bogus charge ends up coming their way, because that is all we have seen so far, but require two people with direct evidence. A bunch of people have been convicted of treason. No President has ever been removed. So if we are going to remove a President, it ought to require two direct witnesses as well. And so it ought to be a short trial.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21.

Mr. COOPER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21 on account of birth of first grandchild.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 255, the Big Bear Land Exchange Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH herebty submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 737, the Shark Fin sales Elimination Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1446, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18-1) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0627; FRL-10001-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Limited Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0216; FRL-10002-25-Region 5] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3035. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0187; FRL-9999-80-Region 3] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3036. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (17-3); Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0464; FRL-10001-43] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3037. A letter from the Director, Regulation Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designation: FL; Redesignation of the Duval County Ozone Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0374; FRL-10002-48-Region 4] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3038. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0497; FRL-10002-13-Region 9] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0711; FRL-10002-46-Region 4] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Reduction Market System Sunsetting [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0032; FRL-10002-26-Region 5] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3041. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of a deployment of additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Saudi Arabia, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(c); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(c); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 116—82); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3042. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Fiscal Year 2018 Semiannual Report, Third and Fourth Quarters, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); Public Law 107-296, Sec. 705; (116 Stat. 2219); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3043. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3044. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3045. A letter from the Board Chairman, Audit Committee Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report to the President addressing the requirements of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National

Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hot Springs National Park; Bicycling [NPS-HOSP-28641; PPMWMWROW2/PMP00UP05.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AE50) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3047. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Hammerhead Shark Management Group in the Atlantic Region; Retention Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 150413357-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-XT024) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3048. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Inseason Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Possession Limit [Docket No.: 180209147-8509-02] (RIN: 0648-XX010) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3049. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pollock Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XY045) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3050. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office 2018 Data Mining Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

3051. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs: CY 2020 Hospital Outpatient PPS Policy Changes and Payment Rates and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment System Policy Changes and Payment Rates. Price Transparency Requirements for Hospitals to Make Standard Charges Public [CMS-1717-F2] (RIN: 0938-AU22) received November 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities (Rept. 116–303, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; with an amendment (Rept. 116–304, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 370 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1132 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; Rept. 116–303, Pt. I; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period ending not later than November 20, 2019, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(r) of rule X.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5186. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new oil or natural gas production leases in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate its existing leases in order to require royalty payments if oil and natural gas prices are greater than or equal to specified price thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5187. A bill to facilitate the development of affordable housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5188. A bill to export clean energy technology around the world; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5189. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Medicaid demonstration program to develop and advance innovative payment models for freestanding birth center services for women with a low-risk pregnancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for health centers and rural health clinics to implement electronic provider consultation and related telemedicine services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5191. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers to include on any insurance card issued by such plan or issuer information on the nearest in-network hospital or urgent care facility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to extend and expand the provision requiring the use of iron and steel products that are produced in the United States in projects funded through a State drinking water treatment revolving loan fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Ms. WILD, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5194. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, to develop financial risk analyses relating to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5195. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 5196. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a separate segregated fund of a corporation which is engaged in the manufacture of opioids from making contributions or expenditures in connection with elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself and Mr. GOODEN):

H.R. 5197. A bill to add establish the treatment of managed stablecoins under the securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act regarding the patient medication information required to be included in the labeling of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the capacity to improve health outcomes and increase access to specialized care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 5200. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for prostate cancer screenings without the imposition of cost-sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program of certain mental health telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5202. A bill to apply cooperative and small employer charity pension plan rules to certain charitable employers whose primary exempt purpose is providing services with respect to mothers and children; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5203. A bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL):

H.R. 5204. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to study student mental health at institutions of higher education and to issue guidance on compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act for mental health and substance use disorder policies of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 5205. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a fund to provide support services for individuals participating in certain training activities under such Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove authorization to implement the Migrant Protection Protocols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to Latina women in comparison to men; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H. Res. 717. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the internet; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H. Res. 718. A resolution supporting the designation of ''GivingTuesday'' and strong incentives for all people of the United States to volunteer and give generously; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FINKENAUER (for herself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. LATTA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. AXNE):

H. Res. 719. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Rural Health Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PERRY, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. YOUNG):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the International Olympic Committee should correct Jim Thorpe's Olympic records for his unprecedented accomplishments during the 1912 Olympic Games; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. MCADAMS):

H. Res. 721. A resolution calling for the establishment of an app ratings board to enforce consistent and accurate age and content ratings of apps on internet-ready devices and calling on technology companies to ensure the implementation of user-friendly and streamlined parental controls on devices used by minors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MENG, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 722. A resolution supporting the goals of Transgender Day of Remembrance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILD (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 723. A resolution encouraging all nations to end sexual violence against girls through in-country data-driven reforms as demonstrated by multiple African nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. REED introduced A bill (H.R. 5208) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Major Brian R. Chontosh, United States Marine Corps (retired), for acts of valor on March 25, 2003; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2

By Ms. CLARK:

H.R. 5189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARDER:

H.R. 5190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 5191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 5192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 5194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 5196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. GARCIA:

H.R. 5197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 5199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 5201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 5202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 5203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 5204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause XVIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I.

Section. 8.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH:

H.R. 5206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 5207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 33: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 129: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 155: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 218: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 553: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 587: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 589: Mr. CLINE and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 655: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 744: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 757: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 784: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 808: Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 837: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 865: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 912: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1002: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1035: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1042: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1043: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1049: Mr. KATKO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1139: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1154: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1166: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1220: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1257: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1329: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1374: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1380: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. GUEST, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1434: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1570: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1603: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1605: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1737: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1753: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 1766: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1814: Mr. COX of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1869: Mr. YOHO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1923: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1975: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1987: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2013: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2073: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2086: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2111: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2137: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2208: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2213: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2222: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 2224: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2256: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2321: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 2344: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2382: Mr. MARSHALL and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2415: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2431: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2441: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2599: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2650: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2651: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2653: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2680: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2720: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2747: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2771: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2775: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2867: Mr. POCAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2924: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2986: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2990: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 3036: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3038: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3107: Mr. LAHOOD and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 3113: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3157: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 3165: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3197: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 3219: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3349: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3369: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3463: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 3495: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3529: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 3565: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3632: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3646: Mr. YOHO and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3657: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 3742: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3760: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3794: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3829: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3867: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3896: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3909: Mr. EMMER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3960: Mr. COX of California and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3961: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KIM, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3977: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4002: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 4022: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4030: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4056: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4069: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4101: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 4107: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4189: Mr. COMER and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 4236: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4248: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 4249: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4297: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 4304: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 4348: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4370: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 4386: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 4426: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4429: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4447: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4495: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4588: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4589: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 4672: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 4674: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4679: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 4680: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4681: Mr. KILMER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4686: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4691: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4748: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4754: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 4764: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4768: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4811: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 4821: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4864: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4873: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4889: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 4890: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4894: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 4914: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4920: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 4934: Mr. BRADY.
H.R. 4935: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4951: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4980: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GAETZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4984: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4986: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4988: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4995: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4996: Mr. TRONE, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5004: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5010: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5017: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5042: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 5046: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 5052: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5104: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5117: Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5129: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 5133: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5138: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5141: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5163: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5164: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5166: Mr. REED.
H.R. 5169: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.J. Res. 78: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ALLEN.
H. Res. 49: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 51: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Res. 69: Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 138: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 230: Ms. SCANLON.
H. Res. 452: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 538: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H. Res. 546: Mr. HECK.
H. Res. 682: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. STEVENS.
H. Res. 688: Ms. HAALAND.
H. Res. 694: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. PAYNE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019 No. 186

Senate

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Listen to our prayers, Almighty God. Let not our Nation be ashamed. You are our mighty rock and fortress. Lead and guide us, enabling us to honor Your Name. Protect our lawmakers from the hidden traps that can derail freedom. Remind them that the truth alone will make us free. Show Yourself strong even to those who strive to save themselves. Manifest Your might to all. May our Senators trust You, seek Your wisdom, and obey Your precepts.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

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

FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in recent years, the opioid epidemic has resulted in steadily climbing numbers of kids entering foster care.

However, in 2018, the number of children in foster care has declined for the first time since 2011. This is evidence that prevention programs are working.

It is important this renewed focus on prevention continues as all 50 States work to implement the Family First Prevention Services Act. When child welfare agencies have more tools, which they will have through this new legislation, to help families before children must be removed, outcomes are better for communities, better for parents, and, more importantly, better for the children we are trying to protect.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the U.S. Senate spoke up forcefully and clearly for the brave people of Hong Kong. We unanimously passed the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

As the author of the original United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and somebody who has advocated for Hongkongers for decades, I was proud to speak out on this back in the summer when the protests began. I was also proud to secure important policy steps for Hong Kong in the Senate Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs back in September.

I am also proud that Senators approved these further steps to update the original law to preserve Hong Kong's autonomy and democracy and provide more tools for holding Beijing accountable.

I want to thank the senior Senator from Florida, all the other Members who led on this issue, and all of our colleagues for securing unanimous passage.

While this bill moves forward, it is also important for the executive branch and our allies and partners around the world to fulfill their roles as well. Even before this new bill becomes law, Congress has already given the administration significant powers to act, including authorities to directly sanction individuals who violate human rights. I urge every trading nation around the world to look clearly at Hong Kong and at Xinjiang and imagine the costs as China continues to entrench its surveillance state and export it all around the world.

The Senate continues to do our part. Everyone else must do theirs as well. The United States and the world must stand with Hong Kong.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, earlier this week, I got to attend the Kentucky Electric Cooperative's annual meeting. The group represents 26 co-ops across Kentucky, particularly in rural communities.

We talked about the positive trends for what you might call Middle America over the past several years—the nascent economic turnaround in small towns, small cities, farm country, rural America, and other places the Obama economy largely left behind.

We also talked about the work still ahead. One of the major priorities that Kentuckians mentioned is the USMCA. I have heard it from our farmers, manufacturers, logistics providers, and bourbon distillers. Almost every sector of our economy would benefit from this trade deal.

Together, Canada and Mexico make up a $500 billion export market for the United States. This major update to

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

Printed on recycled paper.

our trading framework with our neighbors would send that number even higher, generate more wealth here at home, and create an estimated 176,000 new American jobs.

It is no wonder that so many Kentuckians and so many people around the country want Washington to get it done. I hear from everybody, from family farming operations to midsize manufacturers, to Fortune 500 firms, such as UPS and Toyota, that employ thousands and thousands in my State. All of them want this fairer, better playing field in trade with Canada and Mexico.

In a little more than a week from now, it will have been a full year since President Trump signed the draft agreement along with the leaders of Canada and Mexico—1 full year—but for months now, this generational agreement has been sitting on ice over in the House of Representatives. Speaker PELOSI has refused to allow a vote.

In public, House Democrats insist and insist that they care about more things than simply impeaching the President. They insist that they want to work together and legislate, but actions speak louder than words, and apparently, thus far, House Democrats have preferred to block 176,000 new jobs for American workers rather than put impeachment aside and get along with the White House for 5 minutes. It appears there is no governing priority—no matter how bipartisan, no matter how beneficial to American families—that will not take a backseat to impeachment.

Month after month, every time she has been asked about this subject, the Speaker of the House has offered the same empty rhetoric. She is always close to allowing the vote. Her conference is always ''almost there, almost there,'' but we have been almost there for months and months with no outcome in sight. Lots of talk but zero results.

Back in February, the Speaker was asked about the USMCA. She said, ''I'm optimistic.'' That was last February.

We heard the same thing in May and in June. ''We want to pass this bill.'' We heard the same thing through the summer and in September and in October. ''Every day we're becoming closer,'' she said. A few weeks ago the Speaker said: ''I think we are close . . . the last mile,'' and she called this ''the easiest trade deal that we've ever done.'' A few days ago, the Speaker insisted, yet again, a vote was ''imminent.'' That was a few days ago.

This has been the House Democrats' wild goose chase. This is what our American families, American job creators, and our partners in Mexico and Canada have had to put up with. Every time the Trump administration meets the Speaker halfway, she tries to move the goal post another 10 yards. She literally has not even updated her own talking points since Valentine's Day—textbook obstruction.

Just in case anybody did not yet understand that the real roadblock here is partisan politics, I understand the Speaker hosted Richard Trumka yesterday, head of the AFL–CIO, a power player in leftwing Big Labor. He came to the Capitol to quell the uprising of the Democrats' own Members who can't believe this thing still hasn't passed. How ironic. We are talking about a trade deal that would create more American jobs, and Democrats are considering outsourcing their judgment to Big Labor special interests, who, to my recollection, have not supported a single major trade deal in living memory.

Let's get this straight. It sounds like the head of the AFL–CIO—an organization that has never supported any trade agreement—is now the guy who gives the go-ahead on USMCA? We are talking about a trade deal, and Democrats are considering outsourcing their own jobs to the head of AFL–CIO—really? I wish I were making this up.

Reporters got ahold of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday, and he literally said the deal would move forward ''if we can get Richard Trumka to agree.'' So the head of the AFL–CIO—an organization that has never supported a trade agreement—is now the guy who has to green-light the USMCA, which would create 176,000 American jobs. No wonder they have a problem in the House. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee literally said that this major trade agreement will move forward only if this major Democratic campaign contributor gives them permission.

Well, it appears that even some House Democrats are getting fed up with the absurdity. Here is what one of them said yesterday:

> [Trumka] still says we're at the five yard line. . . . So it feels like we've been at the five yard line for a while.

No kidding. This is the biggest opportunity the House Democrats have had in the entirety of their first year in power to do something significant and substantive for American families—to actually pass something new and real that can become law and strengthen our Nation. In other words, the USMCA is House Democrats' final exam for their whole first year in power. And unless something turns around very quickly, after nearly a year of happy talk and empty promises, their leadership seems determined to flunk that exam. All impeachment, all the time—and even the most obvious win for American workers and small businesses gets blocked. That will be Democrats' progress report if USMCA goes nowhere. Obviously, I hope that is not how this story ends.

Mexico has passed it. Canada is waiting on us. I believe a bipartisan majority of the Senate is ready to pass it. Our workers, our job creators, and our neighbors are just waiting on Speaker PELOSI. This is no time to kill a national victory out of political spite. This is no time to outsource your judgment to special interests. The Speaker should allow a vote, and the House should send us the USMCA.

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 CALENDER

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 Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, with government funding set to expire tomorrow, the House of Representatives passed a continuing resolution yesterday to fund the government through December 20. It is now up to the Senate to pass the continuing resolution without much fuss and send it to the President's desk before the deadline.

As the Republican leader and I work to set the time for that vote, we must look ahead. The continuing resolution will give appropriators additional time to get a bipartisan appropriations process back on track before the end of the year. The Senate has been able to process several noncontroversial appropriations bills, bipartisan, but several more can't move forward until the Democrats and the Republicans both all agree on the allocations. You can't do it with one party. That leads to trouble. In recent days, we have made some progress, and I hope the talks between both sets of appropriators—House and Senate, Democratic and Republican—will continue in good faith and in earnest after we finish the continuing resolution.

At the same time, there are several very important issues the Democrats are trying to address in the continuing

resolution that the Senate Republicans refuse to address. Most notably, the Republicans objected to restoring expired funding for the minority-serving institutions, including historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institutions, and predominantly Black institutions.

These are ladders up. Such a high percentage of people of color—people in minority groups—use these colleges to create great lives for themselves. They work hard, and they study. There are no alternatives for them other than these institutions. To hold the money back, which is what the other side is doing, is so wrong. It is so unfair.

The Democrats will not stop fighting the fight to help these institutions, and we are committed to securing this funding in any way we can. These are American dream institutions. If you believe in the American dream, you shouldn't be holding this money back.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. President, on Syria, the Defense Intelligence Agency—it is like the CIA, but it is for the Defense Department; it is very well respected and very nonpartisan and is great in many ways—released a new assessment yesterday that confirms, unfortunately, many of our worst fears. If people haven't seen this assessment, it is really important. I would urge people to look at it.

What did the assessment indicate?

President Trump's own Defense Department wrote that President Trump, by his precipitously withdrawing our troops from northern Syria, has given ISIS a lifeline.

In the chaos that has followed Erdogan's military offensive—an offensive, unfortunately, that President Trump green-lit, much to the consternation of people on both sides of the aisle—ISIS has had room to rebuild. Not only did the assessment suggest that the Islamic State is ''postured to withstand'' the recent death of its leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, but it concluded that the Islamic State ''exploited the Turkish incursion and subsequent drawdown of U.S. troops to reconstitute capabilities and resources within Syria and''—my emphasis but their words—''strengthen its ability to plan attacks abroad.''

By President Trump's giving in to Erdogan, ISIS has been able to ''strengthen its ability to plan attacks abroad.'' Every American should hear that. Let me repeat. Because President Trump abruptly withdrew U.S. troops from northern Syria, ISIS has been able to strengthen its ability to plan attacks abroad. That is not an assessment from some outside group or agency; that is the assessment of the Defense Intelligence Agency, which is part of the Pentagon. The Trump administration needs to get a handle on this situation fast.

Despite this new damning assessment, we still have no idea what the President plans to do to ensure the enduring defeat of ISIS. President Trump has welcomed President Erdogan to the White House, but he hasn't produced a plan to defeat ISIS. This is an administration run amuck. This is security. This is vital to America. There is no plan about ISIS, but there is the greeting of Erdogan—a dictator whose desire to go after ISIS isn't close to ours. He would much rather go after the Kurds—our main protector from ISIS other than the United States itself.

Meanwhile, there are now reports that Russian forces have taken control of the former U.S. military base in northern Syria. The pictures of Russia's entering that deserted base because American soldiers were told they had to leave by the President is not a picture Americans want to see. It is incredible. The President continues to demonstrate an uncanny ability to get steamrolled by autocrats like Erdogan and like Putin without getting a thing in return.

It has been nearly 2 months since the President announced the withdrawal of U.S. troops, and we still don't know what comes next. We all know that a small band of terrorists far away is more than capable of inflicting great damage on our shores, and the intelligence assessments have now confirmed that ISIS has been able to strengthen its ability to do just that.

President Trump, what is your plan to defeat ISIS and protect the United States?

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. President, on the NDAA, the Defense authorization bill, the annual Defense bill, which passed this Chamber months ago, has been stalled in the process of reconciling the Senate's version with the House's version.

One of the snags, it now appears, is the Republican leader's unwillingness to include a strong package of sanctions directed at any foreign nation that should try to interfere in our elections. That is right. One of the reasons the national defense bill has not been sent to the President's desk is because Majority Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican colleagues do not want to include a strong deterrent to interfering in American elections.

Earlier this month, all leading U.S. national security officials—Attorney General Barr, Secretary of Defense Esper, Acting Secretary of Homeland Security McAleenan, Acting Director of National Intelligence Maguire, FBI Director Wray, and U.S. Cyber Command Commander Nakasone—released a statement that read the following:

> Our adversaries want to undermine our democratic institutions, influence public sentiment and affect government policies. Russia, China, Iran, and other foreign malicious actors all will seek to interfere in the voting process or influence voter perceptions.

Those are not my words. They are from the leaders of this administration, including the Secretaries of Defense and State and the head of the NSA.

We know that Putin interfered in the 2016 elections. We know he is trying to do it again. That is clear. We need to send an unmistakable message to President Putin and other foreign actors—China and Iran—that we will not tolerate any interference in our elections.

Unfortunately, Leader MCCONNELL seems to have missed that memo. How he could ignore a statement by the leaders of the administration he supports is beyond me. The Republican leader has repeatedly downplayed the threat to our democracy from foreign actors like President Putin. He has repeatedly blocked commonsense, bipartisan legislation to protect our elections and is now blocking the inclusion of tough, mandatory sanctions on Russia or on any other foreign country that seeks to interfere in our elections.

I hope, for the sake of the Defense bill and for the sake of our elections, the Republican leader will relent and allow a package of tough sanctions to be included.

Unfortunately, election security is not the only issue holding up the Defense bill. The Republican leader is blocking many other important provisions.

The Democrats want to extend family leave benefits to all Federal employees. The majority leader and the Republicans are blocking that. This is a new world. Family leave is necessary to everyone. Here we have a chance to do it for Federal workers, and our Republican friends are saying no.

The Democrats want to clean up our communities and military installations that have been poisoned by PFAS and other contaminants, but the majority leader and our friends, the Republicans here in the Senate, are blocking that.

The Democrats want to send a signal to the Trump administration that it does not have a blank check to wage a war and that only Congress can approve major military operations. Majority Leader MCCONNELL and the Republicans are blocking that as well.

There are hosts of important issues that are holding up the final passage of the national defense bill. These are just a few of them. I strongly urge my Republican friends and, especially, Republican Leader MCCONNELL to work with us to address these provisions. The Democrats want to see that this bill gets done and that it gets done in a way that safeguards our elections, our troops, our communities, and advances America's interests around the globe.

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are various options available for graduates of high schools across the United States. Some of them choose to go to college or university, but even making that choice gives you a lot of options.

There are basically two categories of schools, though, that I want to address in this statement this morning. One category is called for-profit colleges and universities, and the other is the traditional not-for-profit colleges and universities, which would include your community colleges and public universities and many not-for-profit, private universities.

But I want to focus this morning on the for-profit colleges and universities in the United States. People sometimes can't make the distinction between which is which. Some of the big names in the for-profit industry include the University of Phoenix. That is one you probably heard of. DeVry University is another one you might have heard of.

There are some defining characteristics of these schools. They, of course, are in business to make money, and they have a different economic model than many of the other universities.

I have met the CEOs of for-profit colleges and universities and found that in some cases they have limited or no experience when it comes to education. They are investors. They are business people. The idea of education is a secondary part of why they were chosen.

There is an important statistic—in fact, two statistics—that I want to preface my remarks with, and these will be on the final, I might add, for those who are following this statement.

The numbers 9 and 33—9 and 33. Why are they important? Nine percent of postsecondary students go to for-profit colleges and universities—9 percent—but 33 percent of all the federal student loan defaults in the United States are students from for-profit colleges and universities—9 percent of the students, 33 percent of federal student loan defaults.

What is going on here?

Well, what is happening here, unfortunately, is that many of these students are signing up for the for-profit schools that they think are legitimate colleges and universities, and, frankly, they are dramatically overcharging them.

Every analysis we have gone through says that the tuition at these for-profit schools far exceeds what students are likely to pay, certainly, in a community college and in the case of many public colleges and universities. So they have a big tuition bill to start with, and they have poor results.

What kind of results? Students graduate believing that they are being trained or educated to do a certain profession, and then they find out that they can't do the job or they don't qualify for the job, or they get so deeply in debt on the way to graduating, they give up and quit—the worst of all possible outcomes.

So that is the preface on these for-profit colleges and universities. I have come to this floor many times over the years to talk about this industry because we treat it in the eyes of the public like higher education across the board, and yet it is much, much different. It is for profit as opposed to not for profit, and, frankly, the results of that education leave a lot to be desired.

It has been more than 5 years since the for-profit giant Corinthian College collapsed. Their economic model didn't work. For years, Corinthian had lied, inflating its job placement rates and engaging in high-pressure tactics to lure students into enrolling, often leaving them with massive student loan debt and a diploma that didn't work to find a job.

But Corinthian was not unique. As I have said many times, it turned out to be the canary in the coal mine. Since Corinthian College, we have seen the collapse of several other major predatory for-profit colleges and universities. They include ITT Tech, Westwood, Education Corporation of America, and Dream Center. Nearly every major for-profit college company has been the subject of extensive investigations and lawsuits for unfair and deceptive practices similar to Corinthian College.

Check with the attorney general of your home State about that for-profit college and university, and, almost without fail, you will find that they have been investigated for misleading and deceiving the students who go to school at their universities.

I have long said that we shouldn't leave the students holding the bag for the misdeeds of these institutions because, you see, we are complicit. The Federal Government is part of the problem.

How do these schools reach the point where you can take out a Federal student loan to attend? We accredit them. We recognize their accreditation. We tell the world and the families and the students that these are legitimate schools. Depending on that, these students who sign up for a better experience, are often misled, deceived, and overcharged. Ultimately, a third of them are in default on their student loans because they can't pay them back.

There is a provision in the Higher Education Act known as borrower defense. It gives the students the right to have their Federal student loans discharged by the Secretary of Education if they have been defrauded or subject to deception by these schools.

After Corinthian's collapse, this little known, rarely used provision in the law became a hot topic. All of a sudden, here were large numbers of students who had been defrauded and deceived by Corinthian College and went deeply into debt, and now the college goes out of business.

It turns out that most of the hours they took can't be transferred anywhere. It is worthless. They were defrauded, start to finish, and now they are left holding the student loan bag.

Thousands of Corinthian students and other borrowers, mostly from for-profit colleges, began applying for this borrower defense discharge from the U.S. Department of Education. It was in the law. It led the Obama administration to undertake a new rulemaking to update the borrower defense regulation, which dated back to 1994, and to create a standard process for dealing with the inundation and to attempt to prevent future collapses.

Soon after taking office, Secretary Betsy DeVos and the Trump administration delayed implementation of the Obama rule, despite the Department's own inspector general saying that implementing the rule would ''avoid costs to students and taxpayers that result from school closures.''

Secretary DeVos said: I am not going to be a party to that. Her delay was challenged in court. Her decision to delay this new rule was found illegal by a Federal judge, after which the current rule went into effect, and it remains in effect today. Secretary DeVos also announced she would begin a new rulemaking to replace the current rule.

In late August, Secretary DeVos released her borrower defense rule, the new rule which she wants to put in place. It actually guts the borrower and taxpayer protections in the current borrower defense rule and makes it nearly impossible for students holding this student loan debt who have been defrauded to get relief.

How does she make it so hard?

It is estimated that the rule will provide $11 billion less in relief to defrauded borrowers—students—than the current rule. Among other things, the new Betsy DeVos rule increases the burden on these defrauded students to gather and submit almost impossible amounts of evidence to somehow prove their claim. Student borrowers will have to provide evidence that the school intentionally harmed them.

Now, how are they supposed to do that?

The DeVos rule—the new one—requires borrowers to apply individually rather than receiving automatic discharges when they are part of a group of student borrowers who have been harmed by similar practices by places like Corinthian. In other words, you are on your own. Get your own lawyer. Lawyer up. Get some evidence together. Come see us, and maybe we will be convinced.

Student borrowers who have been cheated are not exactly the wealthiest group in America. They are often facing incredible financial difficulties and deep emotional strain, with a mountain of debt and nothing to show for it because of these for-profit schools. Now Secretary DeVos wants them to be investigators and lawyers and get their own relief one by one.

The DeVos rule also eliminates the current prohibition on class action restrictions and mandatory arbitration clauses in enrollment.

What does that mean?

Under the current rule which Secretary DeVos wants to replace, you could gather the other students from Corinthian College and work on this together as a class action claim, share whatever expenses that might be involved in proving your claim, and you couldn't be forced into an arbitration where you are likely to lose. You could have your day in court under the rule that Secretary DeVos wants to replace.

Class action restrictions and mandatory arbitration were used by Corinthian and ITT Tech and others that required students to sign away their rights to sue the school as an individual or as part of a class as a condition of enrollment.

The DeVos rule prevents students from holding schools directly accountable for their wrongdoing and seeking financial redress through the courts. It gives students no other option than to seek relief from taxpayers through borrower defense, but, as I just mentioned, it makes that process almost impossible.

And if anyone doubts the devastating effect this rule will have on the defrauded students' ability to get relief, just look at what Secretary DeVos has done to date.

Since taking office Secretary DeVos has had the authority to discharge hundreds of millions of dollars in student loan debt held by hundreds of thousands of defrauded student borrowers. Instead, she has allowed a backlog of more than 200,000 borrower defense claims from virtually every State in the Nation—student borrower defense claims coming from all 50 States—to build at the Department. She is sitting on it. She is playing slow ball. She has not approved a single claim. Although more than 200,000 claims are pending, she has not approved a single claim in more than 1 year.

Here I want to show you what is behind this. In the few cases where Secretary DeVos has been legally required to provide discharges, she has done so with extreme displeasure.

Think about that. Using her authority to help defrauded borrowers get a fresh start brings her extreme displeasure.

How do I know that?

She wrote it. Here is one of them. Recommendation to discharge. She approves it, signs it, and puts down as a comment: ''with extreme displeasure.''

Discharging a student loan from a for-profit institution that defrauded borrowers, she is displeased to be forced to do such a thing.

She defied a Federal court order and was held in contempt for continuing to collect from these students who had been defrauded by Corinthian.

This is not a Secretary who rewrote the borrower defense rule to help student borrowers. In September, I introduced a resolution in the Senate to overturn the DeVos borrower defense rule; 42 of my colleagues have cosponsored that resolution.

I plan to bring the resolution to a vote on the Senate floor where we will only need a simple majority to pass under the expedited procedures provided for in the Congressional Review Act. At that time, my colleagues will have a choice. Will you stand with Secretary DeVos or with the defrauded student borrowers in your State?

There is no doubt where the American people stand. In a 2016 New America poll, the question was asked whether Americans agreed that students should have their Federal student loan debt canceled if their college deceived them, exactly what the borrower defense rule is about.

Seventy-one percent of Republicans said yes, 87 percent of Democrats. On average, 78 percent of Americans understand it is fundamentally unfair to penalize these students, having been defrauded by a school that this U.S. Government said was doing business honestly and professionally. When you break the numbers down, it is clear. The overwhelming majority of people in this country stand by the students, but not by Secretary DeVos.

I will stand with the defrauded students and the American people over Secretary DeVos, and my colleagues in the Senate will get a chance to vote. I hope they will, too.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from South Dakota.

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, we confirmed Robert Luck, a Florida supreme court justice, to be a U.S. Circuit judge for the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals. With Justice Luck's confirmation, the Senate has now confirmed 47 appellate court judges during this administration and 163 Article III judges overall.

That is more appellate court judges than had been confirmed at this point in any of the previous five Presidential administrations, and it is a particularly outstanding number when you consider that the Democrats have made confirming these judges as difficult as they possibly can. From day one of this administration, Democrats were determined to obstruct anything this President did, his nominations in particular.

Again and again and again, they have attempted to block nominees for no other reason than the fact that they were nominated by this President. Democrats have subjected roughly 75 percent of the administration's judicial nominees to the time-consuming cloture process. Compare that to the treatment of President Obama's nominees. At this point in President Obama's administration, roughly 3 percent of his judicial nominees had been subjected to cloture votes—just 3 percent, 3 percent versus 75 percent for President Trump.

The difference in these numbers is not because this President has nominated scores of extreme nominees who Democrats felt they could not support. In fact, Democrats have repeatedly turned around and voted for the very same judges they have obstructed. In one particularly egregious example, in January of 2018, Democrats forced the Senate to spend more than a week confirming four district court judges, even though not one single Democrat voted against their confirmation. These judges could have been confirmed in a matter of minutes by voice vote, but Democrats forced the Senate to spend more than a week on their consideration, time that could have been spent on genuinely controversial nominees or on some of the important issues facing our country.

Despite Democrats' obstruction, we have continued to move forward, and as I said, yesterday, we confirmed our 163rd judge to the Federal bench. Today, we will confirm our 164th. We are putting judges on the bench with a real respect for the law and for the Constitution and a commitment to applying the law as written.

Now, those sound like basic requirements for a judge, but too often, it seems like my Democrat colleagues are interested not in judges who will uphold the law, but in judges who will act like superlegislators, rewriting the law and the Constitution when they do not fit with the Democrats' political opinions, and that is a very dangerous thing.

When judges rule based not on what the law actually says, but what they think the law should be, they undermine a fundamental principle of our system of government. Our system is based on belief in the rule of law. In the American system, the law is supposed to be the final, impartial arbiter. Cases are to be decided based on what the law says, not on what a particular judge feels.

Sure, it might seem nice when an activist judge goes outside the meaning of a law and rules for your preferred outcome. But what happens when that same judge reaches beyond the law to your detriment? What protection do you have if the law is no longer the highest authority? Equal treatment under the law, equal justice under the law, these principles can only be maintained as long as judges actually rule based on the law and not on their personal feelings or personal opinions.

My Democrat colleagues have shown a disturbing tendency to believe that their opinions are the only ones that should prevail. They disapproved of the outcome of the last election, and so for 3 years, they have done everything they can to undermine a duly-elected President. They are upset by the fact that the President got to replace a perceived swing vote on the Supreme Court, and the solution floated by more than one member of their party was to pack the Supreme Court.

For anyone who needs a refresher on an idea that most thought had been consigned to the dustbin of history decades ago, the theory of court-packing is as follows: If the Supreme Court is not deciding cases to your liking, add more Justices to the Court until you start getting the decisions that you want.

Listen to Democrats question judicial nominees, and it soon becomes apparent that their biggest concern is not finding judges who will uphold the law and the Constitution, but judges who will uphold Democrats' political opinions and preferred policy outcomes. It is a disturbing trend. It is natural to want your party to prevail and to believe that your ideas are the best ones for the country. It is another thing entirely to start acting like your opinions are the only ones that should ever prevail, regardless of election outcomes or the wishes of the American people.

I am proud that we are putting judges on the bench who will rule according to the law and to the Constitution, not their personal opinions, their political beliefs, or the political party of the individuals before their court. I am proud that we are putting judges on the bench who will help ensure that the rule of law is maintained and that everyone in their courtroom receives the equal protection of the law.

I look forward to confirming more excellent judges in the near future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Montanans are growing restless, as Speaker PELOSI and the House Democrats continue to slow-walk a very important trade agreement for Montana and for our country. That is the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

In fact, just last week, I was in Billings to celebrate the Montana Farm Bureau Federation's 100 year anniversary—and, again, another big congratulations to the Montana Farm Bureau. As I was talking with folks at the farm bureau event, there were a lot of cowboy boots and hats. These are the farmers and ranchers of Montana, the salt of the earth folks. They are all asking the same question: Why is it taking so long? What is going on?

Frankly, there is one answer: Speaker NANCY PELOSI and House Democrats are playing political games and holding up this trade deal. They are holding this trade deal hostage. It has been a year since the USMCA was signed by President Trump and leaders of Canada and Mexico—a year. NANCY PELOSI has had this signed trade agreement in her hands for about a year, and rather than deliver this win for our farmers and ranchers in Montana and across the United States, she is focused on one thing: impeachment—because, at the end of the day, this is about our farmers and ranchers. It is time we get the job done because, in Montana, agriculture is the No. 1 driver of our economy, and it is a large part of our Montana way of life.

This trade agreement is expected to create over 180,000 new American jobs and to boost our GDP by over $70 billion. Canada and Mexico both are in high demand for our products like wheat, barley, beef. In fact, in 2018 alone, Montana had $731 million in total exports to Canada and to Mexico. For our producers and our ag-related industries in Montana, passing this trade agreement would help provide certainty and alleviate the challenges and obstacles they have faced over a very tough season.

Mexico is ready. Canada is ready. The United States is ready. I can tell you, Montana is ready. Unfortunately, NANCY PELOSI is not. While the Democrats continue to obsess over impeaching our President, they continue to ignore the voices of our rural communities. This unnecessary reality TV show is nothing but a waste of time to stall the important work like the USMCA. Montanans are sick and tired of the politics and the partisan games being played here in Washington, DC, and frankly, I am, too.

I am grateful for the leadership of my good friend and colleague, GREG GIANFORTE, who is standing up to House Democrats and fighting boldly for the USMCA. Realize, Montana has but one Member in the U.S. House of Representatives, and he is fighting a good fight over there.

We are both fighting to ensure that the votes of Montana farmers and ranchers are heard loud and clear in both Chambers of Congress. The longer the House Democrats stall on this deal, the further we stall opportunity and economic growth in Montana and across our Nation.

To Speaker PELOSI, to my colleagues in the House, enough is enough. Let's deliver the USMCA for the American people and for Montana farmers and ranchers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I totally agree with my friend from Montana on the importance of, after a year of deliberation—or maybe ''deliberation'' is too strong a word—more than a year since all three countries agreed on an agreement, that we still have not gotten a chance to vote on this agreement on the Senate floor; we have to wait for the House to do that. I want to do everything that I can to encourage the House to move forward with this. I think better trade policy can turn a good economy into a great economy, and we need to be working on that great economy.

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

Mr. President, I am here today to talk about another topic. I want to talk for a few minutes about the importance of November as National Adoption Month and to recognize the celebration of National Adoption Day, which will take place on Saturday, November 23. I am pleased to work with my colleague and Senate cochair of the Congressional Coalition For Adoption, Senator KLOBUCHAR, again, to introduce this resolution supporting National Adoption Month and National Adoption Day. This is the 5th year Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have worked together on this legislation and the 5th year where I hope our colleagues will unanimously support it and do that this week.

The Congressional Coalition on Adoption is the largest bipartisan, bicameral caucus in all of Congress, and there is a good reason for that. In the Senate Subcommittee, where agreement is really too often hard to find, the idea that every child deserves to grow up in a safe, stable home with a loving family is something that not only everybody should be able to agree with, but in the Congress, we have been able to agree with that in a broad-based sort of way.

Right now, there are more than 437,000 children in the foster care system in our country. More than 125,000 of those are children who are ready and waiting for families who want to get this adoption completed; yet the average length of time it takes a child from foster care to adoption, once the adoption decision has been made by the adopting family, is 19 months. I was in a meeting just last week with the administrator of this program in the administration who is doing everything I believe they can for the first time in a while to do what they can to reduce this wait.

I would also like to see the State Department, frankly, become for vigorous in encouraging foreign adoptions for those kids all over the world who are in need of families.

I don't disagree with the idea that if someone in Ethiopia wants to adopt an Ethiopian child or someone in Guatemala wants to adopt a Guatemalan child or someone in Russia wants to adopt a Russian child, that is all fine. But if they don't have adoptive families in the country they were born in, let's open the door in a more effective way for American families who want to be part of that.

There is some good news. For the fourth year in a row, the number of children who were adopted increased. Four years in a row, more kids were adopted than in the previous year. For the second year in a row, the number of children who entered foster families decreased. I don't want to say that in a way that takes anything away from people who are willing to be foster families, to give that security, that emotional embrace to kids who don't have that at home. Foster families serve a great purpose, but even foster families often become adoptive families, and they do this because they know that is a situation that becomes permanent. Knowing that you have a family forever makes a difference.

In my home State of Missouri, there are almost 13,000 kids in the foster system right now. I want to share a few of their stories.

Gabe, who is a 10th grader in Missouri, is a big fan of reading and big fan of watching movies. He hopes to join the military when he is older.

Natalie is 14. Natalie loves to read. She loves to draw. She loves to write. She loves to be outside. If she had a superpower, she says she would choose invisibility. This second grader really would like a permanent home. She wants to be a veterinarian someday. She is doing well in school. The thing she really needs is a home she can always go back to.

Ragan and Haylee are sisters who hope to have pets in their home. They don't have pets in their home right now. Ragan is a sixth grader who likes to laugh and draw and learn. Haylee is a fifth grader who likes to play soccer and spend time with her soccer teammates. Even sisters have different ways they look at the world. They would all like a family.

Last week, I had the privilege to meet with three families from Missouri who were here to be celebrated at the Angels in Adoption activity that occurred last week. This is something we do annually to recognize families who have gone above and beyond what you could expect in the adoption community. This was the first year there were Angels in Adoption being recognized from all 50 States and from Washington, DC. Of the three Missouri families I had a chance to spend some time with, one included Justin and Kristin Akin from Chesterfield. I actually first met Kristin when she came to my office to be an advocate for Be The Match. Be The Match is a Federally authorized and funded registry program that matches unrelated bone marrow donors with patients suffering from leukemia and from 70 other fatal blood cancers.

Kristin was here advocating for that because she and Justin had lost two sons, Andrew and Matthew, who were diagnosed with a rare disease and were unable to find matched donors. Kristin and Justin, after losing those two sons, adopted William and Christopher.

Kristin continues to be a volunteer to help other families trying to find that match. We are doing better with that program. In fact, we increased that program in our proposed budget for this year by $5.4 million, as we increased the National Cord Blood Inventory Program also.

As important as that constant effort to do what they can so that other families didn't have happen to them what happened when they lost their two children was their decision to bring two more sons into their house and to do that by adopting.

I also had a chance to meet Zach and Joanna Holden. The Holdens began fostering in May of 2010. They were already parents of three young girls of their own, but they became foster parents to make an impact on the lives of children, knowing it wouldn't be easy for their family but it would be an important thing to do for the kids they brought into their family. Through their 9 years as foster parents, the Holdens have had 30 different foster kids in their house and adopted 2 of those 30 kids through the foster care relationships they had.

In early 2012, they began a small ministry out of their garage called The Caring Closet, which later merged with Fostering Hope, another local foster care ministry. Joanna and that ministry—and the partnership now with Fostering Hope—gathered and sorted donations, put together packs of clothes, distributed them to local foster families wherever there was a need. Fostering Hope now supports children in foster care. They help foster families as they help foster kids, and they help foster care agencies across several communities in Southwest Missouri.

Jody and Mary Ann Allen-Parker also shared their incredible story with me. Nearly two decades ago, Mary Ann witnessed a tragic circumstance involving the friends of one of her sons. He explained a challenging situation he and his family were in, and he asked Mary Ann if he could move in with them. She took this child and, shortly after that, his two siblings under her care along with her own two children.

After going to court, Mary Ann was able to establish custody over those three kids as well. The oldest of them has joined the Marines and the other two are still at home with Mary Ann. She has given them the structure and focus they didn't have in their original home but they have through her, and they also have reconnected with their parents on a much different level than they ever had before.

There are lots of stories to be shared. There are lots of families who are waiting to adopt. There are lots of families who haven't thought about it yet who would be willing to adopt.

According to one survey, nearly one-quarter of the people in the United States who haven't adopted have considered being an adoptive parent. There are many concerns about adoption that aren't there once you get in, open that door, and look at what can happen when you create a forever family for somebody who needs one.

The same survey showed that over one-third of the participants believe that foster care adoption is expensive, and a majority of those considering foster care adoption indicated that receiving financial and emotional support would make a difference in deciding whether to adopt.

I will be sponsoring again this year the refundable tax credit for adoptive parents. About 50 percent of all the parents who adopt don't make enough money to pay income tax, which says a lot about them. It also says a lot about the fact that the system we have now—in which you get a tax credit, but you get a tax credit only if you pay taxes—serves to encourage only about 50 percent of the families who are willing to stretch in unique ways and adopt kids.

Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have introduced the Supporting Adoptive Families Act to ensure adoptive families have access to pre- and post-adoption services, including mental and physical and behavioral health screenings and assistance. In February, we also introduced the Intercountry Adoption Advisory Committee Act to improve the intercountry adoption process.

Since National Adoption Day started in 2000, tens of thousands of children have been adopted. If only a few of them are adopted because this month and this day draw attention to that, that is certainly worth the effort we will make on the Senate floor this week to recognize this important month and to recognize next Saturday as National Adoption Day.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

Ms. HASSAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. 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 (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 360 Ex.]

YEAS—80

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

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 nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Pat Roberts, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Richard C. Shelby, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Cory Gardner, James Lankford, Mike Braun, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, John Thune.

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 Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. 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 (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 361 Ex.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Bennet	Brown	Cardin
Casey	Kaine	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Smith
Duckworth	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Feinstein	Murray	Udall
Gillibrand	Peters	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Reed	Whitehouse
Hirono	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 30.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I can tell the Senate this morning that there is no higher priority for Senate Finance Democrats than the well-being of healthcare patients in this country and how strongly we feel about their having a right to good quality, affordable healthcare coverage.

Right now, too many of those folks are getting ripped off by an insurance lobbyist's dream—taxpayer-funded junk insurance—or by Big Pharma, which is always, always looking to engage in price gouging for one reason: They can get away with it. Take insulin. Insulin prices are up thirteenfold in recent years. The drug is not 13 times better. It is the same insulin that has been around for decades. But the reason the pharmaceutical companies do it is because they can get away with it.

This morning, I am going to take a few minutes and talk about what this really means for patients because I can tell you, this fall, there are a lot of families across this country who would rather be prepping for holidays than worrying about their healthcare. Unfortunately, the Trump administration is refusing to provide that kind of security for our patients.

To begin, let me tell you about a youngster in Oregon named Jasper. Jasper is 3, full of energy and love, and a big fan of playtime with cars and trucks and trains. He was born, however, with huge medical challenges—cystic fibrosis, cardiac and pancreatic problems, hearing loss. He needs a variety of treatments multiple times a day. It is so hard on Jasper's family. It is so hard on Jasper. And, of course, the costs of Jasper's care are in the stratosphere. The family is fortunate to have health insurance through a parent's employer. They know how absolutely vital it is to have what they consider to be a lifeline—the protection of the Affordable Care Act.

At the heart of the Affordable Care Act are bedrock, ironclad protections for people like them—no discrimination by insurance companies against preexisting conditions. That was something we used to have some support for from the other side of the aisle. I know about that because I wrote a bipartisan bill that had airtight, loophole-free protection against what essentially was discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, and we got it into the Affordable Care Act.

Yet now we see the other side of the aisle trying to unravel those protections. They are trying to unravel the protection that we see for patients with respect to big expenses. Our approach has no annual or lifetime limits on coverage, no coverage denials that dragged people into bureaucratic nightmares, has young people covered on their parents' plan until age 26, and lots more. Those protections saved people's lives and made healthcare affordable for millions of Americans.

Unfortunately, with the support of my colleagues here on the other side in the Senate, the Trump administration wants to eliminate those protections that are so important to Jasper and families like his. My colleagues on the other side are standing by and basically doing nothing while the administration and Republican-led States are out there maneuvering in the courts to get the entire Affordable Care Act wiped out.

The so-called Texas case, which is an absurd lawsuit based on an absurd argument—an argument that wouldn't pass the smell test in a middle class school mock trial—somehow rightwing, ideological judges have kept it alive. Because this lawsuit keeps hanging around, tens of millions of Americans might lose their healthcare with hardly any warning and no fallback options to protect them.

Now Republicans have claimed they have fix-it bills they could pass in the event their allies took down the Affordable Care Act. They do read like they were written by the lawyers and the lobbyists on the payroll of the big insurance companies. If insurance companies can hike up the cost of treating a preexisting condition so high that it becomes unaffordable, it is no different from being denied coverage at the outset.

While the Texas case moves forward, the Trump administration is continuing to allow junk insurance scam artists to defraud Americans into buying worthless plans that aren't worth really the paper they are written on and certainly don't cover the healthcare Americans need.

I want to be very specific about it. This is an insurance lobbyist's dream.

You have tax breaks for junk insurance. That is on every insurance lobbyist's wish list for the holidays. I think it is federally funded fraud, plain and simple, but unfortunately it has the support of a lot of Republicans here in the Congress.

It is now the middle of the open enrollment period for health insurance on healthcare.gov. The Trump administration's support for junk plans has created a whole new burden for families across the country who are shopping for insurance.

I am particularly troubled by this because I remember what junk insurance used to be like. I was director of the senior citizens at home for almost 7 years before I was elected to the Congress, and those were the days when you could go around the country, whether it was Montana or Oregon or anywhere else, and fast-talking salesmen would sell 10, 15, sometimes 20 policies to supplement a senior's Medicare. They were called Medigap policies, and they were useless. Seniors should have saved that money to pay the rent and maybe make sure they had heat in their houses.

Finally, we got rid of those Medigap rip-off policies. When I came to the Congress, it was my top priority. We got it passed. It was a bipartisan proposal. But now junk plans are back. They are different from those Medigap rip-offs, but, much like what I battled when I was the head of the senior citizens in Oregon, they are still built around the same proposition. They are essentially worthless. They are an insurance lobbyist's dream. In the case of what we are dealing with—the administration gutting the Affordable Care Act—I think it is essentially Federal tax breaks for junk insurance, and that is why I think it is tantamount to federally funded fraud.

The Trump administration's support for junk plans has created a whole new burden for families across the country who are trying to shop for insurance that gives them real value. Those shoppers used to be able to trust that junk plans had actually been banned from the marketplace. Now those shoppers have to wade through Byzantine and manipulative marketing scams and incomprehensible insurance lingo to try to figure out if they are getting coverage that actually helps them or, as I have described too often, just worthless junk.

What is worse, the Trump administration actually redirects people looking for coverage from the healthcare.gov website to third-party brokers who can sell unsuspecting customers junk plans. I think it is astounding that the Trump administration has seen fit to heap another burden on vulnerable people. After we have called this administration out on it, they are not willing to do anything to correct it.

But unfortunately, since the beginning of the Trump administration—with the help of too many allies in the Congress—it has been one attempt after another to take healthcare away from vulnerable Americans, from millions of vulnerable Americans, those like 3-year-old little Jasper and his family, that I started talking about at home in Oregon.

On a fundamental level, this is a debate about whether this country is going to go back to the days when healthcare was only for the healthy and wealthy. That was the way it worked, if the insurance companies could clobber somebody with a preexisting condition. If you are healthy, it didn't matter. You did not have to worry. If you were wealthy, you just sat down and wrote out a check. That is the way it worked.

But when I came to the Senate, we put together a bipartisan bill, airtight, loophole-free protection for those with preexisting conditions. There are colleagues on the other side of the aisle who cosponsored my bill—and by the way, the President of the Senate knows who was the leader of that effort, one of his predecessors in the Utah delegation, the late Senator Bennet.

So this idea that we are just going to sit around and go back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy, that is not acceptable to Finance Democrats that I have the honor to work with. It is not acceptable to any of us on this side, and it should not be acceptable to my colleagues in the Congress.

That is where Donald Trump wants to return to, the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. They have made it clear by working to eliminate preexisting condition protections in the Congress and the courts, by giving insurance lobbyists Federal tax breaks for junk insurance plans, and by seeking to slash health programs for the vulnerable.

I just want to make it clear that, on this side of the aisle, we are about patients. We are about protecting patients. We are about the proposition that in a country as strong and good and rich as ours—where we are going to spend $3.5 trillion this year on healthcare, if you divide the number of Americans, like maybe 325 million into $3.5 trillion, you could send every family of four in America a check for $40,000. We are spending enough to take care of patients.

We ought to be doing more to protect, rather than turning back the clock on young people like Jasper and his family. I just wanted to make it clear, we will be on the floor talking about more patients in the days ahead and on the fight, a fight we are going to prosecute relentlessly, to protect those patients under the Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I was walking by and heard Senator WYDEN—I do not usually sit over here—Senator WYDEN was speaking about healthcare. It is just so clear to me some of the things that this body could be doing to bring down the cost of healthcare and to expand the number of people that have health insurance. I know, in my State, I worked with, I know, a friend of the Presiding Officer, Governor Kasich, a Republican—I am a Democrat—on expanding Medicaid in Ohio. In fact, after the Affordable Care Act, we now have 900,000 more people that have insurance.

But what I liked about what Senator WYDEN was saying was some of the things we could do in the future. It is clear to me, if we allowed the government to negotiate drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries, directly with the drug companies the way we do at the Veterans Administration, it could make a huge difference in drug costs.

We, in this body, a large part is because the drug company lobby refuses to do it.

Mr. WYDEN. If my colleague would yield?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

MR. WYDEN. My colleague has been an enormous champion for consumers, and I just want to ask my colleague, didn't he and finance Democrats try in the Finance Committee to get rid of the restrictions on negotiating to do exactly what he is saying?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, that is exactly right. It should be an easy process. We know how to do it at the Veterans Administration. The cost is 40 or 50 percent of what typically is the cost a patient pays.

The other thing we could do—and we were this close to getting it in the Affordable Care Act, is giving people the option, at age 50 or 55, to buy into Medicare because, as Senator WYDEN knows, we all have in our States—whether it is Utah or Oregon or Ohio, we have 58-year-olds that lose their jobs or 62-year-olds that lose their jobs, and they cannot really often find insurance, or it is not affordable if they can. If they had the option to buy in—rather in a neutral way we built it into the Affordable Care Act, but lost in the end. We fell one vote short. But it would have made a huge difference in people being able to get through that.

I will never forget, I had a townhall in Youngstown some years ago. A woman stood up and said, ''I'm 62 years old. I hold two jobs. I never had health insurance. I just want to stay alive until I'm 65.'' She did not say I want to stay alive to raise my grandkids or to take a trip. It was to stay alive so I can get on Medicare and get insurance, and that just should not be in this country.

Mr. WYDEN. My understanding—and, again, I have listened to my colleague on the Finance Committee. He is a champion on not going back, but going forward with more Medicare-type choices. Like making that person who is really wondering if they are going to make it until 65 in order to get to Medicare, he would like—for example, say an older woman who has been a victim of age discrimination, did not have much money, he would like to

make them eligible for Medicare at 60 or 61 or something like that.

Mr. BROWN. Absolutely—I thank Senator WYDEN—absolutely. Just give them that option. It is something we ought to be able to do. We can do it in a cost-effective way. In the end, it means fewer trips to the emergency room. In the end, it means a healthy population of people at those 10 years when they are more likely to get sick and more likely to need Medicare, but are not likely to be eligible.

I thank Senator WYDEN.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING NATHAN LANE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a Foreign Service Officer of the United States and a former Pearson Fellow in my office, who was tragically killed in an accident while serving his country abroad.

After serving in my office for a yearlong fellowship, Nathan Lane was assigned to the Poland desk at the U.S. State Department here in Washington. Sadly, while on temporary duty in Poland, he was involved in a car accident. While he was initially hospitalized, his injuries proved too severe, and, surrounded by his loving family, he passed away on November 2.

Nathan was a committed public servant who joined the State Department in 2000 and served in nearly every corner of the globe. He and his wife Sara and, later, his son Peter travelled from Mexico, to Russia, to Belarus, to Vietnam, and finally to Kenya. After his assignment in Kenya, he had the ''misfortune'' to be assigned to my office through a Pearson Fellowship. Here, my team and I got to see his diligence and dedication every day firsthand.

During his time in my office, Nathan proved invaluable. His knowledge and expertise of foreign policy gave him a mastery of the portfolio, as revealed by his exceptionally researched policy papers on important international issues and matters that my team and I tackled in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Nathan's understanding of the dynamics of foreign relations and his skills at compiling pertinent information allowed him to craft the soon-to-be-released report on China. This product of the Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and Cybersecurity Policy will be a comprehensive report on the activities of China in the Indo-Pacific region. Absent Nathan's diligence and dedication, this report would not have been possible.

Additionally, Nathan drafted a resolution urging the formation of an unprecedented treaty alliance between the United States and Indo-Pacific nations to collectively guard against growing cyber threats. The Cyber League of Indo-Pacific States, or CLIPS, was Nathan's brainchild. He was passionate about this idea and rightfully proud of this resolution, and my team and I are honored to carry on this torch.

Of course, Nathan contributed so much more than just policy expertise. His kind heart and curious nature made him a friend to my staff and me. He would readily help those around him, even with the smallest tasks, without a whisper of complaint and quickly fit in as one of the team.

Nathan had many passions beyond foreign policy. He loved chess, and every so often, we would catch him pulling up an ongoing game between times of busyness. He loved running, and it wasn't uncommon for him to step away from his desk at a convenient time to go for a quick jog around Capitol Hill.

Perhaps his greatest passion, though, was baseball. Indeed, one of his most timeless contributions to our office was his membership of Coors & Corn, the joint softball team between Senator SASSE's office and mine. We may not have won it all that year, but we certainly would not have stood a chance without Nathan. As we celebrate the World Series in Washington, Nathan was such a great Nats fan that, every time we cheer for that team, we will also be cheering for him.

He was one of a kind. He was cheerful, eager, and caring; his loss will be felt by all of us who knew him. I ask my colleagues to join me in praying for his family, his wife, and his son and commemorating the man who graced so many of us with his compassion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2843

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. This bill passed the House by a vote of 263 to 158, with 33 Republicans supporting it.

A week ago, along with every other Senate Democrat, I introduced the bill in the Senate. People on the frontlines helping these victims wrote this bill. This bill is not a Democratic bill. It is not a Republican bill. This bill is a survivors' bill. It is written with the help of survivors who know what is needed in the real world.

The bill accomplishes two things. It preserves the advancements we made during the last reauthorization in 2013, and it includes certain meaningful improvements to the law. In particular, there are three key elements.

One, it expands jurisdiction over non-Native Americans for domestic violence offenses and crimes against children, elders, and law enforcement. Violence is a big problem on Tribal lands, and the best way to address it is to allow the Tribes themselves to prosecute these crimes. Unfortunately, some, instead, want to circumvent the Tribal justice system that we know works, and this moves us in the wrong direction.

Secondly, the bill builds on existing antidiscrimination protections for the LGBT community. In the 2013 reauthorization, Congress declared that Federal grant recipients could use funds to train staff to recognize and combat discrimination against LGBT individuals. Unfortunately, the law wasn't clear, and organizations are still uncertain if they can use funds for this purpose. This bill simply clarifies that intent. It is a small but very important change to help this at-risk community. There has been surprising resistance from some on the Republican side to include this modest language.

Third, our bill keeps guns out of the hands of domestic abusers. It does this by adding intimate partners and stalkers to the existing list of individuals who can be banned from possessing firearms. We know the presence of a firearm in a domestic violence situation increases the odds of a woman being killed by 500 percent. That is a major increase in risk. It only makes sense to take guns away from convicted domestic abusers who may use them to kill their spouses or partners.

There is simply no way to stop domestic violence, but I think we have a duty to do all we can, and this bill makes significant improvements in the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no later than before the end of this year, the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2843 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the only amendments in order be two germane amendments per side; that the debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour and amendments limited to 30 minutes each, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments; that upon the disposition of the amendments, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage; and finally, that amendments and passage be subject to a 60-affirmative vote threshold, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object.

I am on the floor today to speak my piece about the Violence Against Women Act. I speak to this body not just as a Senator, but I speak to this body as a survivor of rape and as a survivor of domestic violence.

For months—for months—the senior Senator from California and I worked together on a piece of legislation that would reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, a bipartisan effort, an effort that brought the Senator and I together to reauthorize the bill with as much support in this body as possible.

We were working together in good faith to make our way through the issues that affect so many women in abusive situations, partners in abusive situations, domestic violence situations where children are involved, to find a common path forward to have this bill reauthorized, again, with as much support as possible in this body at a time when America views us as so politically divided.

What could bring us together? The issue of violence directed at women and children and survivors of sexual assault should bring us together.

Months of bipartisan effort—but there was pressure to immediately introduce the House-passed version of the Violence Against Women Act. We were moving ahead with steady progress in a number of these areas, but, again, there was political pressure to introduce the House-passed version of the bill, not one that we could come together with on the floor of this Senate but one that even the Democrats—in their release, in their press gaggle addressing the House version of Violence Against Women—said would never make it through the Senate. Why on Earth would we introduce a piece of legislation that will not make it through this body? Shouldn't we be working together to find a path forward?

We should continue to work on it. I sincerely hope that by the end of this year we can come together as Republicans and Democrats and not present a Republican version or a Democratic version but produce a version that will pass this body and protect those who are in a very vulnerable state. I have been in that vulnerable state before, and I appreciated the assistance that was given to me by folks who were funded by this piece of legislation.

So, with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Objection is heard.

The Senator from California has the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator to yield for just a moment. I know we had some good discussions, and they broke off. I am very happy to continue to work on this. I felt it was important to enter the House bill because of the three very important provisions that I just went over, which are, in essence, the three improvements on the bill, if you will.

I have no problem sitting down now so that we can discuss it. If we could find a way that we can agree, I think that would be just fine. But in the interest of time and because there has been a substantial period of time, I just decided to introduce it. The three issues are Tribal sovereignty, the LGBTQ people, and the gun provisions. Those are the three new House provisions.

I hope that Senator ERNST and I can sit down and discuss it. I would be very happy to do this—sit down and discuss, if she would like.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I truly appreciate the remarks by the senior Senator from California. I truly have enjoyed working on this piece of legislation.

There were three markers that were laid down within the House version of the bill as outlined previously, but there was no consensus there. It was, ''Either accept these provisions or we don't work together.''

We need to keep finding a way to get to consensus on a bill moving through this body, and I am happy to continue working on legislation with the Senator. I think, by the end of this year, we should find something that would work to reauthorize this very important piece of legislation, and I appreciate her leadership on this very much. I truly have enjoyed working with her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I may, in response to the Senator—I am very happy to accept the invitation. We can sit down and continue to work on this, but I would point out that these three provisions have tremendous support: the Tribal sovereignty, the protections for the LGBT community, and spouse protections when a spouse has a weapon. Those are rather difficult over here. They were not in the House. But who knows? Maybe we can work something out, and I am happy to try.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the Violence Against Women Act turned 25 years old this year. As many of us are aware, this law provides desperately needed resources to tackle domestic and sexual abuse in our communities. Folks, it needs to be reauthorized.

I wasn't in the Senate the last time this bill was passed back in 2013, and I wanted to be part of the process of getting the bill done this time around. As a woman, as a survivor, and as someone who volunteered at a women's shelter in college, I understand just how awful violence against women can be in terms of physical and mental well-being, self-image, our families, and security in the whole of society.

For months the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and I worked to develop a bipartisan proposal that I really thought could get across the finish line. Folks, as that old ''Schoolhouse Rock'' video says: Without passing the House, the Senate, and getting a signature from the President, all you have is a bill, just a bill, not a law. And no survivors are helped by a bill.

Here we are today, after months of work and mountains of effort that went toward working on a bipartisan bill, and at some point someone pressed the big red button of partisan politics, and the Democrats refused to work together any longer, walking away from the real progress we had made. Not only did they walk away from the negotiating table, but they did so by dropping a bill that is going nowhere, as they have acknowledged.

The Senate Democrats' bill is a nonstarter. It will not pass the Senate. It will not get the President's signature. Most importantly, it will not actually help the survivors who need it.

These politics are sad. We should be helping survivors, not engaging in the kinds of partisan antics that will never produce real results. We have seen this before. The Democrats will say that Republican women can't speak for women because we don't agree point by point with their leftist agenda. These are worn-out tactics, my friends.

However, despite the minority's decision to walk away and put politics ahead of survivors, I am leading our effort to continue getting a bill done that focuses on providing the resources and support survivors across the country need for women and children in urban and rural areas like mine.

My goal has always been to empower survivors, to punish abusers, and to enhance the overall purpose behind this very important law. That is why, this week, I plan to put forward a bill that puts survivors first. We have included a number of issues Senate Democrats failed to address. For example—and this should be so simple, folks—we are holistically addressing female genital mutilation. We have tripled the amount of funding that is available for education and sexual assault prevention. We also focus more on enhancing the penalties for abusers.

As a matter of fact, one of the most objectionable and unacceptable items in the Senate Democratic bill is that they allow accused abusers to go outside of the justice system and negotiate directly with their victim—with their victim—those women, those abused survivors who have already been manipulated and beat down. It allows those abusers to negotiate directly with their victims to avoid jail time; that is, of course, as long as the victim consents, as if an abusive relationship ever involved consent—outside of the justice system, folks, outside of the justice system. It is unimaginable that we would allow or fund such an abusive system or abusive situation and allow abusers to escape justice. I think abusers should face justice, and I am not sure why our Senate Democratic colleagues don't agree.

Coming from a rural area of our country, I made sure we prioritized rural resources in our bill. We are offering increased funding for housing assistance so that women and children can be safe from their abusers. When living in an area like mine—rural Montgomery County, Red Oak, IA—the nearest shelter is an hour away. You

have virtually cut off a woman and her children from any job she might have, any family she might have, and it truly takes them out of their life. By offering these housing resources through voucher programs, our bill enables them to rent an apartment or home in their home community.

Imagine what we could do in this body if we worked with a single purpose instead of a dozen different motives. Imagine this entire body pulling together with a single purpose, focusing on assisting those survivors.

I welcome the support of all of my colleagues for my bill—Democrats and Republicans—and I hope we can all join together in this effort. How many more violent abusers can we put behind bars to keep survivors safe? How many more people would be alive today?

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me today to speak on the importance of the Violence Against Women Act. I want to send the message to the countless survivors across this country: We are with you. We hear you, and we are working for you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking our friend and colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST, for her leadership on the reauthorization and—indeed, I think the important point should be made—to strengthen the Violence Against Women Act. We don't have to settle for the House bill. We can have a better bill for victims of domestic violence. Unfortunately, like so much important work, we seem constantly to get diverted and distracted and dragged down by the partisanship that seems to dominate Washington, DC, these days. For many months, our colleague from Iowa has been working closely with Senator FEINSTEIN from California to try to figure a way to reauthorize this critical law.

In the meantime, though, not on one occasion but on two occasions, we have offered a continuing resolution that would extend the current reauthorization and our Democratic colleagues have shut that down. So we are in unchartered territory where we don't currently have an authorization for the Violence Against Women Act.

I shared our colleague's disappointment when our Democratic colleagues walked away from the negotiating table and chose to introduce a replica of the House's partisan bill, which as you have heard, does not have the support to pass in the Senate. Let me say one thing that should be abundantly clear but sometimes I think it gets lost: We all agree that more must be done to prevent violence and respond to it. It is fair to say that we have different opinions on what those pathways look like, but one thing that should not be up for debate is whether or not we reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. That is something we need to do.

The fact is that we don't have to settle for the House bill. We can do better. Our Democratic colleagues took an interesting approach in introducing a bill that a majority of people in this Chamber will not support, and they know that. Sadly, that is part of the point. They know they have a bill that does not enjoy consensus support because they would rather make the political point and argument that somehow some of us on this side don't believe in supporting victims of domestic violence, which is absolutely a falsehood. It is a lie. During a press conference, the Senator from Hawaii even conceded five times that the House bill is going nowhere, but that is the path our Democratic colleagues have chosen. Rather than working in a bipartisan fashion to build a consensus package that could actually become law, they decided to head down a partisan path led by the House bill, which came to us 7 months ago.

Clearly, some of our colleagues here in the Senate are not interested in actually making laws. They are in it for the headlines, for the politics. In the face of this ridiculous and unacceptable jockeying, I am glad that today Senator ERNST will introduce a consensus alternative to the bill offered by our colleagues, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation. This bill introduced by the Senator from Iowa will send more funding and more resources to the Violence Against Women Act than the Democrats' bill. It is actually better and will authorize a program for twice as long. It will give the Department of Justice the stability it needs to plan for the future without being jerked around by partisan gains.

This bill includes a lot more than just funding. It also addresses a number of horrific crimes that are being committed against women and girls in our country. Sex trafficking, for example, is currently not always recognized as a form of sexual assault—and it is—but this bill would make that clear. It would also enhance the maximum criminal penalties for sexual abuse of minors and other vulnerable groups. It will, as you heard, take aim at heinous crimes like mutilation and address crimes in rural areas and on Tribal lands. This legislation includes provisions from a number of bipartisan bills that have been introduced in the Senate to both improve resources for victims and target specific types of abuse.

One example is a bill I introduced with the Senator from California, my friend Senator FEINSTEIN, called the HEALS Act, which will remove some of the hurdles that exist between victims of domestic violence and their access to safe housing. That is in our bill. This provision would also include greater flexibility for transitional housing programs so that survivors can get back on their feet without the fear of losing the roof over their head.

This bill includes language introduced by Senators MURKOWSKI and CORTEZ MASTO to combat the epidemic of murdered and missing Native women and girls. It will allow for better law enforcement coordination and provide local and Tribal law enforcement with more resources to address these crimes. It is critical that we all call attention to these despicable acts of violence and unequivocally reject them without regard to partisanship or party.

Another challenge we face is technology outpacing our ability to counter certain types of exploitation. Abusive images and videos proliferate online, for example. This is a relatively new challenge, but it is real and it is omnipresent. This legislation will empower victims of this type of abuse to remove the content from the internet by using copyright takedown authority. It also establishes an innovation fund for the Office on Violence Against Women to address emerging trends so victims can get the support they need as quickly as possible.

If you compare this legislation to the bill passing the House and introduced by our Democratic colleagues here, there is no question that our version does more to support survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. It provides more funding over a longer period of time, and it targets despicable crimes that are being committed across the country that aren't even covered by the House bill.

Let me just close by thanking our friend from Iowa for continuing to fight for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and for leading the effort to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. It is a bill that never should have lapsed, despite two attempts to continue it that our Democratic colleagues objected to. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill and look forward to working with all of our colleagues to advance it. I hope our colleagues will return to the negotiation table and work with us so we can send a long-term reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act to the President's desk for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues from Iowa, Texas, and Alaska in calling for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA. VAWA was foundational to addressing domestic violence and sexual assault and supporting survivors in their recovery.

VAWA expired earlier this year, and it is critical that the services and tools offered through the law are reauthorized so we can continue to help and empower survivors. Additionally, it is important that we make it known that crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking are not tolerated.

Senator ERNST will be introducing this legislation, which I am cosponsoring, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. This bill includes key Tribal provisions, such as expanding Tribal criminal jurisdiction and upholding Tribal sovereignty while

amending the 2013 VAWA, and providing increased funding for Indian Tribes to address violence committed against Indians on their lands.

A Department of Justice report found that more than four in five American Indian and Alaska Native women experience violence in their lifetime, and Native women are significantly more likely to experience cases of stalking and physical violence by an intimate partner.

Under Senator ERNST's VAWA bill, Indian Tribes will be allowed to train more lawyers and Tribal court judges, further strengthening the Tribal criminal justice system; have access to increased data and reporting on the subject of missing and murdered Indians; and will require the Department of Justice to issue annual reports to Congress in order to thoroughly track the progress of the special criminal jurisdiction and better determine trends of violence committed on Indian lands.

The Committee on Indian Affairs has held hearings on violence against Indians and missing and murdered Native Americans. As chairman of the committee, I introduced legislation that would increase resources to Indian victims of crime. The Senate majority VAWA includes my SURVIVE Act, which would provide Indian Tribes with a 5-percent Tribal set aside of the Crime Victims Fund. Prior to our work on this initiative, Tribes were accessing less than 1 percent of this important funding. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have included a Tribal set-aside in the three previous fiscal years of criminal justice science packages, which underscores the importance of passing authorizing language, such as my SURVIVE Act.

This VAWA bill also includes Savanna's Act, a bill I am cosponsoring, named for Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, a pregnant woman from the Spirit Lake Nation in my home State who went missing and was found murdered 8 days later. Savanna's tragic death did not go unnoticed and has helped to raise awareness about missing and murdered Native American women. Savanna's Act will help to address cases of missing or murdered Indians by directing the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and criminal justice guidelines; improving access to Federal criminal databases; holding Tribal consultations with Indian Tribes, Tribal Organizations, and Urban Indian Organizations when the Department of Justice develops and implements guidelines; requiring training and technical assistance to Indian Tribes participating in the guidelines implementation process; and mandating data collection and reporting by the Department of Justice.

The Senate majority VAWA includes these important Tribal bills, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senator ERNST's bill. There are many great provisions in this VAWA bill, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will give it serious consideration. We must act to reauthorize VAWA in order to help support survivors and provide them with the assistance they need to recover. Reauthorizing VAWA also sends the important message that crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking are not tolerated in this country, and that we will continue to support survivors.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues here on the importance of the VAWA reauthorization. In particular, I want to thank Senator ERNST for her months of hard work that she has put into this bill that we are introducing today. I am a proud cosponsor on that bill.

You saw in her remarks earlier her passion, her energy, and her focus on rural America, which is very important to me and my great State of Alaska. I am hopeful, as all of my colleagues here are, including our friend from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, that we in the Senate are going to get to a place where we can have a bipartisan bill that is going to reauthorize VAWA. This is hugely important for America, and it is hugely important for Alaska.

I come down to the floor every week and I talk about someone who is doing something great in my State. I like to brag about the great State of Alaska. It is an amazing place, but, I will tell you, there is one area where we are not so amazing. My State, unfortunately, has the highest rates of domestic violence and sexual assault of any State in America. It is horrendous. The number of victims and the carnage that this leaves in Alaska and throughout our country are something we should be able to come together and fix. We can do this.

I want to talk about a provision in Senator ERNST's bill that is something that I have been working on with her, but, importantly, with many Senators, including a lot of my Democratic colleagues. It is title XII of the bill. It is called the ''Choose Respect'' title. This is a series of bills that I have introduced with Senators GILLIBRAND, HARRIS, and COONS, my Democratic colleagues, and it is focused on trying to change the culture and get more legal resources to victims and to survivors.

Why is that so important? When you look at the studies that show what is the best way for a survivor to break out of the cycle of violence that they often find themselves in, one of the answers is to get them an attorney. It empowers them. It enables them to use the justice system to their advantage. Yet here is the problem. When you look—literally, on a daily basis—at the lack of legal representation for victims and survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault, it is endemic across the country. So a number of the elements of this bill, particularly under the ''Choose Respect'' title, are going to try to change this.

Last year, we had legislation that I authored that was passed into law and was then signed by the President. It was called the POWER Act and was about getting more legal resources for survivors. It was a good start, but it didn't do enough. The bill this year—again, a bill that I cosponsored earlier with Senator HARRIS of California—focuses on this issue.

Think about this: If you have an accused abuser—let's say an accused rapist—and if there is an indictment, under the Sixth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, that perpetrator gets a right to counsel. OK. That is our Constitution. That is fine. What does the victim get? What does the survivor get? Right now, the victim gets nothing. Far too often, victims go without any legal representation, and that is often the beginning of a cycle they fall into.

One of the provisions of this would be, once there is an indictment of a crime of violence, that the Federal Government would help to ensure the goal of having the victim also get an attorney through State domestic violence counsels. These are just some of the elements of this bill.

Senator GILLIBRAND and I have legislation that is part of this. It is called the Choose Respect Act, which would have a public advocacy program to try to get young men in particular to start changing our culture. It is not just a problem in Alaska; it is a problem throughout the country.

There are many things in this bill that are very bipartisan, and I certainly am committed to working with Senator CORNYN, Senator HOEVEN, Senator BLACKBURN, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator ERNST in order to get to the compromises we need to make in the Senate to pass this bill. That is what we want to have done. That is why we are all here on the floor, talking about this passionately. I think we can do it because it is too important to miss this opportunity to pass legislation that is going to help some of the most vulnerable people in our country and in my State, and I am certainly committed to working with everybody here to make it happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the vote.

NOMINATION OF ADRIAN ZUCKERMAN

Mr. President, I also ask that in relation to the Zuckerman nomination, 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.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so pleased to stand with Senator ERNST and my colleagues today to talk about the 2019 Violence Against Women Act.

Most women will tell you that they know of a female friend or acquaintance or relative who has experienced the horrors of sexual assault or domestic violence or even trafficking. Through my work with shelters back home in Tennessee, I have learned that the volunteers, the counselors, the advocates, and the attorneys who support these victims are of the utmost importance. They are who the victims need to see the minute they walk through that door, into their arms, and hear them say: How can we help you? This is a safe place.

These are the people who come around them to empower them, and the one thing I hear over and over in the wake of one's attack is that these victims need that type of support. This is why, in addition to providing funding for both prevention and educational programs, this year's authorization will do some important things. It will increase funding for the court-appointed special advocates by $3 million. It will provide over $1 million per year for Federal victim counselors. It will also help to provide transitional housing to victims, which is something they will desperately need. They need to know they have a safe place.

These resources—and this is important—are going to go directly into the hands of those who are providing these services, and this will have a direct impact on the lives of these women when they need it the most.

Just for a moment, I would like to highlight a portion of the reauthorization on which I have spent a good deal of time working this year. It has to do with a particular violent sexual crime that is so grotesque that most Americans prefer not to even acknowledge it. They don't want to admit that this exists. Yet, for the victims of female genital mutilation, the pain and the humiliation are nearly unbearable.

You would think that Federal prosecutors would be able to make short work out of such heinous charges, but due to a loophole in Federal criminal law, scores of victims have watched their abusers walk free. The Federal Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act of 2019, which is a separate bill that I sponsored earlier this year, is now a part of this year's reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. It will correct fatal constitutional flaws in the Federal statute that bans the practice of FGM. When this is done, under Federal law, prosecutions for mutilation and cutting will be able to continue.

I would be remiss if I did not say that in a perfect world, we would not have to worry about allocating resources for safe houses and for victim counseling. We should not have to do this, but this is not a perfect world. So, yes, indeed, we do have to step up and do this for the sake of the thousands of women who fall victim to sexual violence, trafficking, and sexual abuse each year.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and work on this. Let's pass the 2019 Violence Against Women Act.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON ZUCKERMAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Zuckerman nomination?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 (Mr. COTTON. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 362 Ex.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Feinstein	Reed
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden

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.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 503.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, last week, my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL stood on the floor of this Chamber to talk about the epidemic of gun violence in our country. Gun violence is an issue that hits close to home for my friend from Connecticut.

Seven years ago, his home State was the site of one of the most horrific acts of gun violence anyone can imagine. A young man armed with an assault rifle opened fire in Sandy Hook Elementary School, murdering 20 first graders and 6 adults.

While he spoke on the floor of this Senate, Senator BLUMENTHAL was handed a note informing him that, at that very moment, an active shooter was on the loose at another school—this one in Santa Clarita, CA. This marked the 243rd instance of gun violence at a school in this country since the massacre at Columbine High School in 1999. Sadly, today, school shootings have become almost routine and commonplace. It has gotten to the point that students are fearful but, sadly, not surprised when a shooting occurs at their school.

Following an attack last year at Santa Fe High School in Texas that killed eight students and two teachers, 17-year-old student Paige Curry was asked whether there was a part of her that couldn't believe this happened at her school. Her response was heartbreaking. She said:

There wasn't.

She said:

It's been happening everywhere. I've always felt it would eventually happen here too.

This is the country we now live in: a country where we have more guns than we have people; a country where a mass shooting—that is a shooting involving the death or injury of four or more victims—occurs, on average, more than once every day; a country where school shootings occur frequently enough that students feel it will eventually happen at their own school.

This is not the country any of us should want to live in. Yet the U.S. Senate—one of the few institutions

that can actually do something to help prevent gun violence—does nothing. Gun violence kills 100 people in our country every day—every day. That is 3,000 people a month and 36,000 people a year.

This is a crisis, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not treating it like one. Perhaps looking at the numbers—100 people dying every day—is just way too abstract.

How would the majority leader react if the entire population of Sparta, KY—all 231 residents—disappeared in less than 3 days?

How would the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee react if all 128 residents of Livingston, SC, disappeared in a little over a day?

How would my colleagues from Texas react if Bartlett's 2,600 residents were killed in just under a month?

This is the scale of what is happening in our country every single day, week, and year. This is a crisis, and it is past time Senate Republicans start treating it like one.

Here is what we can do right now. We can join the House in passing H.R. 8, a bill that would close loopholes in the background check system. More than 90 percent of the American public supports this bill. Although it passed the House 266 days ago—almost a year ago—the majority leader refuses to even bring the bill to the Senate floor for a vote.

We can also pass S. 66, which would reinstitute the Federal assault weapons ban that expired in 2004. I have joined Senator FEINSTEIN and 34 of my colleagues in cosponsoring this commonsense measure, but the Republican majority refuses to hold a hearing or otherwise consider it.

We can finally pass an extreme risk protection order bill that would allow police or family members to petition a court to remove firearms from people who may be a danger to themselves or to others, and despite repeated promises after each mass shooting that we will get a vote, the vote never comes.

We all know none of these bills alone will end gun violence in our country, but they will help keep guns out of the hands of those who are a danger to themselves and others. They will make those guns that remain available for sale far less lethal. In other words, the bills will make us safer.

Republicans refuse to take any of these commonsense steps. Instead, they cower before the NRA, an organization that curries favor with gun manufacturers and gun rights extremists by opposing seemingly every piece of gun safety legislation that is introduced; this, in spite of the fact that a strong majority of the NRA's claimed 5 million members actually support stronger gun safety protections.

We all remember the aftermath of the Sandy Hook massacre, where it seemed for a brief moment Congress might pass a gun safety bill for the first time in a generation. Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY introduced a modest background check proposal that actually came to the Senate floor for a vote, but what happened? The NRA came out against the bill, and nearly every Republican Member of the Senate fell in line to defeat it.

The vote came in the aftermath of a shooting that took the lives of 20 innocent elementary school children, and my Republican colleagues chose to side with the NRA and its $50-plus million in campaign donations.

Today those first graders who were killed would be in the eighth grade, and yet we still haven't passed a background check law. We have seen the NRA block commonsense gun safety bills time and again. Most recently, President Trump voiced support for strengthening background checks in the wake of mass shootings in El Paso, Dayton, and Gilroy. He tweeted that ''Republicans and Democrats must come together and get strong background checks.''

Days later, he spoke on the phone with the NRA executive vice president and CEO Wayne LaPierre and quickly changed his tune. Suddenly, our loophole-ridden background system became ''very, very strong,'' to quote the President. He no longer saw a need for additional legislation.

The President of the United States is often called the most powerful man in the world. Yet, in the face of opposition from the NRA, Donald Trump proved himself anything but.

Like so many people across the country, I am angry and frustrated that Republicans in Congress seem to care more about satisfying the NRA than taking commonsense steps to keep our communities safe.

Every day that Republicans in Congress refuse to act costs lives. In the 6 days following the November 14 shooting in which two people were killed and three others wounded at Saugus High School, there have been at least four more mass shootings.

On November 16, five were killed and one wounded in a murder-suicide in Paradise Hills, CA. On November 17, four were killed and an additional six were wounded when gunmen opened fire at a backyard party at Fresno, CA. That same day, four were injured when a gunman fired shots into a home outside Cleveland, OH. On November 18, one was killed and four injured in a shooting in Newark, NJ.

These shootings happen quickly—16 seconds in the case of the Saugus High School shooting in Santa Clarita. This is hardly enough time to expect the proverbial ''good guy with a gun'' to protect innocent men, women, and children caught in the line of fire.

Failing to take decisive action to confront the crisis of gun violence in our country makes the Senate complicit in its continuation. Instead of making more excuses for the Senate's inaction, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should stop hiding behind the NRA and join us in passing commonsense gun safety legislation that will save lives.

As our country endures mass shooting after mass shooting, I have to ask, at what point do we say, ''Enough''? When will my Republican colleagues turn their backs on the NRA's leadership, listen to the 90 percent of the American people and the rank-and-file NRA members who join them, and pass gun safety laws? The cost of continued inaction is far too high.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Wake up. What is it going to take? What is it going to take?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as the 2020 Democratic Presidential candidates prepare to debate this evening. We are sure to hear once again about their proposals for massive taxing and spending. At the top of the list is their $34 trillion Medicare for All, which is really a one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme for the people of our country. Here is the key point. Democrats will dramatically raise taxes on all Americans. One candidate plans to increase taxes on working families by $26 trillion over the next year—that is new taxes—new taxes—of $26 trillion. This candidate also proposes an additional $2 trillion on top of the $26 trillion by hiring an army of IRS agents to crack down on hard-working Americans who this one candidate, as a Member of this body, says can actually pay more and are not paying their full share. So Americans will pay $28 trillion more in taxes over a decade. Do not be deceived. These taxes will hit all Americans.

Democrats know they can't win this election on policy. Specifically, they are dangerous Democratic socialist policies that they are going to be promoting in the debate tonight. So what are they doing? Well, they are counting on their totally partisan impeachment process. We have been hearing all about it now for months—actually, for years.

Democrats have been obsessed with impeaching—impeaching—President Trump since day one, the day he was elected. Then fast forward to his inauguration in 2017. The campaign to impeach President Trump, starting from the day he was elected, really took force the day he was sworn into office.

Democrats want to overturn the last election, and they want to interfere with the upcoming election. Election day 2020 is now less than a year away. Still, Democrats' impeachment obsession continues to burn on.

This is an unfair, bitterly partisan process. I will tell you, the Americans I talk to at home in Wyoming see right through it. When I talk to my colleagues around the country, their constituents at home see right through it as well.

Recent polling shows that the public wants the voters—not House Democrats and not Speaker PELOSI—to make

their own call on election day. The Democrats, meanwhile, seem to prefer impeachment to doing the work of the American people—the work all of us were elected to do.

Republicans prefer to work on the issues we were elected to address: jobs, the economy, and our Nation's security. We are going to continue to work for the people who elected us.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, on another matter, I come to the floor as we approach another government funding deadline. The fact is, it is already past time to fund the government, especially our military.

Republicans have worked all year to complete the annual appropriations process and to get it done on time. Here is the problem: Republicans can't pass the annual funding bills alone. We need cooperation from the Democrats. We need the House Democrats' cooperation, and here in the Senate, we need to clear the 60-vote hurdle. So we need Senate Democrats to be involved in the process as well. But Democrats prefer impeachment grandstanding rather than governing. That is what we are facing here today.

We are nearly 2 months into fiscal year 2020, and we have yet to pass any of the 2020 funding bills. The government has been running under what is called a short-term continuing resolution. This current continuing resolution is set to expire Thursday—tomorrow. We will, undoubtedly, pass another stopgap continuing resolution this week, but these are only a temporary fix. They are needed to keep the government's lights on but at last year's funding levels. Meanwhile, there is no end in sight to Democrats' 3-year-long impeachment obsession. Their impeachment fever rages on.

They are so consumed by this bitterly partisan process that they cannot focus on the priorities of the American people. They are too consumed to fix our aging roads and bridges, too obsessed to pass ''America First'' trade deals, and too fixated to fund the government on time. Above all, people expect us to fully fund defense—the defense of our Nation. Yet the Democrats continue to stonewall.

Republicans are fighting to fully fund the military; Democrats are waging war on the Commander in Chief. Remember, both parties came to the table and completed a bipartisan budget deal this past summer. The deal meant that we could fund the government on time. The deal supported critical defense funding to keep our Nation safe, and it included a major pay raise for our troops.

So what happened? It is pretty clear. The Democrats went back on their word. And in so doing, they broke faith with the American people and broke faith with our troops—those in harm's way today.

Back at home in Wyoming, a deal is a deal. Your word means something. A handshake means something. You never go back on your word, certainly not when you make promises to our men and women in uniform. Nevertheless, the Democrats have since poisoned the well with unreasonable partisan demands. They are tying our Americans' hands, repeatedly blocking key defense votes. Democrats filibuster and Democrats impeach while neglecting the troops.

U.S. forces, meanwhile, are facing heightened threats with last year's funding levels. The fact is, while necessary, these continuing resolutions take a real toll on our military. The current CR means a $22 billion cut from this summer's bipartisan budget deal when it comes to our troops. It is harming military readiness and harming military training.

The CR has also delayed new weapons programs, and it has suspended existing weapons programs. These include hypersonic strike weapons, missile defense systems, and new fighters and ships.

Our adversaries—most notably Iran, China, and Russia—pose a grave, growing threat to our Nation. That hasn't stopped House and Senate Democrats from blocking both the Defense authorization and funding bills. Right now they are blocking both.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which is the authorizing bill, has passed and been signed every year since 1961. That is when John Kennedy was President of the United States—1961.

The NDAA has a long history of strong bipartisan support. Yet, right now, House Democrats are delaying final passage of our National Defense Authorization Act. Again, they are blocking the House's spending bill for our military, even though it gives our troops a well-earned pay raise.

Like the Presiding Officer, I frequently visit our troops overseas. I did so last month. We have a number of Wyoming National Guard members deployed around the world, and it is always an honor to spend time with them.

Most recently, I visited Wyoming troops deployed in the Middle East and in Kosovo. The Wyoming guard is about 400 members overseas. It is our State's largest deployment in a decade. As I noted at this year's American Legion Post 6 Veterans Day celebration in Cheyenne, WY, these troops will be away from home for Thanksgiving; they will be away from home for Christmas; and they will be away from home for New Year's as well.

Both my dad and my father-in-law served overseas. My dad fought in Europe in World War II in the pivotal Battle of the Bulge, the 75th anniversary of which is coming up next month. My father-in-law fought in both theaters during World War II and also served in the Korean war.

The U.S. Armed Forces are on the frontlines. They are defending our freedoms, and they are doing it every single day. They make this sacrifice 365 days a year, and they do it to protect us, to protect our freedom, and to protect our Nation. U.S. servicemembers never quit. They don't complain, and we don't quit on them when they need us the most.

Our troops deserve our full support right now, and, clearly, that support must be bipartisan. Yet Democrats remain too obsessed to do the work of the Nation. People elected them to do a job, and those people are nowhere to be found.

Think about it. Democrats are fast-tracking impeachment and filibustering the defense funding bill. How can they do that in good conscience? Instead of funding certainty, we have an impeachment circus.

Republicans are committed to work on policy priorities for the people who elected us. It is time for Democrats to stop the stonewalling. Let's give our troops the state-of-the-art tools they need and the raise they deserve and have earned.

Democrats need to get their priorities in order. Defense should be top of the list. It is past time to keep our promises to the military. It is past time to give the troops a well-earned and well-deserved pay raise, and it is past time to fund the defense of our Nation and to fund our government.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PENSIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the financial crisis facing the private sector multiemployer pension system calls for comprehensive reform and getting it done soon.

The crisis is severe and growing worse every day. Would you believe about 125 multiemployer plans are in so-called critical and declining financial status? These plans report that they will become insolvent over the next two decades. There will be a lot of people without a retirement plan if we don't act.

Several large plans, including the United Mine Workers Pension Fund and the large Central States Pension Fund, predict these plans will become insolvent in the next few years. That is not a very comfortable environment for those retirees.

This will leave more than 1.3 million participants without the pension benefits they have been promised and, of course, worked for probably throughout their whole lives.

In just my State of Iowa, the benefits of close to 10,000 participants of multiemployer plans are at risk if the system fails. Ten thousand Iowans being affected by what we do or don't do, obviously, gets my attention. That figure of 10,000 will represent over $70 million in benefits paid out annually that these individuals rely on in retirement.

More broadly, another large group of multiemployer plans are in critical status. They report that no realistic combination of contribution increases or allowable benefit reductions—options available under the current law

to address their financial condition—will enable these plans to emerge from their current, poorly funded financial condition. So it is very important that Congress act to save these retirement plans. These plans cover millions more workers and retirees across the Nation, and those workers and retirees face significant benefit cuts under existing law.

We should also be concerned about the financial health of the Federal insurance system that backs up these retirement benefits. The Federal insurance system goes by the name of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. The PBGC's multiemployer pension program may itself become insolvent if only one or possibly two larger multiemployer plans fail.

One of these plans, the United Mine Workers, just lost its last large contributing employer to bankruptcy. Without reforms, the Federal guaranty system, the PBGC, reports it will be insolvent no later than 2026. When that happens, the PBGC will not be able to pay either current or future retirees more than a very small fraction of the benefits they have been promised.

Consequently, substantial reductions in retirement income are a very real possibility for the millions of workers and retirees who depend on benefits from these plans. We need to act very soon to protect the hard-earned pension benefits of the workers who participate in these plans.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am on the floor today to join with Chairman ALEXANDER from the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee to release a responsible reform plan to address the immediate financial challenges of a number of plans in critical financial condition and also at the same time to secure the multiemployer pension system over the long term, not just a quick fix that is going to last a short period of time.

As we looked at options for reforming the current system, we relied on several important reform principles. I will go through these principles.

First, a reform plan should provide balanced assistance to the most poorly funded plans.

The second principle is that Federal assistance to the failing plans should rely on as little taxpayer dollars as possible.

The third principle is that reforms must promote long-term stability of the multiemployer pension system and the long-term solvency of the PBGC.

To help the sickest plans recover their financial footing, our proposal creates a special partition option for multiemployer plans.

I want everybody to know that this is not a new concept. In fact, quite simply, it expands on the PBGC's existing authority. It is based on banking industry reforms that Congress enacted after the Great Depression and at other times.

The partition option permits employers to maintain a financially healthy multiemployer plan by carving out pension benefit liabilities owed to participants who have been ''orphaned'' by employers who have exited the plan without paying their full share of those liabilities. By removing these liabilities, we allow the original plan to continue to provide benefits in a self-sustaining manner by funding benefits with contributions from current participating employers. In effect, partitioning creates a healthy pension that continues to meet all of its obligations to retirees and a separate ''sick pension'' that requires attention and assistance from the PBGC.

For this partition program to operate effectively and address the plans that are in immediate danger, a limited amount of Federal taxpayer funds will be needed to support the PBGC. We expect the necessary Federal resources to comprise only a small—I should say very small—portion of the financial assistance provided to the faltering multiemployer plans, and it is our intent, as we should be fiscally responsible, to offset those costs.

We should also acknowledge the reality that action right now means lower taxpayer involvement than if we wait for the PBGC to become insolvent, which would lead to a far larger commitment of taxpayer funds in the not too distant future. Congress needs to be ahead of the real catastrophe we know is coming.

Over the long run, the reforms we are proposing will be sustained primarily by shared-sacrifice funding reforms and a new premium structure for all stakeholders of the multiemployer plans.

Because taxpayer dollars would be at risk if the sickest plans fail to move to fully funded status, the proposal also includes a number of plan-governance reforms to strengthen multiemployer plans, to protect the taxpayers' contributions to the overall reforms, and to shield taxpayers from future risks.

While partitioning addresses one element needed for reform, Senator ALEXANDER and I propose to go a step further to make significant changes to the management and operation of all multiemployer pension plans. This is something that should have been done years ago so that plan trustees would have had to act in a responsible way, and maybe we wouldn't be where we are today, but we want to make sure this doesn't happen in the future. If we go that way—and we must go that way—moving forward, the entire multiemployer pension system will be better funded and more transparent to participants, to sponsoring employers, and to government regulators.

Providing relief to critical and declining plans is contingent on making changes to the legal framework of the multiemployer pension system to ensure that all plans operate, as people would expect, in a financially sound way in the future.

To help finance the partition relief and to provide a stronger PBGC insurance guarantee to participants in the system, our reform proposal creates a new premium structure. That structure includes raising the flat-rate premium to $80 per participant in a multiemployer plan, putting the multiemployer program on par with a single-employer guarantee program. The new premium structure also broadens the base on which premiums are assessed to more equitably spread the cost of insuring benefits and to ensure PBGC solvency. The new structure applies a copayment to active workers and retirees. However, because of the broader contribution base, the copayments are significantly less than the amount of the typical benefit cuts retirees face under current law if their plan should fail. Older retirees and disabled participants will also be protected.

In addition, our reform package establishes a variable-rate premium. This variable-rate premium, which parallels the variable-rate premium that has long applied to single-employer plans, is tied to a plan's funding status to manage risks stemming from more poorly funded plans. This also creates an incentive for plans to improve their funding over time.

The new premium structure not only helps to secure the finances of the PBGC but also funds an increase in the guaranteed benefit level for the vast majority of participants in the system. Raising the guaranteed benefit will greatly reduce the risk to retirees of significant reductions in retirement income, which would otherwise occur if their multiemployer plan becomes insolvent.

While the changes to the premium structure will fundamentally strengthen the financial status of the multiemployer pension system and the PBGC, the reforms we are proposing make other important structural changes to the multiemployer system to help ensure that the entire system moves to a well-funded status over the long haul.

We achieve this goal by addressing key flaws in the current legal framework governing multiemployer plans. Current multiemployer plan rules do not serve the best interests of workers and retirees. You can tell that by the bad condition, financially, some of these plans are in today, threatening the retirement of our workers who have paid into them over a lifetime. These rules have not been sufficient to keep plans in good financial health, and they tend to underestimate liabilities and result in insufficient contributions to the plans.

To ensure that benefit promises offered in a multiemployer plan are ultimately met, our proposal strengthens the rules for measuring the value of promised pension benefits and the amount of employer contributions necessary to pay them when the worker retires. These changes will require plan trustees and actuaries to measure and project plan assets and liabilities in a more prudent and accurate way than has been required under present law.

These changes also are designed to help move plans toward full funding

and at the same time protect the interests of plan participants and the taxpayers who would otherwise be required to bail out these multiemployer plans.

Our reform proposal also improves the so-called zone rules. Plans will be required to look further into the future when estimating their financial status, and will have to institute a form of stress testing to check whether a plan can remain financially sustainable through potential economic and demographic stresses. Depending on its health, plans will have to bolster the steps they take when signs of financial hardship arise. That is a pretty commonsense approach.

We will also replace current withdrawal-liability rules with a simpler, more transparent, and consistent method for determining an employer's liability if it withdraws from a multiemployer pension plan.

We have to look to the future. In doing so, the proposal includes a new option for sponsors of multiemployer plans to establish a new hybrid pension plan that we are going to call a composite plan. We have heard a great deal of interest from smaller businesses and their workers about the benefits of a composite plan approach, including less costly operations and more certainty in the financing of these plans.

In closing, let me say that there are no perfect solutions to the multiemployer pension crisis. But it is very true that the longer we wait, the harder and more expensive this problem gets. But it is clear, our solution is far better than allowing the system to continue on its current path—to collapse—and far better than merely throwing Federal money into plans without changing how they operate. The problem is never going to be solved by waiting or by using taxpayers' money.

The House has essentially advanced a pure, no-strings-attached bailout plan that throws taxpayer money to the plans in the hope that they can somehow earn returns sufficient to keep them going. We rely a great deal on the Congressional Budget Office around here for estimates of the future, and the nonpartisan CBO has told us that the House's proposal will not generate sustainability of pension plans or the sustainability of the PBGC. So we had better not spend our time on something the Congressional Budget Office says just isn't going to bring a solution and definitely not a long-term solution to these issues.

In contrast, the proposal that Senator ALEXANDER and I are releasing today addresses the immediate needs of the few multiemployer plans facing immediate crisis in a manner that protects participant benefits and also ensures a sustainable multiemployer pension system for the long haul, and it does this all in a fiscally responsible way.

Our proposal is not a giveaway to corporations or to unions, and it is a better deal for the taxpayers than a future that would be an even larger problem and PBGC funding needs that will almost surely be met with a taxpayer bailout.

All participants in the system would make a sacrifice. Let me make that clear. All participants in the system are going to sacrifice—employers, unions, workers, and retirees. I am sure each one of those groups isn't going to consider this fair and responsible, but with a problem like this, if everybody doesn't give a little bit, it is never going to be fair and responsible anyway. But with some shared pain will come significant shared gain that will be to the benefit of over 1.5 million participants in about 125 multiemployer plans that are in serious financial jeopardy.

Without changes to the current system, we can't say for sure that people are going to get the benefits that they sacrificed for over a lifetime of work. But our plan, we are confident, will benefit all multiemployer plans and their participants by providing a stronger system for the long haul and by promoting long-term solvency of the PBGC.

Senator ALEXANDER and I offer this proposal as a path forward for a multiemployer pension system that we all know is in crisis.

Now, as we turn to getting this job done, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to advance this proposal. We all know that just because you lay something on the table, that it is not necessarily going to be passed that way. So maybe there is some compromise needed. But whether it is this proposal or a little bit of compromise, we have to get this piece of legislation to the President's desk before more pension holders face losses of the benefits they have earned and benefits that they were promised.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2486

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to talk about what some observers have called one of the best historically black colleges and universities in our country—Delaware State University in Dover, DE, home of the Hornets.

For a number of years, I was a naval flight officer in the Vietnam war and then came back to the United States and moved to Delaware and got an MBA at the University of Delaware. Right away after that, I went to work at what became the Delaware Economic Office. We were headquartered at the campus of Delaware State College.

Delaware State College was an HBCU and was not a well-funded college, not one that was in the favor, frankly, of the Governor and legislature, for the most part, and was a bit of a stepchild.

I used to think: Boy, wouldn't it be great to be able to help transform Delaware State College into something historic, memorable, and outstanding.

Later on, I would be elected Governor—about 15 years later—and have the chance to work with the fellow who was the president of Delaware State University at the time and to transform, with the help of the Delaware General Assembly, Delaware State College into Delaware State University.

Today, of all the HBCUs in the country, I think its latest rating is No. 5, and I think there are 70 or 75 of them in all. They just reported that their enrollment for the coming year will reach 5,000 students, all in undergraduate, graduate, master's and Ph.D. programs, which is a record. We are proud of the Hornets and the great job they are doing educating people.

Last month, in one of my frequent visits to Delaware State, I took a campus tour unlike any other, from the cockpit of a brand-new Vulcanair V1.0 single-engine aircraft. We flew all over Kent County, north of Dover. We had a chance to do some approaches. It was a lot of fun, and it was basically a reminder that Delaware State provides undergraduate and graduate programs for all kinds of training and educational needs. One of the key ones right now and one of the most interesting, at least for a naval flight officer, is that Delaware State is the largest producer of pilots and aviation professionals of color in the country. I believe they have over 100 students and every one of them, when they graduate, has a job waiting for them. Some are pilots and others do a variety of work for aviation.

Today, we have about 157 million people who go to work in this country, and we have about 5 million jobs where nobody will show up. One of those areas where we need people is in the aviation world, and Delaware State is providing that. When the plane landed earlier this year at the airport just north of Dover, I held a roundtable with the Delaware State University executive vice president and provost, Dr. Tony Allen. We talked with administrators and students about a bipartisan bill called the FUTURE Act, which was discussed on the floor today and in previous days.

The FUTURE Act, as you will recall, was introduced by Senator JONES along with Senator SCOTT from South Carolina, and would provide a little over $255 million annually to minority-serving institutions of higher education including about $85 million to HBCUs for an additional 2 years through fiscal year 2021.

Almost $900,000 of that money will go directly to Delaware State University.

You might ask: What would Delaware State do with that money? They use this Federal funding to help support STEM and teacher education programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and to ensure that students at Delaware State have access to the best research tools. Specifically, this funding is used to help modernize classrooms at DSU, to improve math instruction, and to help recruit young men of color to teach in K-through-12 classrooms so that all students have mentors they can look up to.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, only 2 percent of teachers in the American public school system are African-American men, but 20 percent or more of the students are African-American males.

Think about that. A lot of these African-American males, frankly, haven't had some of the best mentors and role models in their lives growing up, and we have so few teachers of color that are minority male. The FUTURE Act funding, I think, is a good step for Congress to take to bridge that gap. I think it is a good example of how the Federal Government supports this critical mission at Delaware State and at HBCUs across the country.

Back in early September, the House of Representatives did its job and voted to reauthorize this funding through the bipartisan FUTURE Act. Unfortunately, the Senate has not followed the lead of the House in this critical funding for HBCUs which lapsed on September 30.

Before I yield to Senator COONS, I just wanted to say that my recollection is—and I might have this wrong, but I am looking for my staff, who would be sitting right here in front of me telling me if I had the right numbers—that 2 percent of teachers who are in public schools in America and I think in Delaware are men of color. They are African American. Almost 20 percent, maybe 25 percent, of the students in the public school system are people of color and about half of those are male. We need to do a better job.

As Governor, I started a mentoring program. We recruited, when I was Governor, 10,000 mentors—a lot of them to work with children of color. A lot of them have grown up in homes where they didn't have a positive male role model in their life. That is why the mentoring program is so important. That is why we especially need minority male teachers who are African American. That is not all we need, but it is a big part of what we need. Over half of the minority male teachers that we have in Delaware in our schools were educated at Delaware State University—over half—and we need more of them.

Senator COONS has joined me on the floor. I am enormously proud of Delaware State University and the leadership they have today and in the past, and proud to have been an honorary Hornet, and proud to yield to my colleague, Senator COONS, who has been right there fighting for Delaware State University.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague from our home State of Delaware. I come to the floor to join a number of my colleagues who are speaking on a pressing issue, the critical lapse in funding for hundreds of colleges and universities across our Nation.

On September 30, $255 million in annual Federal funding for historically black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions expired.

Since this fund was first created, it has supported 400 HBCUs and MSIs, historically Black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions, across our country, including 97 HBCUs last year. This lapse has created real uncertainty and harm to these organizations and these universities, their students, their employees, and the public.

I just wanted to join my colleagues in highlighting the importance of this funding. I want to speak specifically to the HBCU of which Delaware is so proud—Delaware State University.

Delaware State is an engine for educational equity and access, for innovation and for leadership in our State, our region, and our Nation.

Delaware State University is one of the country's top public HBCUs. Its graduates go on to successful careers in all sorts of industries. Graduates from Delaware State have become some of our State's best nurses, teachers, business leaders, social workers, and Senate staff.

DSU's research programs are important drivers for innovation in a State with a proud history of invention and innovation. It is home to the Delaware Center for Neuroscience Research, a partnership of institutions across our State working to advance our understanding of how our brains form thoughts and memories and feelings, and how they change over time as we age.

It is also home to OSCAR, the Optical Science Center for Applied Research, where research that is in part federally funded is helping to speed early detection of disease, supporting our soldiers in better deterring and detecting threats, and equipping NASA missions, including the Mars Rover, with improved sensors.

To put it simply, we are very proud of Delaware State, and there is a lot of which to be proud. DSU grads are so impressive that I have asked several of them to join my staff here in Washington. Their commitment to equity and excellence is why we can't allow HBCUs around the country, such as Delaware State, to lose out on vitally needed Federal funding.

Last year, this program provided nearly $1 million—$887,000—to Delaware State, which is about 20 percent of their title III funding. These funds have a direct impact on students and funds critical science, math, and educator preparation programs.

There is no good reason for the Senate to ignore our HBCUs and MSIs and deny them the funding they deserve. In September, the House passed a bipartisan, budget-neutral, 2-year extension of this critical funding, which is known as the FUTURE Act. While I share Senator ALEXANDER's commitment to permanently extending this funding, we must not ask institutions to put their budgeting and planning on hold while we here in the Senate negotiate over many other pressing issues in higher education.

I urge my colleagues to pass the FUTURE Act immediately, and with that, I would like to make a motion.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that 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 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I will object—I am disappointed that my colleagues are offering such a short-term, piecemeal approach toward resolving the problems of our historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions, when I have repeatedly offered a much better idea, and they have blocked it. I will offer it again in just a moment. I know the Senator from North Carolina is here to speak on the same subject.

Compared to what I have offered, they are offering a short-term, 2-year, budget gimmick-supported idea that will have a difficult time passing the Senate. What I have offered and they have blocked is permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions—permanent funding—at the level of $255 million a year, properly funded. That is No. 1. There is assurance from the U.S. Department of Education that every single historically Black institution—there are 97 of them—have enough funding to go until next October. Even the Senate ought to be able to do its job in that period of time.

At the same time, I have offered the Alexander-Jones bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, which would simplify the Federal aid application form called the FAFSA for 8 million minority students, among 20 million families in this country.

Why would anybody want to take a short-term, piecemeal approach that is based on a budget gimmick that couldn't pass the Senate compared with permanent funding for historically Black colleges and a bipartisan proposal to change the hated, dreaded FAFSA by reducing the number of questions you have to answer from 108 questions to between 18 and 30? This

document is the single biggest impediment to minority students going to college in America today, and the Democrats are blocking the passage of a bipartisan bill.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for objecting. I want to tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I appreciate their being here giving the passionate speeches they have because they made the case for Senator ALEXANDER's bipartisan bill.

You see, incorporated in this legislation is an initiative by Senator JONES and Senator BALDWIN. Anybody who makes this out to be a partisan piece of legislation is just flat wrong. I have more historical Black colleges in North Carolina than any State can claim. When those chancellors and presidents have been presented with the question: Do you want 2 years or permanent, they all said permanent. They didn't know there was a permanent option.

I say this to my three colleagues because none of them are on the committee: There is a permanent option for funding historically Black colleges. It is in the chairman's bill. We have been told that the FUTURE Act needs to be passed. The FUTURE Act is 2 years long. There is not much of a future there. We ought to match its title with the chairman's bill because this really does address the future.

The No. 1 concern of historically Black institutions is predictability of funding. The chairman's bill is permanent. We are not going to come in here in 2 years and seek another reauthorization, but the benefit is that we are passing good legislation.

Let me point out to my colleagues that it is important to read legislation. The FUTURE Act is funded by whacking the funding for the State guaranty agencies. By taking away the account maintenance fees that these State-based organizations receive to administer loans, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. These same students who are probably going to go to historically Black universities are also seeking State-based loans to do it, and we are providing the institutions 2 years of predictability on one side, and we are taking away the fees that are needed to administer the loans to allow them to be able to afford it. This is when it is important to look at the details.

The way the FUTURE Act is funded, it actually hurts all institutions in North Carolina. Just today, I heard from the North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority about how important this funding is for their daily functions in administering student loans. So I believe there is a better way to extend HBC funding but also not to hurt students.

At the end of the day, our focus—the human face we see is the student who benefits from the educational opportunity they have been given. I would tell you that the FUTURE Act flunks on all counts. It is not permanent. It takes away from some because of how it is funded. We have an opportunity with Chairman ALEXANDER's bill, the Student Aid Improvement Act, which would extend this title III funding permanently, but it would also include other bipartisan support changes in higher education, like expanding Pell grants. Every Member of the Senate has sat on this floor and said we have to do something on Pell grants. Here is your opportunity.

It doesn't fit in the timeframe of passing a bill that passed the House that provides 2 years of funding, but we have a bipartisan piece of legislation. It simplifies the financial student financial aid process. You saw the chairman hold up the form. There is nobody who can defend the continuation of that form. It should be one page. The chairman of the Education Committee has tried for now 5 years to transition that to one page. You might look at us and say: Well, we can do this very quickly, but we need time to talk about this. We have taken 5 years to do this, and the people on the committee know this.

This is the sixth time you have come to the floor and asked unanimous consent to do the exact same thing: Pass this; don't look at anything else.

No, that is wrong, but it is not wrong because we are in the majority. It is wrong because it is not serving the students for whom we are supposed to be here setting policy. It simplifies aid award letters to students. It is actually easy to tell them they got their student aid. It is cumbersome. If you are on the committee, you understand the agony they go through. We are wiping all of that away.

I believe Chairman ALEXANDER has a better path. I also would like to remind my colleagues that while this funding should be extended, there has been no lapse. Let me state that again. It should be extended, and there has been no lapse.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter I received from Secretary DeVos, stating that the title III funding in question is available through September 2021, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2019.

DEAR [REDACTED] I write to clarify the status of grants under Title III, Part F of the Higher Education Act of 1965, in light of the enactment of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019 (Pub. L. No. 116–59), signed on September 27, 2019.

Initially, I want to note that the new law has no effect on funds that we recently awarded in the Title III, Part F programs. Funds obligated in fiscal year (FY) 2019 have already been made available to grantees under all Part F programs in the Department of Education's (Department) G5 System for the project period beginning on October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2020. Those funds will remain available to grantees for allowable uses during this period. In addition, in the Part F programs that award grants competitively, the Department has carried over FY 2019 funds into FY 2020 to support noncompeting continuation awards and supplements for project periods from October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021.

The Department's ability to make additional formula grants in FY 2020 under Part F for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, and to conduct new competitions for FY 2021, depends on the availability of congressionally appropriated funds. However, this will have no bearing on the grant funds that have already been made available to grantees for the next 12 months.

This Administration is committed to each and every HBCU and other minority-serving institutions and the important work they do in educating historically underrepresented student populations. If you have any questions about these programs, please reach out to your program officer in the Department's Office of Postsecondary Education.

Sincerely,

BETSY DEVOS.

Mr. BURR. On that basis alone, there is not the sense of urgency that some have come to the floor six times and suggested. I don't disagree with any of my colleagues that this is something we need to do now, but a 2-year temporary bill that doesn't accomplish any of the other reforms when we have had 5 years of bipartisan work—why would we not take this option? Why would we not sit down and find a way for Chairman ALEXANDER's bill—which has many Democratic initiatives in it—to pass and provide historically Black colleges and universities with permanent funding, provide students with a one-page form to fill out for student aid, provide an expedited way for the notification when their loans have been approved? We are there, but for some reason, some want us to do a 2-year temporary fix. It is wrong. I thank the chairman for objecting.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I see the Senator from Ohio. I intend to offer my alternative to which, I gather, someone plans to object. I will go ahead and do that unless he wants to speak at this point.

Mr. BROWN. Go ahead, Senator ALEXANDER.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2557

Mr. ALEXANDER. What I will do is make my offer quickly, and then I will make my speech following the objection.

Let me summarize, to begin with, that what has just happened is I have objected to a short-term, piecemeal extension of funding for historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions because it is a bill that, I think, will have great difficulty passing the Senate because of the way it is not properly funded. What I am about to offer, and which I will speak on after the objection is made, is permanent funding for historically Black colleges at the level of $255 million a year—permanent funding—as opposed to short-term, piecemeal funding as part of a

package of higher education legislation that has been prepared and cosponsored by 29 Senators—more Democrats than Republicans—with the principal other provision being reducing the questions in the FAFSA, the Federal aid application form, from 108 to between 18 and 30. This is a bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. JONES, and I, which our Senate committee has been working on for 5 years. It is the single most important impediment to keeping minority students from going to college in our State—and I think most States, according to our former Governor—and it would help 8 million minority students who fill out this complicated form every year.

I will speak more to that in just a minute, but that is what I am about to ask my friends on the other side to permit me to pass.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2557—the bill I just described, the permanent funding of historically Black colleges and the simplification of the FAFSA and other measures—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 Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I reserve the right to object.

I and my colleagues here—Senator CARPER, Senator COONS, and prominent Democrats in the education debate—have deep concerns about Senator ALEXANDER's proposed micropackage. To be sure, it is a micropackage of higher education bills. It is not a complete reauthorization.

Our caucus has been clear about what a comprehensive bill should look like. It addresses access, affordability, accountability, and campus safety. This Alexander proposal falls well short.

The Senator from Tennessee says this package is bipartisan. That is sort of true but not entirely. He has made a number of changes to the underlying bipartisan bills that do not have the support of lead Democrats on this and, in some cases, the lead Republicans of the original bills. For example, this package includes a limited repeal of the ban on Pell grants for incarcerated adults instead of the full repeal of the ban included in the bipartisan bill. Our bill adds to Pell grants.

His version of the short-term Pell Grant Program makes significant changes to the bipartisan JOBS Act of 2019, a bill of which I am an original cosponsor. The JOBS Act excludes for-profit colleges from eligibility for the program. We know the Trump administration is all about for-profit institutions, with the Secretary of Education leading the charge. This version allows for-profit colleges—the sorts of schools we know mislead and scam students in too many cases—to sneak their way into eligibility.

One of the things I admire about the chairman of the HELP Committee—and have admired since I met him 20-some years ago—was his work not just as Secretary of Education but his work as president of the University of Tennessee. He knows what for-profit colleges do for and to far too many students. His legislation removes a number of the protections meant to ensure programs eligible for this funding are actually high-quality ones that educate students. These are just a couple of the ways this micropackage is different from the original bipartisan bills. We know the micropackage cannot pass the House. Chairman SCOTT and Speaker PELOSI have been clear that they want comprehensive reform. A comprehensive HEA reauthorization can pass. That is not what this is.

I hope we can come to a bipartisan agreement, but as we work together, we can't hold hostage historically Black colleges and universities. Most of them are in the South. Most of them are in the States of my colleagues who are from the South. Most of them are in Republican States with Republican Senators. As mentioned by Senator CARPER and Senator COONS, of Delaware, my State, which is similar to Delaware, has historically Black colleges. In Ohio, Wilberforce and Central State are prominent institutions that matter so much to our State. For the nearly 2 years now since the Trump administration has been in office, these schools have been in fiscal limbo.

I know Senator ALEXANDER cares about these schools, but there is no evidence that the President of the United States does. They need their funding extended now. The mandatory funding, which is vital to these schools, ran out on September 30 because the Senate refused to act and because the President didn't seem to care. The House did its job in passing the FUTURE Act. Now HBCUs are facing impossible decisions in the face of dwindling funding. The Senate needs to immediately take up and vote on the bill the House already passed to provide full, mandatory funding for MSIs and HBCUs.

We all agree—Senator BURR, Senator ALEXANDER, the two Senators from Delaware, and Senator CARDIN, who has just joined us—that HBCUs have fostered generations of Black leaders. They are a critical part of our Nation's higher ed system. These schools have rich legacies and proven track records of educating students of color and other underrepresented students.

Wilberforce was founded in 1856 in Wilberforce, OH, as the Nation's first private institution of higher ed for Black students. Central State, which is in the same town across the road in Wilberforce, has a rich legacy of educating students as an 1890 land grant institution. We have helped it this year through the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. It is further tasked with strengthening research, extension, and teaching in food and ag science.

We know that without our HBCUs, millions of Black students would have been denied the opportunity to pursue higher ed. HBCUs account for approximately a quarter of all of Black students who earn bachelor's degrees and nearly a third of all of the African-American students who earn STEM bachelor's degrees. Our country owes an enormous debt to these schools that we don't seem to be paying back. That is why it is unconscionable that the Senate has abandoned these schools and these students.

I have heard from schools about how their budgets have been thrown into chaos. They tell me that academia is about planning, and many of them already operate close to the margins. HBCUs have already received letters from the Department of Education telling them that they are not getting future funding and that they can't use any Federal funding for long-term projects. It could mean program cuts and layoffs. It means no long-term construction projects. It means not hiring permanent faculty and not purchasing major equipment. Imagine operating a school like that.

It is shameful that in 2019 we still ignore schools that serve students of color by treating this as anything other than a must-pass bill. I know that very few African Americans voted for President Trump, and I know he seems to care for only those people who voted for him. Yet this is an obligation. Senator ALEXANDER wants to fulfill it, but he is operating in a straitjacket with this President.

It is so important that we do this. The FUTURE Act is budget neutral, and it is fully paid for. We use the same offset the administration has used. It is a bipartisan pay-for, not a gimmick.

I should add that less than 2 years ago, this Senate and President Trump had no problem passing a $1 trillion tax cut for corporations and the wealthy that wasn't paid for. We have seen that under Republican leadership in the White House. We have seen what has happened to our budget debt, and we know corporations have had huge tax cuts. We know 70 percent of the tax cuts went to the wealthiest 1 percent. Yet this body can't take care of historically Black colleges. They hold schools that serve students of color to a different standard.

I am hopeful that Senator ALEXANDER, whom I trust, and Senator MURRAY, whom I trust, will continue to negotiate a truly bipartisan and truly comprehensive higher ed reauthorization that supports HBCUs. I support those efforts. That is the way forward for the priorities that Senator ALEXANDER has outlined in his micropackage and for the updates and reauthorizations all of our students and families need. HBCUs and MSIs can't wait

until that process is over. They need action now. They have all had to overcome enough hurdles every day in order to educate their students. The U.S. Senate should not be one of those hurdles. We need to pass the FUTURE Act now.

Accordingly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I see the Senator from Maryland, but I would like to take a few minutes to describe the proposal to which Senator BROWN just objected.

I appreciate the Senator from Ohio in his saying that he hopes that Senator MURRAY and I can do what we usually do, which is to take issues within our Education Committee and work them out and present them to the Senate as a whole, but that is not the way this came up. This came up suddenly, and no one talked to me about it. Here we are when, for 5 years, we have been in the midst of reauthorizing higher education. Permanently funding historically Black colleges has always been an important part of that discussion when suddenly here comes this bill as if there were an emergency.

What I heard my friend from Ohio say is that he objects to my proposal as a microproposal, as a small proposal, but he is suggesting an even smaller proposal. He is suggesting a 2-year fix that, in my opinion, can't pass the Senate because of the way it is funded.

Plus, why would you want a 2-year fix when you have the chairman of the Education Committee working for the permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions? This is what I have offered on the floor, and that is what has just now been objected to by the Democrats.

At the same time, he mentioned a number of bills that he thought needed some changes. The request I made that was objected to also included simplifying FAFSA, which is the Federal aid application form that 20 million students fill out every year. Let's put a human face on that.

The President of Southwest Tennessee Community College in Memphis, which is a largely minority institution in terms of its students—I see my colleague from Tennessee is presiding today, and she knows this institution well—told me they lose 1,500 students every semester because of the complexity of this form. There are 108 questions. A bipartisan working group, including Senator BENNET, of Colorado, a Democrat; Senator JONES, of Alabama, a Democrat; Senator KING, of Maine, an Independent; and many others on our side, we have reduced these 108 questions to between 18 and 30. It has the support of the student aid administrators from across the country. It has the support of college presidents who see their students turned away because their parents and their grandparents see this as too complex.

Former Governor of Tennessee Bill Haslam led our legislature to create 2 free years of college tuition in Tennessee, but first you have to fill this out. Governor Haslam has told me the single biggest impediment to low-income Tennesseans getting those 2 years of free education is the complexity of that form.

Why would the Senator object to doing it when we have been working on it for 5 years and have a bipartisan bill to get it done? Why don't we pass it? Why don't we make it the law? What do we say to those 1,500 students who don't get to go to college because of this?

At the same time, at the other end of our State, the president of East Tennessee State University tells me that 70 percent of his student body is subjected to verification. The way this system works is you have to give some information to the IRS and some information to the Department of Education, and if you make one little mistake, they jerk your Pell grant while they figure out what the problem is. Seventy percent of the students were subjected to that verification, and some of them lost their scholarships while that happened. That is totally unnecessary.

People in Tennessee ask me: If that is true, why don't you pass it?

That is the question I am asking my friends because I just asked the Senate to pass it, and the Senator objected. Why don't we pass it? Why don't we make it the law? It is not as if I just showed up one day with this. We have been all the way through our process of hearings. It has been through working groups of Democratic and Republican Senators. It ought to be done.

There is no need for us to come to the floor and say we need to pass a short-term, 2-year fix for historically Black colleges when, at the same time, you could have permanent funding for historically Black colleges and could fix the Federal aid application form that 8 million minority students fill out every year—8 million students. What are the Senators going to say to them about why they are not going to make it easier for them to go to college when we are here, arguing about a short-term, piecemeal fix for historically Black colleges?

In a way, I am glad we are having this discussion because I have been trying to bring this to the attention of my colleagues and if you go home and talk to the families, they will tell you that 20 million fill this out every year. In Tennessee, it is 400,000. And college aid administrators will tell you that.

I will give another example. I was in West Tennessee a couple of weeks ago at an event that was sponsored by the Ayers family. For 20 years, they have given money to help rural kids succeed in college. What the Ayers have discovered is that instead of spending their money on scholarships, they are spending it on counselors because counselors help students more than the money does. They have found there are lots of scholarships, but it is the counselors who make the difference. Yet what do the counselors spend their time doing? They help students answer these unnecessary questions.

So we are blocking and impeding the very students the Senator is claiming he wants to help when he objects to this bill I offered today.

I want to make it clear that I will come to the floor every day, if I need to, and offer legislation for the permanent funding of historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions, which will be fully paid for, and a bipartisan proposal to simplify the FAFSA from 108 questions to 18 to 30 questions, which is estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to allow for 250,000 new American students to receive Pell grants as a result of the simplicity of what we have done.

I am disappointed that we haven't come to a bipartisan result on that. My friends who are here today know very well that this is the way I like to work. I believe it is hard to get to the U.S. Senate, that it is hard to stay here, and that while you are here, you might as well try to accomplish something. That is what I want to do. I hope we can do it on higher education.

When we accomplish it, I hope we can say we have agreed on the permanent funding for historically Black colleges and that we have elevated the importance of this complicated FAFSA to the attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle so that we say: Let's get this done. I don't want to go home any longer and have people ask me: Why don't you pass that? Why do I have to give the same information to two different parts of the Federal Government? Why are you discouraging the very low-income students who ought to be going to college?

I am disappointed in this result today, and I intend to continue to work for the permanent funding of historically Black colleges.

My last sentence will be this: I want all of the presidents of the 97 institutions to know that the U.S. Department of Education has said there is full Federal funding for historically Black colleges and minority-serving institutions for another year. Another year ought to be plenty of time for us to reject this short-term fix and to adopt a permanent solution as well as to simplify the FAFSA, have short-term Pell grants, and take up a variety of other proposals that ought to be a part of the Higher Education Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

REMEMBERING SERGEI MAGNITSKY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, November 16 was the 10th anniversary of the tragic death of Sergei Magnitsky.

Sergei Magnitsky was a Moscow-based lawyer who represented an investment company, known as Hermitage Capital, whose American-born founder was Bill Browder. In the course of Mr. Magnitsky's representation of his client, he discovered a major tax fraud issue—$230 million of taxpayer moneys being funneled through shell companies with business ties to President Putin. Mr. Magnitsky did what any good lawyer would do in discovering corruption and reported it to the local authorities. As a result, he was arrested and tortured. Ultimately, he died in prison. He was in prison for nearly a year without having a trial.

Unfortunately, this is not a unique circumstance in Russia, but we in the global community decided that we could not let this injustice go without taking action. Those responsible needed to be held accountable. Yet, in Russia, those responsible for this tragedy were promoted and received awards.

So there needs to be accountability for those who violate basic human rights and their government will not take action.

I first learned of the Magnitsky tragedy in my role as a member of the Helsinki Commission. I was the chair and ranking Democrat on the Helsinki Commission. The Helsinki Commission is the way we enforced the Helsinki Final Act that was passed in 1975, and it adheres to basic principles of human rights. It gives every member-signator of the Helsinki Final Accords the right to challenge what is happening in other states. Russia is a signator to the Helsinki Final Act. The United States is a signator, and we raised the Magnitsky issue.

Then, working with the late Senator John McCain, I authored legislation known as the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act. It was enacted into law in 2012, and what it does is it says that those who were participating in gross human rights violations in Russia—related to what happened to Sergei Magnitsky—that those who were responsible would not be allowed to visit the United States by being granted visas or to use our banking system. Why was that so important? Because these corrupt officials like to have their assets in dollars, not rubles, and they like to visit the United States, and they like their families to visit the United States.

What is unique about the Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act is that Congress can initiate the executive branch taking up particular names.

It is interesting—I have heard from many Russians who fully support what we are doing. We are giving them an opportunity for their voices to be heard.

Mr. Putin lobbied against its passage, but it passed Congress by an overwhelming vote. To date, 54 individuals have been sanctioned under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012, and it has been very effective. We have been told through press accounts that in the summit meeting between Mr. Putin and President Trump, it was one of the first subjects that Mr. Putin raised in regard to the Magnitsky sanctions. And I must tell you, it provided U.S. leadership a way to stand up and hold human rights abusers and corrupt individuals accountable for their crimes. As a result of our action, other countries acted—Canada acted; European countries acted—and we were able to get much more effective use of this sanction against human rights violators.

The Magnitsky legacy is not limited to Russia. Unfortunately, there are powerful, corrupt, and dangerous human rights violators globally, where countries do not hold these violators accountable for their actions. So once again partnering with the late Senator John McCain, I authored the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which was enacted in 2016, and we have used that act. We used it in Saudi Arabia to deal with the tragic death of Jamal Khashoggi. Over 100 individuals have been sanctioned under Global Magnitsky, including those in the DRC, Nicaragua, and Burma as result a result of the Rohingya tragedies. Once again, U.S. leadership was there. As a result of our action, we saw action in Canada, and we saw action in the European Union.

As we commemorate the 10th anniversary of Sergei Magnitsky's tragic death, let us recognize that Sergei's life and legacy have led to two of the most significant human rights accountability laws that exist today. Because of Sergei Magnitsky, the United States and many of our allies now have the tools available to hold human rights abusers accountable and to deter would-be perpetrators from committing such crimes in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to continue to honor Sergei Magnitsky through our actions. Let us stand by our values and continue to ensure the protection and defense of human rights around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I know people are waiting to see what might happen around here. We will have before us a continuing resolution to fully fund the Federal Government through December 20. I wish this was not necessary, and that we would have just passed all of our appropriations bills. But while I wish the step was not necessary, I would urge all Members to vote aye.

I wish we were further along in our work, but it is not for lack of trying. It is no secret what is holding up negotiations—the President's demand for $8.6 billion more for his vanity wall along the southern border. This is a wall the President gave his word to the American people that Mexico would pay for it, and now he is telling the American people: No, I want the American taxpayers to pay for it.

I should point out that he already has $10 billion on hand. He could not possibly build that much of his wall, anyway, over the next fiscal year with the eminent domain that would have to be done in Texas and elsewhere. And, of course, the wall they have built, at a cost of millions of taxpayer dollars a mile, can be defeated by a $100 saw at the local hardware store. The President was talking about how they will make it so high that it will be hard to get over it, but you can just kneel down and cut a hole to go through it. But he has $10 billion on hand for his wall. It could not be spent in the next year no matter how much the government is overcharged for the wall.

He stole $6.3 billion of that from our troops and their families, and despite the fact that the vast majority of that money has yet to be spent, he wants more.

If we hadn't had this issue, we would have had our work done by now. To quote one of the most famous baseball players, ''It's deja vu all over again.'' The President is once again putting his own personal interests ahead of the interests of our country.

I would like to remind the Chamber what is at stake in the annual appropriations bills. These are the things that are being held up because the President wants us to forget his promise that Mexico would pay for this wall.

What is being held up? Well, education for our children. Cutting-edge medical research. Anybody who has a family member with cancer or diabetes or any other disease wants their tax dollars being spent on medical research. Support for our Nation's farmers, medical care for our veterans, addressing the opioid crisis, environmental programs to keep our air safe to breathe and our water safe to drink—all of these things are being held up, all are being put on autopilot because the President cares about his wall—his symbolic wall—far more than he does about medical research or medical care for our veterans.

So we find ourselves at a critical juncture. We could pass another continuing resolution to allow us to continue to negotiate in good faith, which I am committed to do, or shut down the government. Well, that is really not a choice.

The continuing resolution before us is a good bill that will allow us to continue our bipartisan, bicameral negotiating on the fiscal year 2020 appropriations process. I hope all Senators will support it.

I would note for Senators how the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator SHELBY, and I, as vice chairman, have kept the process in a bipartisan fashion. Almost all of our appropriations bills have come out of committee unanimously or virtually unanimously. They have come to the floor, and then they have gotten an overwhelming vote. Let's rely on those Senators in both parties who are willing to set aside political posturing and who are willing to set aside symbolism and instead have substance.

In addition to continuing to fund our government for 4 more weeks, our bill tackles some issues that have to be addressed right away. It provides the Commerce Department with the necessary funds to carry out the decennial census, which is required by our Constitution. It provides funds for mobile centers to ensure that the census reaches those in the hardest to reach areas. It fulfills our constitutional obligation to make sure every American is counted.

The bill includes a provision that would block a looming $7.6 billion rescission of highway funding set to hit the States July 1—the States of virtually everybody in this Chamber, Republican and Democratic alike. Without this provision, each of our States would see significant cuts to its highway funding. That is the last thing we need given the dire state of infrastructure in America today.

The bill includes a pay raise for the military, which is set to go into effect in January. It also includes legislation to ensure that victims of state-sponsored terrorism get the compensation they are entitled to. More importantly, it ensures that the government remains funded and open while we continue to work on full-year appropriations bills.

Now, even if we passed this bill today or tomorrow, we have only 4 short weeks to complete our work. It can be done. I am committed to staying here, as we have in the past. We all worked nights, weekends, and I must say the tremendous Appropriations Committee staff worked even more hours.

But it cannot be a one-sided negotiation. And we cannot be expected to divert billions more in taxpayer dollars to fulfill President Trump's cynical campaign promise as part of the final deal. It does not have the support in this Chamber or among the American people to carry the day.

If we had an up-or-down vote in this body—will you take this money away from housing for our troops, for medical research, and all these other things, to pay for an ineffective wall so the President will not be embarrassed by not keeping his word that Mexico was going to pay for it? Of course, that would fail. Of course, that would fail. Nobody wants to go back home and say they did that.

We have billions of dollars in here to keep our borders secure. We want to keep our borders secure. Everybody wants to, Republican and Democrats alike, but let's not waste the money on symbolism, especially if it means we do not do our medical research or take care of housing for our troops among all the other things I have listed. Do not do a bill with the hopes of, someday, Mexico will pay us back, just because the President promised they would. We all know they are not going to.

So, with that being said, we have made some progress. I do not go and call press conferences like some of my colleague do each moment along the way, but I have been working closely with a bipartisan group. We all look forward to continue to work with Chairman SHELBY and Chairwoman LOWEY and with Ranking Member GRANGER to get these bills across the finish line.

We owe it to the American people, and we have demonstrated—I think Senator SHELBY as chair, myself as vice chair, we have demonstrated that we can get the bills through with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. Just let us do it. Let's go forward and pass them. Let's do substance over symbolism.

With that, Mr. President, I see my distinguished colleague on the floor, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Tennessee.

INTERNET EXCHANGE ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is so interesting to be here on the floor and to hear such a variety of ideas and to know that, across the country, people are logging on and they are tuning in and they are watching how we go about our business. And one of the things that is so interesting as we pull the Internet and online activity into our lives and stay connected, we sometimes enjoy the idea of just ''unplugging'' for a weekend, going to somewhere in the country that holds a really special appeal. Certainly at this time of year, people will talk about going away for Thanksgiving, or maybe they went away during the fall to look at pretty leaves.

They see it as an escape and maybe even an opportunity to get just a little bit of smugness in their tone when they talk about how they have chosen a destination that has politely informed them to not expect WiFi and not to expect that Internet connection.

But here is a question for you: How many would make that trip, but still knowing there is not that connection, they take the smartphone, the iPad, or the laptop anyway? Of course, we know we all do that.

After all, we have been trained to respond to the buzzing, beeping, and the ringing of our device, and so eventually, what happens is we give up and we start wandering around, searching for a signal, and then declaring to all of the very unimpressed locals: Well, I don't see how y'all do it without being able to have access to high-speed Internet. How can you survive without broadband?

Well, to my colleagues, let me say this: They do it because they do not have a choice. You know, these days, encountering so much as a spotty cell signal causes concern for those of us who are accustomed to high-speed Internet and broadband connectivity, but I will tell you there are millions of Americans out there for whom a broadband connection or even the pop and hiss of a dialup connection is completely out of reach.

In a world where even simple online interactions require lightning fast connections, economies in rural America are falling behind. We read every day about entire industries setting up shop in budding metropolises like Nashville, TN, but to many, corporate America's glowing new hubs sound like remote outposts compared to the familiar crush that is here on the eastern seaboard.

Our perspective is skewed. Even so, businesses move inward because they see potential for growth with minimal risk, but there is only so far that they can push it. Rural communities do not have much to offer in terms of operational support or a reliable customer base, and most of them lack a crucial resource: the funding and infrastructure to back reliable broadband services.

It is true, ''the cloud'' needs a physical connection to Planet Earth, and broadband networks rely on physical ''Internet Exchange'' points. Without these hubs, subscribers of different Internet providers cannot communicate with one another.

While many businesses are certainly capable of fronting the costs associated with building the actual exchange points and running connections to other hubs, there is no incentive for them to gamble on a stagnant economy, so they go elsewhere, and local businesses go nowhere, unable to expand into the global online marketplace.

And just to think, a decade ago, we wasted an opportunity to bridge the digital divide, to even close the digital divide. Back in 2009, during the stimulus days, President Obama signed an economic recovery package that included 7.2 billion, $7.2 billion to expand broadband services in underserved areas.

Well, predictably, those dollars began to flow into urban and suburban areas, leaving rural communities stranded on the far side of a gulf that Washington had ended up widening. Mistakes were made, but it would be an even bigger mistake to make rural residents suffer through it.

This year, I introduced the bipartisan Internet Exchange Act in an effort to get the Senate talking about broadband accessibility. When passed, the bill will offset the start-up cost of establishing broadband connections via a series of grants reserved exclusively for unserved rural areas. That is unserved rural areas, those that have been left out, those that did not benefit

from the $7.2 billion that President Obama put in the stimulus for broadband expansion.

They did not get any of that money. They got left further behind and pushed further out of the economic mainstream for the 21st century. As with any program, infrastructure alone is no guarantee of success, but the presence of new and expanded Internet exchange facilities will create a stronger and more competitive web. More hubs will enable faster data transmissions, allowing local businesses to expand and, in rural communities, e-commerce to flourish

Farmers, manufacturers, miners, will gain access to state-of-the-art technologies that support safer and more productive operations. Medical practitioners will be able to care for neglected populations via telemedicine. Schools and libraries will have advanced tools at their fingertips and open the world to their students. The local law enforcement will add an important tool in their ''public safety toolbox.'' Businesses looking to lay down roots will notice that rural communities are investing in themselves and, hopefully, make the decision to bring jobs and business opportunities to local workers and to rural America.

But perhaps, most importantly, rural residents and their guests will be able to decide for themselves whether they want to connect or unplug, and they will be able to do it on their own terms.

Mr. President, 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.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 455

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to raise awareness about the open enrollment period for health insurance marketplace coverage.

Between now and December 15, Granite Staters and Americans across the country can enroll in healthcare plans for 2020 through the Affordable Care Act's health insurance marketplaces. Tens of thousands of Granite Staters and millions of Americans will be eligible for Federal premium tax credits to help pay the cost of monthly premiums as well as financial assistance to reduce the cost of annual deductibles. I am sad to say the Trump administration refuses to be a reliable partner in helping to spread the word about open enrollment.

For the third year in a row, we have an administration that has focused on sabotaging the Affordable Care Act instead of raising awareness for open enrollment. This administration is even focusing resources on promoting enrollment and junk health plans that don't provide coverage for preexisting conditions and that don't meet the Affordable Care Act's comprehensive coverage requirements.

After failing to repeal the Affordable Care Act in the Senate, the Trump administration is making an end-run around Congress, trying to dismantle the ACA through regulations, administrative actions, and lawsuits in the Federal court.

As we can see in this chart, 2 years ago, the administration cut funding for advertising and outreach efforts to promote open enrollment by 90 percent. The administration went from $100 million—we can see on that bar—down to $10 million in 2017 and $10 million in 2018 and $10 million in 2019.

These advertising cuts are pennywise and pound foolish. They are part of the administration's concerted attempt to keep Americans in the dark about what their insurance options are.

Federal advertising on television and through digital platforms and other media is critical to drawing a healthy and balanced mix of consumers into the marketplace. In fact, research shows that California's State-level investments in marketing and advertising for open enrollment generated a 3-to-1 return on investment through lower premiums from a more balanced risk pool.

By refusing to adequately promote open enrollment, the administration is forcing our insurance markets to miss out on an opportunity to improve the markets, to lower premiums for consumers, and to ensure a healthy health insurance market—no pun intended—throughout this country.

That is why I introduced the MORE Health Education Act—to restore those health insurance marketplace advertising dollars and to increase outreach funding back to the $100 million a year. My bill would also prohibit the administration from using any of these funds to promote short-term plans or junk plans—plans that don't comply with the Affordable Care Act's requirements for preexisting condition protections among many other provisions that provide real insurance coverage for people who need it.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that approximately 500,000 more people would enroll in the health insurance marketplace or Medicaid coverage each year as a result of my legislation. That is half a million people who would be insured and be able to better take care of themselves and their families, and they would have access to primary care, to preventive services, and to a wide variety of other services they need and that they would be afforded under the essential health benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

My bill would also result in a reduction in marketplace premiums thanks to the increased enrollment from a more balanced risk pool. It would be a win-win all around.

Mr. President, at this time, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 455 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 Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 913

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, ObamaCare has failed because it is the classic example of Big Government getting in cahoots with a healthcare industry that is broken. It was doomed to fail because when has Big Government and Big Business ever resulted in something that is going to cost less and be more effective?

Under ObamaCare, decisions are made by the healthcare industry executives and the Federal Government bureaucrats—not patients, not consumers. This program is authorizing millions of dollars we don't have to prop up a system that is not working. If ObamaCare was working, it would sell itself, but it doesn't work. Costs continue to rise, and Americans continue to be stuck with the bill.

I believe there are things that ObamaCare does that we should keep. I actually incorporated it into my own business's plan back before the law required you to do it. I covered preexisting conditions and no cap on coverage. The pillars of ObamaCare—we should all accept that.

When they added keeping kids on there until they are 26, that is fine too. Those ships have sailed. But the Affordable Care Act is not remotely affordable, and it is only going to get worse.

I applaud the Trump administration for doing their due diligence on how healthcare policy changes are going to affect average Americans. They are taking the approach to not go deeper in the hole with something like ObamaCare but to reform the industry by making it competitive, transparent, eliminate the barriers to entry and, yes, encourage the healthcare consumer to get involved in his or her own well-being.

I do believe President Trump is right. The Republicans can be the party of healthcare without involving more government, but we need to do that by putting more power back into the hands of the American people, not ceding total power to government bureaucrats and big healthcare executives.

I have a better idea. The truth in pricing act—my bill I am countering with—encapsulates some of the ideas behind the proposed and final rules announced by the White House last week, which I fully support. The complex, opaque nature of healthcare pricing makes it difficult for consumers to anticipate, measure, and compare healthcare costs and coverage options.

Hospitals have a chargemaster that nobody can understand, which actually inflates retail prices billable to a patient or an insurance provider, but insurers usually negotiate steep discounts to these inflated prices that consumers and the employers who pay all the bills never see. It is done behind closed doors.

More pricing transparency would address this market failure. Increased competition gives more decision making to the people who are supposed to use it.

This is why I introduced the truth in pricing act, which requires health insurers to disclose negotiated rates, including any cost-sharing obligations for consumers for healthcare services covered under their health plans. It is difficult for insured consumers to shop for healthcare services in our current, opaque, and broken market within which ObamaCare works, especially if they don't know actual prices. Insurers have the unique ability to provide this information to consumers.

Why subsidize insurance companies to pay for navigators and insurance agents when we can instead make the market work better and be more consumer-driven and transparent? This is the way we break the stranglehold that government in big healthcare has on healthcare delivery.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request and instead, as in legislative session, the Committee on HELP be discharged from further consideration of S. 913, the True Price Act, 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. Does the Senator so modify her request?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I agree with my colleague that we need more transparency in healthcare pricing. I would argue that one of the places we most need that transparency is when it comes to the price of prescription drugs.

As I am sure my colleague knows, the cost of prescription drugs is probably the biggest cost driver right now in increases in healthcare. Yet we in Congress and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid are stymied because they can't negotiate with the big drug companies to lower the prices of prescription drugs and to make that more transparent to consumers.

The Veterans' Administration can negotiate for the cost of prescription drugs. If you talk to any veteran about the cost of their prescription drugs and compare them to what people are paying in the marketplace, there is a huge difference because they have that ability to negotiate.

I am sure that at some point we could probably find some agreement on transparency that would make sense. I think what my colleague is proposing is not something that has had a chance to go through the HELP Committee and, therefore, would need a further look. I would want to know what hospitals in New Hampshire, the doctors, consumers, and the insurance department in my State would have to say about that. Until I find that out, I would have to object to what my colleague is proposing, but I hope we could work together to address the challenges that my constituents—and I am sure his constituents—are facing because of the cost of healthcare.

He talked about the failure of the Affordable Care Act. Actually, in New Hampshire, we have over 90,000 people who have now gotten coverage for health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. Through the expansion of Medicaid, we have reduced the number of uninsured in New Hampshire to half the number we had before we passed the Affordable Care Act.

What my legislation would do is help people understand what the filing period is and how to sign up for the Affordable Care Act and health insurance.

In fact, under the Affordable Care Act as it exists now, according to estimates from the administration, approximately 54 percent of Granite Staters who are shopping for coverage on healthcare.gov are eligible for a plan with net monthly premiums of less than $75, after accounting for tax credits, and nearly 40 percent of Granite Staters shopping on healthcare.gov can find a plan with net monthly premiums under $10.

Now, the cautionary note is that when constituents of mine or in Indiana or anywhere else in the country are shopping for plans, they need to watch out for those short-term, limited-duration insurance plans—what are commonly called junk plans—because they are not required to cover preexisting conditions. I was pleased to hear my colleague from Indiana say that for existing conditions, coverage is important.

Those junk plans are not required to provide coverage for essential health benefits, like maternity care, prescription drugs, and mental health services. If you don't pay very careful attention when you go on the healthcare.gov website, you can be redirected to third-party insurance broker sites that sell both junk plans and ACA-compliant marketplace plans. That creates further confusion for customers. What we heard is that those insurance brokers are able to charge multiple times the price for those plans for their fee than they are for plans under the Affordable Care Act.

The administration has been allowing these links to redirect consumers to sites that sell junk plans, even though the ACA expressly prohibits any health insurance exchange from making available any plans that are not qualified health plans under the Affordable Care Act.

A number of my colleagues and I have been pressing the administration to conduct better oversight of brokers to ensure that healthcare.gov customers are not being sold junk plans.

I urge consumers, when they go on the website, to make sure they stay on the healthcare.gov website or their State's official health insurance exchange website when they are shopping for coverage. Be careful when you click on links that provide assistance from third-party insurance brokers.

I encourage Granite Staters and people across this country who need health insurance coverage to take a look at their options between now and December 15, during this year's open enrollment period. There is still time to enroll. It is important to tell your friends and neighbors and your family members who may not know about open enrollment because the amount of money available for outreach has been reduced so dramatically.

When the administration was trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act and this Senate voted, Americans across the country made their voices heard. Now we need that same level of engagement to raise awareness of this year's open enrollment and overcome this administration's sabotage of the ACA.

Thank you. And if it was not clear earlier, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have made progress here this evening in the sense that my colleague has brought up another topic—transparency for prescriptions.

Across the board, when it comes to hospitals and exposing their charge practices, drug companies becoming transparent and competing, health insurance companies getting rid of the secret agreements behind the scenes, and even practitioners, publish your prices in print or on the web so we as employers and consumers of healthcare can try to make the right decisions and bring costs down.

I do object to the original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, John

Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, Chuck Grassley, Tom Cotton, Rick Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany H.R. 3055. I further ask unanimous consent that Senator PAUL or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to concur with further amendment, the text of which is at the desk, and following 2 minutes of debate equally divided, Senator SHELBY or his designee be recognized to make a motion to table the Paul motion. Further, I ask that following disposition of the Paul motion, the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment; finally, that notwithstanding rule XXII, if cloture is filed on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment that the vote on the cloture motion occur immediately and that if cloture is invoked, the postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the motion to concur with no intervening action or debate.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, November 21; 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 that the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Brouillette nomination.

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

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CUBA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, since the onset of the Trump Presidency, the White House has issued a steady stream of executive orders to reverse the policy of engagement with Cuba begun by President Obama. Those decisions have largely curtailed travel by law-abiding Americans to Cuba who seek to participate in people-to-people exchanges, patronize Cuban private businesses, and otherwise experience Cuban culture.

Cuba is the only country in the world to which Americans cannot travel freely, other than North Korea, because President Trump apparently believes it is his sole prerogative to tell Americans where they can travel and spend their own money.

I have spoken about the need for engagement with Cuba many times. It is in our national interest because our past policy of unilateral sanctions and isolation—enforced for more than half a century—failed to achieve any of its objectives and because engagement with the people of other countries is the way we promote our values and protect our interests.

This is especially true when the foreign government is one with which we have profound disagreements, like Russia, China, Egypt, Turkey; it is a long list. But no one is proposing that we prevent Americans from traveling to those countries, and if they did, it would be strongly opposed by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Today, our Embassy in Havana is operating on a shoestring. Whereas there used to be more than 50 direct hire staff, today there are fewer than 18. The Cuban Embassy in Washington has also been reduced to a shell of what it used to be. As a result, the ability of both governments to process visas and conduct diplomacy is at a virtual standstill.

Cubans who seek visas to travel to the U.S. today to participate in educational programs, cultural, entrepreneurial, or scientific exchanges have to travel to Trinidad, Mexico, or some other country to apply at our embassies there. The cost to do so far exceeds what the vast majority of Cubans can afford, so travel by Cubans to the U.S. has been reduced to a trickle compared to what it was before.

The White House has curtailed most air and sea travel to Cuba, so travel by Americans has also plummeted. This has wreaked havoc on fledgling Cuban private businesses, which depend on American customers. The administration seems utterly unconcerned, focused instead on punishing the Cuban Government for its support of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela. This is nothing new to the Cuban authorities, and it empowers hardliners in the Cuban Government who opposed engagement with the United States in the first place and who are more comfortable building alliances with counterparts in Russia, China, and North Korea with whom they share a common ideology and disdain for the United States.

I recognize that the Trump administration has no reluctance to hold Cuba to a standard that it does not hold for other authoritarian regimes. In fact, if President Trump were consistent he would be praising his Cuban counterpart as a friend or great leader, the way he praises Kim Jung Un, Xi Jinping, Abdel Fattah al Sisi, Rodrigo Duterte, Vladimir Putin, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, and other autocrats.

But despite this hypocrisy, why don't we at least increase the number of consular officers at our embassies so Americans and Cubans can visit each other's countries? I understand that we have yet to determine the cause of illnesses suffered by U.S. Embassy personnel in Cuba, for which there is no evidence implicating the Cuban Government, despite kneejerk claims by some to the contrary. But the last such incident was more than a year ago, and there are certainly U.S. Foreign Service Officers who would welcome the opportunity to serve in Havana. Both governments should be working to create favorable conditions for restaffing each other's consular services so they can better serve the people of our two countries.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 358, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 487, Robert J. Luck, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 359, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 488, Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.•

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon

such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19–59, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India for defense articles and services estimated to cost $1.0210 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–59

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of India.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $.5614 billion.
Other $.4596 billion.
Total $1.0210 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to thirteen (13) MK 45 5 inch/62 caliber (MOD 4) naval guns.

Up to three thousand five hundred (3,500) D349 Projectile, BL&P 5″/54 MK 92 MOD 1 Ammunition.

Non-MDE: Also included are other ammunition, spare parts, personnel training and equipment training, publications and technical data, transportation, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance and other related logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (IN–P–LAU).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: November 19, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

India—MK 45 Gun System

The Government of India has requested to buy up to thirteen (13) MK 45 5 inch/62 caliber (MOD 4) naval guns and three thousand five hundred (3,500) D349 Projectile, 5''/54 MK 92 MOD 1 Ammunition. Also included are other ammunition, spare parts, personnel training and equipment training, publications and technical data, transportation, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance and other related logistics support. The total estimated cost is $1.0210 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a strategic regional partner.

The proposed sale will improve India's capability to meet current and future threats from enemy weapon systems. The MK–45 Gun System will provide the capability to conduct anti-surface warfare and anti-air defense missions while enhancing interoperability with U.S. and other allied forces. India will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen its homeland defense.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be BAE Systems Land and Armaments, Minneapolis, Minnesota with gun manufacturing in Louisville, Kentucky. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement required by India will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor(s).

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of additional U.S. Government and/or contractor representatives to India. However, U.S. Government or contractor personnel in country visits will be required on a temporary basis in conjunction with program technical oversight and support requirements.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–59

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MK–45 Gun System is a U.S. naval artillery gun mount consisting of 127 mm (5 inch) L54 Mark 19 Gun on Mark 45 Mount. The highest level of release of the subsystem is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest level of information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is UNCLASSIFIED; the highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is UNCLASSIFIED. Reverse engineering would not reveal venerable information.

2. A determination has been made that India can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to further the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

3. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of India.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA, November 19, 2019.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19–63 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Morocco for defense articles and services estimated to cost $4.25 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–63

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Morocco.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $3.00 billion.
Other $1.25 billion.
Total $4.25 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty-six (36) AH–64E Apache Attack Helicopters (24 new, 12 optional).

Seventy-nine (79) T700–GE–701 D Engines (72 installed, 6 spares).

Thirty-six (36) AN/ASQ–170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAR–11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (M–TADS/PNVS).

Eighteen (18) AN/APG–78 Fire Control Radars (FCR) with Radar Electronic Units (REU).

Eighteen (18) AN/APR–48B Modernized-Radar Frequency Interferometers (MRFI).

Five hundred fifty-one (551) AGM–114R Hellfire Missiles (441 new, 110 optional).

Sixty (60) AGM–114L Hellfire Missiles.

Seventy-two (72) M36E9 Hellfire Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM).

Five hundred eighty-eight (588) Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS) Kits (478 installed, 110 optional).

Seventy-eight (78) Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (EGIs) (72 installed, 6 spares).

Thirty-nine (39) AAR–57 Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS) (36 installed, 3 spares).

Two hundred (200) AIM–92H Stinger Missiles.

Non-MDE: Also included are twenty-one (21) Manned-Unmanned Teaming–2 (MUMT–2) video receivers (18 installed, 3

spares); thirty-nine (39) Manned-Unmanned Teaming–2 (MUMT–2) air-air-ground kits (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APR–39D(V)2 radar signal detecting sets (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/AVR–2B laser detecting sets (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APX–123 or AN/APX–123A common transponders (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) IDM–401 Improved Data Modems (36 new, 3 spares); six (6) Link–16 terminals; thirty-nine (39) Improved Countermeasure Dispensing System (ICMD) (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/ARN–149 (V)3 automatic direction finders (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) Doppler ASN–157 Doppler radar velocity sensors (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APN–209 radar altimeters (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/ARN–153 Tactical Air Navigation (TACAN) sets (36 installed, 3 spares); four (4) TACAN ground stations; thirty-six (36) Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range/Instrument Landing Systems (VOR/ILS) (36 installed, 3 new); twelve (12) AN/PYQ–10(C) simple key loader (12 new); thirty-six (36) M230E1 + M139 AWS automatic gun (36 new); eighty-one (81) M261 rocket launchers (72 new, 9 spares); seventy-eight (78) M299 missile launchers (72 new, 6 spares); fifty-three (53) Stinger Air-to-Air launchers (53 new); twenty-nine (29) Stinger Captive Flight Trainers (CFT) (29 new); eight (8) Stinger Aerial Handling Trainers (AHT) (8 new); five thousand two hundred sixteen (5,216) 2.75–inch rockets (3,896 new, 1,320 optional); ninety-three thousand (93,000) 30mm rounds (65,500 new, 27,500 optional); secure voice radios; training devices; communication systems; helmets; simulators; generators; transportation and organization equipment; spare and repair parts; support equipment; tools and test equipment; technical data and publications; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: MO–B–UTN.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: November 19, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Morocco—AH–64E Helicopters

The Government of Morocco has requested a possible sale of thirty-six (36) AH–64E Apache attack helicopters (24 new, 12 optional); seventy-nine (79) T700–GE–701D engines (72 installed, 6 spares); thirty-six (36) AN/ASQ–170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAR–11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (M–TADS/PNVS); eighteen (18) AN/APG–78 Fire Control Radars (FCR) with Radar Electronic Units (REU); eighteen (18) AN/APR–48B Modernized-Radar Frequency Interferometers (MRFI); five hundred fifty-one (551) AGM–114R Hellfire missiles (441 new, 110 optional); sixty (60) AGM–1 14L Hellfire missiles; seventy-two (72) M36E9 Hellfire Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM); five hundred eighty-eight (588) Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS) kits (478 installed, 110 optional); seventy-eight (78) Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (EGIs) (72 installed, 6 spares); thirty-nine (39) AAR–57 Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS) (36 installed, 3 spares); and two hundred (200) AIM–92H Stinger missiles. Also included are twenty-one (21) Manned-Unmanned Teaming–2 (MUMT–2) video receivers (18 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) Manned-Unmanned Teaming–2 (MUMT–2) air-air-ground kits (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APR–39D(V)2 radar signal detecting sets (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/AVR–2B laser detecting sets (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APX–123 or AN/APX–123A common transponders (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) IDM–401 Improved Data Modems (36 new, 3 spares); six (6) Link–16 terminals; thirty-nine (39) Improved Countermeasure Dispensing System (ICMD) (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/ARN–149 (V)3 automatic direction finders (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) Doppler ASN–157 Doppler radar velocity sensors (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/APN–209 radar altimeters (36 installed, 3 spares); thirty-nine (39) AN/ARN–153 Tactical Air Navigation (TACAN) sets (36 installed, 3 spares); four (4) TACAN ground stations; thirty-six (36) Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range/Instrument Landing Systems (VOR/ILS) (36 installed, 3 new); twelve (12) AN/PYQ–10(C) simple key loader (12 new); thirty-six (36) M230E1 + M139 AWS automatic gun (36 new); eighty-one (81) M261 rocket launchers (72 new, 9 spares); seventy-eight (78) M299 missile launchers (72 new, 6 spares); fifty-three (53) Stinger Air-to-Air launchers (53 new); twenty-nine (29) Stinger Captive Flight Trainers (CFT) (29 new); eight (8) Stinger Aerial Handling Trainers (AHT) (8 new); five thousand two hundred sixteen (5,216) 2.75–inch rockets (3,896 new, 1,320 optional); ninety-three thousand (93,000) 30mm rounds (65,500 new, 27,500 optional); secure voice radios; training devices; communication systems; helmets; simulators; generators; transportation and organization equipment; spare and repair parts; support equipment; tools and test equipment; technical data and publications; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is $4.25 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major Non-NATO ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in North Africa.

The proposed sale will improve Morocco's capability to meet current and future threats, and will enhance interoperability with U.S. forces and other allied forces. Morocco will use the enhanced capability to strengthen its homeland defense and provide close air support to its forces. Morocco will have no difficulty absorbing the Apache aircraft into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and services will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors involved in this program will be Boeing Company, Mesa, AZ and Lockheed Martin, Orlando, FL. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor(s).

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of eleven U.S. Government personnel and three contractor representatives to Morocco as part of the Technical Assistance Fielding Team and Field Service Representatives.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–63

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AH–64E Apache Attack Helicopter weapon system contains communications and target identification equipment, navigation equipment, aircraft survivability equipment, displays, and sensors. The airframe itself does not contain sensitive technology; however, the pertinent equipment listed below will be either installed on the aircraft or included in the sale. The highest classification of the AH–64E Apache Helicopter is CONFIDENTIAL, and the highest classification of data and information is SECRET.

a. The AN/ASQ–170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/ AN/AAQ–11 Pilot Night Vision Sensor (MTADS/PNVS) provides day, night, and limited adverse weather target information, as well as night navigation capabilities. The PNVS provides thermal imaging that permits nap-of-the-earth flight to, from, and within the battle area, while TADS provides the co-pilot gunner with search, detection, recognition, and designation by means of Direct View Optics (DVO), EI2 television, and Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) sighting systems that may be used singularly or in combinations. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Technical manuals for authorized maintenance levels are UNCLASSIFIED.

b. The AN/APG–78 Fire Control Radar (FCR) is an active, low-probability of intercept, millimeter-wave radar, combined with a passive AN/APR–48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometer (M–RFI) mounted on top of the helicopter mast. The FCR Ground Targeting Mode detects, locates, classifies and prioritizes stationary or moving armored vehicles, tanks and mobile air defense systems as well as hovering helicopters, and fixed wing aircraft in normal flight. If desired, the radar data can be used to refer targets to the regular electro-optical Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight (MTADS). The content of these items is classified SECRET. User Data Module (UDM) on the RFI processor, contains the Radio Frequency threat library. The UDM, which is a hardware assemblage, is classified CONFIDENTIAL when programmed.

c. The AN/APR–48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometer (M–RFI) is an updated version of the passive radar detection and direction finding system. It utilizes a detachable UDM on the M–RFI processor, which contains the Radar Frequency (RF) threat library. The UDM, which is a hardware assemblage item is classified CONFIDENTIAL when programmed. Hardware becomes CLASSIFIED when populated with threat parametric data. Releasable technical manuals are UNCLASSIFIED/Restricted distribution.

d. The AGM–114R is used against heavy and light armored targets, thin skinned vehicles, urban structures, bunkers, caves and personnel. The missile is Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) based, with a variable delay fuse, improved safety and reliability. The highest level for release of the AGM–114R is SECRET. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is up to and including SECRET. The highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is up to and including SECRET. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL. Reverse engineering could reveal SECRET information.

e. The Hellfire M36E9 CATM is a flight-training missile that consists of a functional

guidance section coupled to an inert missile bus. The M36E9 CATM does not have a functional rocket motor or warhead, and cannot be launched. The missile has an operational semi-active laser seeker that can search for and lock-on to laser-designated targets. It functions like a tactical missile (without launch capability) during captive carry on the aircraft, making it suitable for training the aircrew in simulated Hellfire missile target acquisition and lock. The missile comes in a reusable aluminum container designed to protect the missile from shock, vibration, and other environmental conditions encountered during shipment, handling, and storage. The highest level for release of the CATM is SECRET, based upon the software. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is SECRET; the highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL. Reverse engineering could reveal confidential information. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL.

f. The Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation System plus Multi Mode Receiver (EGI+MMR). The aircraft has two EGIs which use internal accelerometers, rate gyro measurements, and external sensor measurements to estimate the aircraft state, provides aircraft flight and position data to aircraft systems. The EGI is a velocity-aided, strap down, ring laser gyro based inertial unit. The EGI unit houses a GPS receiver. The receiver is capable of operating in either non-encrypted or encrypted. When keyed, the GPS receiver will automatically use anti-spoof/jam capabilities when they are in use. The EGI will retain the key through power on/off/on cycles. Because of safeguards built into the EGI, it is not considered classified when keyed. Integrated within the EGI is an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) for processing functions. Each EGI also houses a Multi-Mode Receiver (MMR). The MMR is incorporated to provide for reception of ground based NAVAID signals for instrument aided flight. Provides IMC I IFR integration and certification of improved Embedded Global Positioning System and Inertial (EGI) unit, with attached MMR, with specific cockpit instrumentation allows Apaches to operate within the worldwide IFR route structure. Also includes integration of the Common Army Aviation Map (CAAM), Area Navigation (RNAV), Digital Aeronautical Flight Information File (DAFIF) and Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) compliance.

g. The AAR–57 Common Missile Warning System (CMWS) detects energy emitted by threat missiles in-flight, evaluates potential false alarm emitters in the environment, declares validity of threat and selects appropriate countermeasures. The CMWS consists of an Electronic Control Unit (ECU), Electro-Optic Missile Sensors (EOMSs), and Sequencer and Improved Countermeasures Dispenser (ICMD). The ECU hardware is classified CONFIDENTIAL; releasable technical manuals for operation and maintenance are classified SECRET.

h. The AN/APR–39 Radar Signal Detecting Set is a system that provides warnings of radar-directed air defense threats and allows appropriate countermeasures. This is the 1553 databus compatible configuration. The hardware is classified CONFIDENTIAL when programmed with threat data; releasable technical manuals for operation and maintenance are classified CONFIDENTIAL; releasable technical data (technical performance) is classified SECRET. The system can be programmed with threat data provided by the purchasing country.

i. The Stinger RMP Block I Missile, hardware, embedded software object code and operating documentation contain sensitive technology and are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The highest classification of the Stinger 92H Reprogrammable Micro-Processor (RMP) Block I missile hardware is CONFIDENTIAL, and the highest classification of data and information is SECRET. The guidance section of the missile and tracking head trainer contain highly sensitive technology and are classified CONFIDENTIAL. Missile System hardware components contain sensitive critical technologies. Stinger Block I critical technology is primarily in the area of design and production know-how and not end-items. Information on countermeasures vulnerability to electronic countermeasures, system performance capabilities and effectiveness, simulation and test data and software source code are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Morocco can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Morocco.

REMEMBERING GERT BOYLE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to remember the remarkable life of my friend Gert Boyle and her many economic and philanthropic contributions to Oregon.

Gert died earlier this month at the age of 95. I am one of the many fans of Columbia Sportswear—and there are an awful lot of us in Oregon—who admired Gert and saw her as synonymous with the iconic Oregon company she led. This force of nature came to Oregon after fleeing Nazi Germany with her family in 1937. It is an immigrant story she shared with my parents, who also fled the Nazis. Like so many other refugees welcomed to America over the centuries, Gert arrived to America ready to work and eager to contribute. She did both in spades, adding her own significant chapter to America's proud history of immigrant successes.

She was a pioneer, a woman running a company at a time when that was unfortunately even more rare than women CEOs are today. When Gert's husband Neal died unexpectedly in 1970, she stepped in to replace him as president of what was then a tiny local company weighed down by debt. The challenge was mighty, but so was Gert. She became identified everywhere with Columbia Sportswear as she grew this Oregon business into a national and international brand. It now generates net annual revenue of $3 billion and employs more than 6,500 people. Business school students and Oregon historians alike will always remember Gert for that exceptional run, as will I. And she gave back along the way, generously supporting Special Olympics and the Knight Cancer Institute at Oregon Health and Science University in Portland. She was also was a hell of a lot of fun, as evidenced by her hilarious role spoofing herself in a 1980s Columbia Sportswear ad campaign as ''one tough mother.''

I close by citing two anecdotes about Gert among many in the recent obituaries chronicling her amazing life. I think both capture her toughness and sense of humor perfectly. One of the two anecdotes comes from Kerry Tymchuk, executive director of the Oregon Historical Society. He said, ''When she took over, you know, she was a woman CEO in a business where there weren't many women CEOs, in the sports apparel business. She was discriminated against and there was this famous incident where she picked up her phone and the fellow on the other end said, 'I want to speak to the CEO,' and she said 'speaking,' and he said, 'but you're a woman,' and she said, 'you know, I noticed that when I got up this morning.' ''

The other anecdote comes from Gert herself. In another obituary, she was quoted as having said, ''After my husband died, I said, 'It's the same ballgame—it's just a different coach. I might not know what I'm doing, but we're going to do it my way.' '' Gert certainly did do it her way. And her company, its employees, and our entire State of Oregon are much the better for it.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JAY HILDEBRANDT

• Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 40-year career of a great Idahoan, Jay Hildebrandt, co-anchor of KIFI Local News 8 in Idaho Falls, ID. Jay has covered the news from KIFI since 1984 and has become a trusted, familiar face to east Idaho residents. Viewers have come to know him as a dedicated professional who gets to the bottom of important stories, while treating all people with dignity and respect.

Motivated by his conviction to share positive stories, Jay leaves behind an inspiring legacy through the uplifting segments he produced over the past four decades. In one such weekly segment titled ''Wednesday's Child,'' Jay introduced children in need of a big brother or sister figure, a foster home or an adoptive family. Jay produced this segment for 28 years, and many children found permanent homes as a result. In recognition of his advocacy, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute honored him and his wife Sally as ''Angels in Adoption.'' In addition to this heartwarming segment, Jay also highlighted hundreds of high-achieving local high school seniors through his ''Distinguished Student'' weekly report. In 1990, Karole Honas

joined Jay at the anchor desk. Their contrasting perspectives and reporting styles created a compelling synergy that kept viewers watching for over 29 years.

When he isn't reporting the news, Jay is an active volunteer in his community. His service includes participation on the Governor's Children's Trust Fund Board, Region VII Health and Welfare Advisory Board, and the Safe Place Advisory Board. He also serves his community as an adjunct professor in the communications department at Brigham Young University-Idaho, where he passes along his expertise, reporting philosophies and lessons that can only be learned through experience to the next generation of journalists.

I would like to commend Jay for over 40 years of bringing the news to Idahoans and congratulate him on his retirement. He will surely stay busy with his wife Sally, their five grown children, and 15 grandchildren. His many dedicated years on the air have left a record of a kind and gentle individual, demonstrating positivity in words and actions.●

RECOGNIZING LEISURELAND RV CENTER

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. 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 Leisureland RV Center in Boise as the veteran-owned Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 20, 2019.

Leisureland RV Center is owned and operated by U.S. Air Force veteran John DeHoff and his wife Carina. John DeHoff served in the U.S. Air Force for 25 years, and now, he and his wife travel across the United States hand-selecting preowned recreational vehicles—RVs—to restore and resell at their Boise location. The DeHoffs opened Leisureland RV Center in 2014 to combine their passions for using recreational vehicles and renovating cars.

The company has a 10,000-square-foot maintenance facility on-site where experienced technicians restore high-end RVs and resell them at market value. In addition to selling refurbished RVs, Leisureland RV Center offers basic RV maintenance services and large-scale RV repairs. Leisureland RV Center's top priority is customer satisfaction. Employees assess the needs of each customer to ensure new buyers select an RV that will fit their lifestyle. This dedication to exceptional customer service is one reason many people travel from across the West to purchase an RV from Leisureland RV Center.

Congratulations to John and Carina DeHoff and all of the employees at Leisureland RV Center for being selected as the veteran-owned Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 20, 2019. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO GREGORY FERRY

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Captain Gregory Ferry of Hooksett as November's Granite Stater of the Month for his leadership m strengthening the partnership between New Hampshire's law enforcement and the Special Olympics.

Captain Ferry recently retired from the New Hampshire State Police after 25 years of dedicated service to the people of New Hampshire. Known for going the extra mile to support his fellow officers in the line of duty, Captain Ferry led outside of work as well. Throughout his career, even while carrying out the full duties of a New Hampshire State Trooper, Captain Ferry volunteered with the Special Olympics. He has been involved in everything from handing out medals to the athletes to the Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Law Enforcement Torch Run helps bring awareness to the Special Olympics. Captain Ferry would help his fellow officers run what is called the ''Flame for Hope'' all across New Hampshire, for a total distance of 550 miles. Since the run's inception 35 years ago, New Hampshire law enforcement has raised more than $5.5 million for Special Olympics, and for 25 of those 35 years, Captain Ferry was at its helm.

After 17 years of participating in the program, Captain Ferry decided to get even more involved and was chosen as State police liaison to the Special Olympics.

In this role, Captain Ferry oversaw the expansion of law enforcement's partnership with the program, which included recruiting more liaisons, expanding law enforcement's participation in the Summer and Winter Games, and increasing fundraising efforts.

As a symbol of Captain Ferry's strong relationship with the program, he was selected to represent New Hampshire at the 2019 Special Olympics World Games in Abu Dhabi, where he participated in the Torch Run across the United Arab Emirates. This was a once in a lifetime opportunity for Captain Ferry to represent both New Hampshire law enforcement and the Special Olympics program on the world stage.

Captain Ferry has said that the most rewarding part of his involvement in the Special Olympics has been the special bonds that he has formed with the athletes, which extend beyond the playing field. He continues to keep in touch with some of the athletes on social media and makes sure to give them a hug whenever he sees them outside of the program.

Captain Ferry's daughter, Jillian, also happens to be a Special Olympian. Her favorite event is bowling, and she has beaten dad on a few occasions.

From serving as a public safety officer who went out of his way to support his fellow officers and protect his community, to providing a sense of security for the athletes in the Special Olympics program who have learned to trust him, Captain Ferry has demonstrated what it means to be a dedicated public servant.

Thank you, Captain Ferry, for your service to our great State, and I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5084. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity and for other purposes.

At 5:50 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 862. An act to extend the sunset for the collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

S. 1838. An act to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

S. 2170. An act to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5084. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2920. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3237. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Organic Program; Amendments to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances per April 2018 NOSB Recommendations (Crops and Handling)'' ((RIN0581–AD80) (Docket No. AMS–NOP–18–0051)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3238. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2019 Amendments)'' ((7 CFR Part 1205) (Docket No. AMS–CN–19–0007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3239. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Modification of Handling Regulations'' ((7 CFR Part 966) (Docket No. AMS–SC–18–0075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3240. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3241. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3242. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3243. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Capital Rule: Simplifications to the Capital Rule Pursuant to the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996; Revised Effective Date'' (RIN1557–AE70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3244. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Bank Organizations'' (RIN1557–AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3245. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships with, Hedge Fund and Private Equity Funds'' (RIN1557–AE27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3246. A communication from the Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Annual Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3247. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hot Springs National Park; Bicycling'' (RIN1024–AE50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3248. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Redesignation of the Duval County Ozone Unclassifiable Area'' (FRL No. 10002–48–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3249. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department'' (FRL No. 10002–13–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3250. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Miscellaneous Revisions'' (FRL No. 10002–46–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3251. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Reduction Market System Sunsetting'' (FRL No. 10002–26–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3252. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Limited Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS'' (FRL No. 10002–25–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3253. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills'' (FRL No. 9999–80–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3254. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (17–3); Technical Correction'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 10001–43)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3255. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18–1)'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 10001–30)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3256. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Optional Standard Mileage Rates Procedures'' (Rev. Proc. 2019–46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3257. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ownership Attribution for Purposes of Determining Whether a Problem Is Related to a Controlled Foreign Corporation; Rents Derived in the Active Conduct of a Trade or Business'' ((RIN1545–BM90) (TD 9883)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3258. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electronic Filing of the Report of Health Insurance Provider Information'' ((RIN1545–BN57) (TD 9881)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3259. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs: CY 2020 Hospital Outpatient PPS Policy Changes and Payment Rates and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment System Policy Changes and Payment Rates: Price Transparency Requirements for Hospitals to Make Standard Charges Public'' (RIN0938–AU22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3260. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019–0108 - 2019–0114); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3261. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to sections 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Italy and Qatar to support the manufacture, integration, assembly, operation, training, testing, and maintenance of 300 Blackout 5.56mm upper and lower receivers and weapon assembly in the amount of $1,000,000 or

more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–031); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3262. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Acquisition and Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation (AIDAR): Revisions to the Incentive Awards Program for Personal Services Contractors (PSCs)'' (RIN0412–AA93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3263. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3264. A communication from the Associate Commissioner for Legislative Affairs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Drug Shortages: Root Causes and Potential Solutions''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3265. A communication from the Director of Congressional Relations and Government Affairs, Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office's October 2019 quarterly report to Congress (OSS–2019–1225); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3266. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3267. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3268. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from April 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3269. A communication from the Chairman of the Board, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's consolidated report addressing the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA or Integrity Act) and the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3270. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3271. A joint communication from the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's Annual Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3272. A communication from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3273. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3274. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3275. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2019 Annual Financial Report (AFR); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3276. A communication from the Assistant Director of the Office of Policy, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementing Bilateral and Multilateral Asylum Cooperative Agreements Under the Immigration and Nationality Act'' (RIN1125–AA98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 19, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3277. A communication from the Division Director for Policy, Legislation, and Regulation, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernizing Recruitment Requirements for the Temporary Employment of H–2B Foreign Workers in the United States'' (RIN1205–AB91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3278. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)'' (RIN0790–AI27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2019; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–3279. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3280. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3281. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0439)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3282. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0254)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3283. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0485)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3284. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0807)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3285. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0690)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3286. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Ipeco Pilot and Co-Pilot Seats'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0260)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3287. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0583)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3288. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc., Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0536)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3289. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0582)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3290. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aviointeriors S.p.A. Centaurus Passenger Seats'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0557)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3291. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0866)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3292. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 31282)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3293. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Spokane, WA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0363)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3294. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XY010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3295. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XY007) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3296. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Closure for Atlantic Spanish Mackerel in the Northern Zone'' (RIN0648–XS007) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3297. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XY006) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3298. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Spiny Lobster Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Amendment 13; Correction'' (RIN0648–BI11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3299. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XG086) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3300. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2019 Commercial Accountability Measures; Annual Catch Limit and Annual Catch Target Reductions'' (RIN0648–XG974) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3301. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2019 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Red Snapper'' (RIN0648–XS009) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3302. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XY014) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3303. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Equal to or Greater Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XY020) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3304. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Trip Limit Reduction for King Mackerel in the Atlantic Southern Zone'' (RIN0648–XS010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3305. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XY019) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3306. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requirements of the Vessel Monitoring System Type-Approval'' (RIN0648–BG34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3307. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer from NC to RI and VA'' (RIN0648–XX020) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3308. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2019–2020 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments'' (RIN0648–BJ36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3309. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Recreational and Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 6 through No. 27'' (RIN0648–XW007) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

David T. Fischer, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Nominee: David Fischer.

Post: Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. David T. Fischer:

Trott for Congress, Inc., $2,700, 02/23/15, David A. Trott.

Automotive Free International Trade PAC, $5,000, 03/25/15.

Cantor for Congress, refund, $502, 06/08/15, Eric Cantor.

Trott for Congress, Inc., $2,700, 06/24/15, David A. Trott.

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Mike Bishop for Congress, $2,700, 06/30/15, Mike Bishop.

Friends of Jason Chaffetz, $2,700, 09/10/15, Jason Chaffetz.

Friends of Jason Chaffetz, $2,700, 09/10/15, Jason Chaffetz.

Portman for Senate Committee, $2,700, 09/15/15, Rob Portman.

Sedona PAC, refund, $5,400, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Sedona PAC, refund, $2,700, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Sedona PAC, $2,700, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Sedona PAC, $10,800, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Michigan Republican Party, $10,000, 12/21/15.

Kasich for America, Inc., $2,700, 02/29/16, John R Kasich.

Automotive Free International Trade PAC, $5,000, 04/20/16.

Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., $2,700, 04/25/16, Ronald Harold Johnson.

Portman for Senate Committee, $2,700, 05/03/16, Rob Portman.

Debbie Dingell for Congress, $2,700, 05/17/16, Debbie Dingell.

Trump Victory, $250,000, 05/24/16, Trump Victory.

Trump Victory, refund, $250,000, 06/16/16, Trump Victory.

Trump Victory, $5,400, 06/21/16, Trump Victory.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., $2,700, 06/21/16, Donald J. Trump.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., $2,700, 06/21/16, Donald J. Trump.

Republican National Committee, $33,400, 06/29/16.

Republican National Committee, $91,600, 06//29/16.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc., $1,000, 06/30/16, Kelly Ayotte.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc., $1,000, 06/30/16, Kelly Ayotte.

Marco Rubio for Senate refund, $2,700, 06/30/16, Marco Rubio

Marco Rubio for Senate, $2,700, 06/30/16, Marco Rubio

Marco Rubio for Senate, $5,400, 06/30/16, Marco Rubio.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $1,000, 08/17/16, Todd Christopher Young.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $1,000, 08/17/16, Todd Christopher Young.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $1,000, 08/17/16, Todd Christopher Young.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $1,000, 08/17/16, Todd Christopher Young.

Friends of Paul Mitchell, $2,700, 08/22/16, Paul Mitchell III.

Roskam for Congress Committee, $2,700, 09/13/16, Peter Roskam.

Walberg for Congress, $2,700, 09/14/16, Timothy L. Walberg.

Walberg Victory Fund, $5,000, 09/15/16 Walberg Victory Fund.

Mike Bishop for Congress, $2,700, 09/28/16, Mike Bishop.

Bergman Victory Committee, $2,700, 09/29/16, Bergman Victory Committee.

Bergmanforcongress, $2,700, 09/29/16, John Bergman.

NRCC, $33,400, 09/30/16.

NRCC, $58,900, 09/30/16.

Prosperity Action Inc., $5,000, 09/30/16, Prosperity Action Inc.

Ryan for Congress, Inc., $2,700, 09/30/16, Paul D. Ryan.

Team Ryan, $100,000, 09/30/16, Team Ryan.

Fighting For Ohio Fund, $15,000, 10/03/16, Fighting For Ohio Fund.

Brenda Lawrence for Congress, $2,500, 10/26/16, Brenda Lulenar Lawrence.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $4,400, 10/26/16, Todd Christopher Young.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., refund, 2,700, 10/27/16.

Republican National Committee, $14,400, 02/03/17.

Republican National Committee, $33,900, 02/03/17.

Republican National Committee, $101,700, 02/03/17.

Automotive Free International Trade PAC, $5,000, 02/21/17.

True North PAC, $5,000, 03/08/17, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate.

NRCC, $25,000, 03/23/17.

Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate, $5,400, 05/12/17, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate.

Team Ryan, $50,000, 06/19/17, Team Ryan.

McMorris Rodgers American Dream Project, $2,700, 10/24/17, Cathy McMorris Rodgers.

Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate, refund, $2,700, 12/31/17, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate.

2. Jennifer M. Fischer (wife):

Trott for Congress, Inc., $2,700, 02/23/15, David A. Trott.

Cantor for Congress, refund, $219.44, 06/08/15, Eric Cantor.

Trott for Congress, Inc., $2,700, 06/24/15, David A. Trott.

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Mike Bishop for Congress, $2,700, 06/30/15, Mike Bishop.

Friends of Jason Chaffetz, $2,700, 09/10/15, Jason Chaffetz.

Friends of Jason Chaffetz, $2,700, 09/10/15, Jason Chaffetz.

Portman for Senate Committee, $2,700, 09/15/15, Rob Portman.

Sedona PAC, refund, $2,700, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Sedona PAC, $2,700, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Sedona PAC, 5,400, 11/17/15, John McCain.

Kasich for America, Inc., $2,700, 02/29/16, John R. Kasich.

Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., $2,700, 04/25/16, Ronald Harold Johnson.

Portman for Senate Committee, $2,700, 05/03/16, Rob Portman.

Debbie Dingell for Congress, $2,700, 05/17/16, Debbie Dingell.

Trump Victory, 5,400, 06/21/16.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., $2,700, 06/21/16, Donald J. Trump.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., $2,700, 06/21/16, Donald J. Trump.

Republican National Committee, $33,400, 06/29/16.

Republican National Committee, $91,600, 06/29/16.

Roskam for Congress Committee, $2,700, 09/13/16, Peter Roskam.

Trump Victory, refund, $5,400, 09/21/16.

Mike Bishop for Congress, $2,700, 09/28/16, Mike Bishop.

Bergman Victory Committee, $2,700, 09/29/16, John Bergman.

Bergmanforcongress, $2,700, 09/29/16, John Bergman.

Friends of Todd Young, Inc., $2,700, 10/27/16, Todd Young.

Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate, $5,400, 05/12/17, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate.

Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate, refund, $2,700, 12/31/17, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate.

3. Children and Spouses:

David T. Fischer, Jr. (son):

Romney Victory, Inc., $1,700, 03/31/15, Mitt Romney.

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Trott For Congress, Inc., $1,000, 04/05/16, David A. Trott.

Automotive Free International Trade PAC, $5,000, 02/13/17.

NRCC, $25,000, 04/04/17.

Darcy Fischer (wife of David T. Fischer, Jr.):

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Zachary Fischer (son):

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Keirstead for Congress, $1,000, 06/23/17.

Ashley Fischer (wife of Zachary Fischer):

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/26/15, Jeb Bush.

Jeffrey Phelps (stepson):

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/30/15, Jeb Bush.

Stefanie Phelps (wife of Jeffrey Phelps):

Jeb 2016, Inc., $2,700, 06/30/15, Jeb Bush.

4. Parents:

Richard A. Fischer—deceased.

Jeanne M. Fischer—deceased.

5. Grandparents:

Carl H.F. Fischer—deceased.

Josephine Fischer—deceased.

Thomas C. Morgan—deceased.

Ruth E. Morgan—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses:

Richard A. Fischer, Jr. (brother): None.

William Fischer (brother): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

Morse H. Tan, of Illinois, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice.

Nominee: Morse Tan.

Post: Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Sarah Tan: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Hope Tan (age 12): None. Enoch Tan (age 10): None. Isaiah Tan (age 6): None. Moses Tan (age 4): None.

4. Parents: Minho Tan (father): None. Sunae Tan (mother): None.

5. Grandparents: Hee Pong Tan (paternal grandfather, deceased): None. Su Pong Tan (paternal grandmother): None. Won Joong Kim (maternal grandfather, deceased): None. Dang Kyung Kim (maternal grandmother): None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Alice Tan (resident of Korea): None. Inku Kang (resident of Korea): None.

Roxanne Cabral, 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 Republic of the Marshall Islands.

Nominee—Roxanne J. Cabral.

Post: Nominated (for Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands).

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: David C. Schroeder: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Quinn R. Schroeder, no spouse: None. Roman C. Schroeder,

no spouse: None; Evan S. Schroeder, no spouse: None.

4. Parents: Nancy J. Cabral (mother)—None. Roger C. Cabral (deceased 1995)—N/A. Thomas G. Schroeder (father-in-law): $35, 2016 or 18, Republican National Committee; $90, 2015, Rob Wittman (Va 1st); $45, 2017, Rob Wittman; $100, 2018, Rob Wittman; $25, 2018, Americans for Prosperity. Nancy S. Schroeder (mother-in-law)—None.

5. Grandparents: None. All deceased prior to 2009—None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Neal J. Cabral, no spouse None. (since 2010):

7. Sisters and Spouses: Lisa M. Cabral, no spouse: None.

Kelley Eckels Currie, of Georgia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

Nominee: Kelley Eckels Currie.

Post: Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: $500, 3/15/2016, Marco Rubio for President.

2. Spouse: Peter MacLean Currie: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Peter MacLean Currie, Jr.: none. Sarah W. Currie: none.

4. Parents: Mary Elizabeth Price: none. Steven Lee Eckels—deceased.

5. Grandparents: all deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: n/a.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Emily Dianne Eckels: none.

Leslie Meredith Tsou, 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 Sultanate of Oman.

Nominee: Leslie Meredith Tsou.

Post: Sultanate of Oman.

Nominated: June 24, 2019.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $0,

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Edward and Carol Tsou: $12.50, 11/15/18, Jacky Rosen; $12.50, 11/15/18, Bill Nelson—Recount Fund; $12.50, 11/14/18, Jacky Rosen; $12.50, 11/14/18, Mike Espy; $50.00, 10/11/18, Heidi Heitkamp; $25.00, 10/06/18, Tim Ryan; $25.00, 10/06/18, dccc O'Rourke; $25.00, 10/06/18, Jacky Rosen; $25.00, 10/06/18, Krysten Sinema; $100.00, 10/24/17, Democratic Action; $100.00, 10/23/17, Democratic National Committee (DNC) Marketing; $100.00, 08/23/17, Democratic Congress; $75.00, 07/27/17, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC); $50.00, 07/25/17, Mark Warner; $75.00, 07/13/17, DCCC; $50.00, 06/22/17, Mark Warner; $50.00, 05/26/17, Tim Kaine; $25.00, 05/14/17, Amy Klobucher; $75.00, 04/30/17, DCCC; $100.00, 04/07/17, DCCC; $25.00, 02/08/17, DCCC; $63.00, 01/30/17, DCCC; $50.00, 01/10/17, DCCC; $50.00, 01/06/17, DCCC; $100.00, 11/04/16, Hilary for America; $50.00, 10/28/15, Kasich for America; $50.00, 10/24/16, Hilary for America; $50.00, 09/25/15, Bernie Sanders; $100.00, 09/25/16, Hilary Victory Fund; $50.00, 06/14/16, Hilary Victory Fund; $50.00, 06/27/15, DNC Online Democrats.org; $100.00, 05/01/15, Bernie Sanders; $50.00, 01/16/15, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; $75.00, 01/07/15, DSCC; $75.00, 11/13/14, Mary Landrieu; $50.00, 11/09/14, DCCC; $100.00, 10/23/14, DCCC; $50.00, 10/09/14, DCCC; $50.00, 09/30/14, DCCC; $50.00, 09/23/14, DCCC; $50.00, 09/09/14, DCCC; $50.00, 08/30/14, DCCC; $50.00, 08/23/14, DCCC; $50.00, 08/09/14, DCCC; $50.00, 07/30/14, DCCC; $50.00, 07/28/14, DCCC; $50.00, 07/23/14, DCCC; $50.00, 07/17/14, DCCC; $50.00, 07/09/14, DCCC; $50.00, 06/30/14, DCCC; $50.00, 06/27/14, DCCC; $100.00, 05/30/14, DCCC.

5. Grandparents: All Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A (no brothers).

7. Sisters and Spouses: MaryAnn Strunk (sister) and Robert Strunk (husband), $0; Wendy Berg (sister) and David Berg (husband), $0.

Yuri Kim, of Guam, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Albania.

Nominee: Yuri Kim.

Post: Albania.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $100, 2018, Young Kim; $250, 2017, Bob Casey; $2,775, 2016, Hillary Clinton.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Kenneth Taerang Kim: 0; Jane Whayoung Kim: 0 (deceased 1997); Jin Sook Kim (step): 0.

5. Grandparents: Park Hee-soon: 0; Cheong Ku-hak: 0 (deceased 2017).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Yeong-Sae Kim: 0; Jenni Quoc Kim: 0; Guhn Woo Kim (step): 0; Min Woo Kim (step): 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Rebecca Hyemin Kim (step): 0.

Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federated States of Micronesia.

Nominee: Carmen G. Cantor.

Post: Federated States of Micronesia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: $50, 2018, Larry Hogan; $100, 2016, H. Clinton.

2. Spouse: Carlos A. Cantor: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Ashley N. Cantor: None. Amanda K. Cantor: None. Adriana M. Cantor: None. Carlos A. Cantor III (stepson): None. Anthony R. Cantor (stepson): None. Shannon Walko (stepdaughter) & John Walko: None.

4. Parents: Anibal Castro & Zoraida Laracuente: None.

5. Grandparents: Liborio Laracuente & Magdalena Ramirez—Deceased; Vicente Castro & Dolores Justiniano—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: I don't have brothers.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Zoraida Castro and Hector C. Banchs: None.

Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

Nominee: Michael George DeSombre.

Post: Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: $32400, 1/20/2015, Republican National Committee; $100, 1/20/2015, Republican National Committee; $−2400, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $−2700, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $−2700, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $−2400, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $2400, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $2400, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $2700, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $2700, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $7800, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $7800, 2/5/2015, Friends of Mike Lee Inc; $5000, 2/13/2015, Right to Rise PAC, Inc.; $150, 4/8/2015, Republican National Committee; $1000, 6/4/2015, Elise for Congress; $100, 7/23/2015, Republican National Committee; $2700, 9/9/2015, Jeb 2016, Inc.; $250, 3/14/2016, Republican National Committee; $250, 5/5/2017, Republican National Committee; $33525, 6/2/2017, Republican National Committee; $1475, 6/2/2017, Republican National Committee; $1000, 12/14/2017, Duffy for Wisconsin; $25000, 12/14/2017, NRSC; $250, 1/1/2018, Michael C. Toth; $500, 2/6/2018, Stephen Yates; $1285, 4/16/2018, Republican National Committee; $33715, 4/16/2018, Republican National Committee; $100, 4/26/2018, Republican National Committee; $100, 4/26/2018, Republican National Committee; $100, 5/11/2018, Republican National Committee; $−100, 5/11/2018, Republican National Committee; $1000, 6/29/2018, Elise for Congress.

1. Spouse: $2700, 8/7/2015, Scott Walker Inc; $2700, 9/3/2015, Jeb 2016, Inc.

2. Children and Spouses: N/A, N/A, N/A.

3. Eugene R. DeSombre (Father): $200, 4/11/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $300, 6/15/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $300, 6/15/2016, Hillary for America; $500, 6/27/2016, Citizens for Lisa Madigan; $200, 8/8/2016, DSCC; $500, 9/26/2016, Citizens for Lisa Madigan; $300, 10/12/2016, DSCC; $300, 10/12/2016, DSCC; $300, 10/12/2016, DSCC; $200, 10/26/2016, DSCC; $300, 3/1/2017, DNC Services Corp./Dem. Nat'l Committee; $250, 4/6/2018, SMP; $300, 7/27/2018, DSCC; $340, 8/23/2018, DNC Services Corp./Dem. Natl Committee. Nancy C. DeSombre (Mother): $100, 12/4/2015, Tammy for Illinois; $1000, 6/30/2015, Citizens for Lisa Madigan; $90, 1/20/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $45, 1/20/2016, Emily's List; $180, 1/20/2016, Emily's List; $45, 1/20/2016, Emily's List; $90, 1/20/2016, Emily's List; $100, 3/10/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $500, 3/26/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List, $90, 3/29/2016. Emily's List; $90, 3/29/2016, Emily's List; $45, 4/11/2016, Emily's List; $500, 4/21/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $100, 4/25/2016, Emily's List; $90, 5/24/2016, Emily's List; $100, 6/27/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $100, 6/27/2016, Emily's List; $100, 6/27/2016, Emily's List; $100, 6/27/2016, Emily's List; $100, 6/27/2016, Emily's List; $100, 8/8/2016, Emily's List; $150, 8/8/2016, Emily's List; $100, 8/22/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $100, 8/23/2016, Emily's List; $500, 9/13/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $50, 9/22/2016, Emily's List; $10, 9/22/2016, Emily's List; $100, 10/20/2016, Emily's List; $100, 10/24/2016, Tammy for Illinois; $100, 10/25/2016, Katie McGinty for Senate; $100, 10/29/2016, Emily's List; $100, 11/4/2016, Emily's List; $225, 2/10/2017, DNC Services Corp./Dem. Nat'l Committee; $100, 9/30/2017, Emily's List; $100, 11/8/2017, Emily's List; $50, 11/18/2017, Emily's List; $50, 11/29/2017, Emily's List; $100, 12/20/2017, Emily's List; $100, 2/1/2018, Emily's List; $35, 2/21/2018, Emily's List; $50, 2/27/2018, Emily's List; $100, 3/18/2018, Emily's List; $50, 3/22/2018, Emily's List; $100, 3/30/2018, Emily's List; $35, 8/17/2018, Emily's List;

$100, 8/18/2018, Emily's List; $100, 8/18/2018, Emily's List; $50, 8/26/2018, Emily's List.

4. Grandparents Names: N/A, N/A, N/A.

5. Brothers and Spouses; N/A, N/A, N/A.

6. Elizabeth DeSombre (Sister): $25, 4/6/2016, Hillary for America; $55.9, 4/17/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 4/19/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 4/19/2016, Hillary for America; $83.45, 4/21/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 4/28/2016, Hillary for America; $34.31, 4/30/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 4/30/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 5/23/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 5/24/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 5/26/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 5/26/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 5/27/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 6/7/2016, Hillary for America; $3, 6/25/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 6/25/2016, Hillary for America; $3, 6/25/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 7/7/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 7/8/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $5, 7/8/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 7/22/2016, Hillary for America; $103.45, 7/26/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $19, 7/26/2016, Hillary for America; $103.45, 7/26/2016, Hillary for America; $16.55, 7/29/2016, Hillary for America; $16.55, 7/29/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $5, 8/13/2016, Hillary for America; $19, 8/29/2016, Hillary for America; $56.95, 9/6/2016, Hillary for America; $56.95, 9/6/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; $5, 10/12/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 10/17/2016, Hillary for America; $5, 10/21/2016, Hillary for America; $10, 10/22/2016, Actblue; $10, 10/26/2016, Actblue; $25, 10/29/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 11/2/2016, Hillary for America; $25, 11/5/2016, Hillary for America; $3, 6/30/2019, Elizabeth Warren; $25, 7/9/2019, Elizabeth Warren; $5, 7/7/2019, Kamala Harris; $10, 7/7/2019, Kamala Harris.

Robert S. Gilchrist, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lithuania.

Nominee: Robert Stuart Gilchrist.

Post: Lithuania.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None, N/A, N/A.

2. Spouse: None, N/A, N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: None, N/A, N/A.

4. Parents: Deceased, N/A, N/A.

5. Grandparents: Deceased, N/A, N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David Gilchrist: $250, 10/22/18, Bob Rackleef Campaign Committee; Hilda Gilchrist: $25, 01/15/14, Act Blue; $5, 01/15/14, Act Blue; $60, 01/22/14, Act Blue; $35, 09/29/15, Act Blue; $25, 05/16/16, Act Blue; $25, 09/01/16, Act Blue; $25, 10/14/16, Act Blue; $50, 08/15/17, Act Blue; $10, 11/10/18, Act Blue; $50, 11/01/18, Act Blue; $10, 11/01/18, Act Blue; Donald Gilchrist: $250, 09/13/14, Hagan for Senate; $250, 10/04/16, North Carolina Democratic Party; $250, 08/11/18, Act Blue; $100, 08/11/18, Kathy Manning for Congress; $250, 09/28/18, Kathy Manning for Congress; Lynne Klauer: None, N/A, N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None, N/A, N/A.

Alina L. Romanowski, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

Nominee: Alina L. Romanowski.

Post: Kuwait.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0.

2. Spouse: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Nicholas R. Matzelevich: 0, Eric R. Matzelevich: 0.

4. Parents: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Dominique S. Romanowski: 0, Paolo Consiglio: 0.

Kelly C. Degnan, of California, 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 Georgia.

Nominee: Kelly Colleen Degnan.

Post: Georgia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: No contributions.

2. Spouse: N/A—no spouse.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A—no children.

4. Parents: Kathryn Colleen Morrison—deceased; Richard Patrick Degnan—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Michael and Mathilda Degnan—deceased; David and Kathryn Morrison—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A—no brothers.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Kate Degnan—no spouse: No contributions; Kim Degnan—no spouse: No contributions.

Peter M. Haymond, 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 Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Nominee: Peter M. Haymond.

Post: Lao People's Democratic Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Faye Donaya Haymond, Single, none.

4. Parents: Phillip M. Haymond—deceased; Carole Marie Haymond—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Paul M. Haymond—deceased; Faye Averett Haymond Madsen—deceased; Roy C. Cummings—deceased; Ethel Cummings—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Alan David Haymond, none; Pamela Haymond, none; Andrew Cummings Haymond, none; Colleen Haymond, none; Jonathan Ruel Haymond, none; Tresa Haymond, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Allen, none; Spencer Allen, none; Martha Dobler, none; Andreas Dobler, none; Rebekah McKnight, divorced, none; Esther Gozo, divorced, none.

John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

Nominee: John J. Sullivan.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Russia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $250.00, 2016, Trump-Pence 2016 Presidential Campaign; $5,000.00, 2015, Right to Rise USA (Jeb Bush Presidential Campaign).

2. Spouse: Graciela M. Rodriguez: None.

3. Children and Spouses: John H. Sullivan: None. Katherine A. Sullivan: None. Edward A. Sullivan: None.

4. Parents: John H. Sullivan—deceased: None. Julia C. Sullivan—deceased: None.

5. Grandparents: Joseph W. Sullivan—deceased: None. Sabrina F. Sullivan—deceased: None. Patrick J. Clark—deceased: None. Bridget K. Clark—deceased: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

Andeliz N. Castillo, of New York, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Alma L. Golden, of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations 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.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Derrick Scott Brown and ending with V. Kate Somvongsiri, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Idris M. Diaz)

Foreign Service nomination of Jay P. Williams.

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Sean O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

(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 Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2902. A bill to enhance the rural health workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2903. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, to develop financial risk analyses relating to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2904. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on the outputs that may be generated by generative adversarial networks, otherwise known as deepfakes, and other comparable techniques that may be developed in

the future, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2905. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2906. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new oil or natural gas production leases in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate its existing leases in order to require royalty payments if oil and natural gas prices are greater than or equal to specified price thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2907. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2908. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 2909. A bill to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2910. A bill to establish aviation accession training programs for the Commissioned Officer Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to prepare students for commissioned service as pilots in the Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2911. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a monthly out-of-pocket cost sharing maximum for enrollees who incur a significant portion of costs for covered part D drugs towards the annual out-of-pocket threshold during a month; to the Committee on Finance .

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2912. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land located in Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2913. A bill to apply cooperative and small employer charity pension plan rules to certain charitable employers whose primary exempt purpose is providing services with respect to mothers and children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2914. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure access to acupuncturist services through the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 2915. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of services and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who experience domestic violence, intimate partner violence, or sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2917. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2918. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to carry out activities to benefit pollinators on roadsides and highway rights-of-way, including the planting and seeding of native, locally-appropriate grasses and wildflowers, including milkweed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 2919. A bill to require the Federal financial regulators to issue guidance encouraging financial institutions to work with consumers and businesses affected by a Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2920. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2921. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for an auction of C–Band spectrum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2922. A bill to permit Amtrak to bring civil actions in Federal district court to enforce the right set forth in section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, which gives intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 435. A resolution reaffirming the importance of the General Security of Military Information Agreement between the Republic of Korea and Japan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 191

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 191, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) 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. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) 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. 610

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont

(Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) 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. 1089

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 1309

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1399, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Services Act to revise and extend nursing workforce development programs.

S. 1554

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1554, a bill to provide for an automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1575

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1575, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to make available to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention copies of consular reports of death of United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1838, supra.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, supra.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 1992, a bill to amend the FAST Act to repeal a rescission of funds.

S. 2080

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2080, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2218

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2218, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.

S. 2365

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2365, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize urban Indian organizations to enter into arrangements for the sharing of medical services and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2377

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2377, a bill to apply the Medicaid asset verification program to all applicants for, and recipients of, medical assistance in all States and territories, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) 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. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 2561

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2561, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 2648

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2648, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benchmarking process for the Medicare Shared Savings Program.

S. 2674

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2674, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to establish a grant program for improving infrastructure asset management by small public water systems, and for other purposes.

S. 2680

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) 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. 2699

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2699, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 2745

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2745, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 2766

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2766, a bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leadership of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes.

S. 2788

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2788, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 2826

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2826, a bill to require a global economic security strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 2835

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2835, a bill to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to a prospective FHA borrower who is a veteran, to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of a certificate of eligibility for VA home loans during the preseparation counseling for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2870

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2870, a bill to limit the use of solitary confinement and other forms of restrictive housing in immigration detention, and for other purposes.

S. 2874

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2874, a bill to terminate certain waivers of sanctions with respect to Iran issued in connection with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2913. A bill to apply cooperative and small employer charity pension plan rules to certain charitable employers whose primary exempt purpose is providing services with respect to mothers and children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Protecting Critical Services for Mothers and Babies Act, with my colleague Senator PERDUE. Enacting this bill will help ensure that mothers and infants across the country continue to receive access to important health programs.

About 700 women die each year in the United States from complications during or after pregnancy, a problem that disproportionately affects Black and American Indian/Alaskan Native women. In the face of these challenges, organizations like March of Dimes provide services that disseminate health information to pregnant women and mothers and support care for premature and ill infants.

Inflexible funding rules and historically low interest rates have combined to result in a sharp increase in March of Dimes' pension funding obligations next year. This Act will extend more flexible rules to organizations that have a long track record of serving maternal and infant health needs. These rules, already offered to other organizations, will continue to protect plan participants while also smoothing out pension funding obligations. This change will ensure that resources are not diverted away from important maternal and infant health programs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, in introducing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. This bill would update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which have provided life-saving services and housing for America's homeless youth for more than forty years.

Homelessness is affecting youth in unprecedented numbers. According to a recent study by Voices of Youth Count, an estimated 4.2 million young people experience homelessness at some point each year. Some of these youth may stay away from home for a few nights, while others have been living on the streets for years. Approximately 73 percent experienced homelessness lasting more than one month. The study also found that homelessness is just as prevalent in rural communities as it is in urban communities.

And sadly, these statistics likely underestimate the scale of this problem. This month, I met with teachers and specialists from Lewiston, Maine, who work directly with young people in Lewiston High School whose families experience homelessness. We talked about the pressures that student homelessness places on teachers, school administrators, and their already strapped resources, and, of course, on the children and teens themselves. Although schools often serve as a first stop for assistance, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act would reauthorize and strengthen the programs that help homeless youth meet their immediate needs, and it would help secure long-term residential services for those who cannot be reunified with their families safely.

The three Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs—the Basic Center Program, the Street Outreach Program, and the Transitional Living Program—help community-based organizations reach these young people when they need support the most. These programs help runaway and homeless youth avoid the juvenile justice system, and early intervention can help them to escape victimization and trafficking.

As Chairman of the Senate Housing Appropriations Subcommittee, working to end the scourge of homelessness—among both youth and adults—has been one of my top priorities. Along with Senator JACK REED, I created a grant program to reduce youth homelessness. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, there has been a 15 percent drop in chronic homelessness since 2007. We must build on this success. Homeless youth should have the same opportunities to succeed as their peers, and this bill is an important step in that direction.

In Maine, our homeless shelters are critical partners in the fight to end human trafficking. Earlier this year, I hosted U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Ben Carson in Lewiston. We visited New Beginnings, where we saw firsthand how Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resources are

providing essential safety nets for young people in need. Staff at New Beginnings help young people with case management, find referrals to local and State agencies, assist with housing needs and access to shelter, and connect them to local educational and employment programs.

These programs produce results. In 2015, I held a hearing during which Brittany Dixon, a former homeless youth from Auburn, Maine, testified about her personal experience with New Beginnings. After becoming homeless as a teenager, New Beginnings gave her the help and support she needed to develop critical life skills and become self-sufficient. She went on to earn a college degree and obtain a full-time job as an education technician at an elementary school.

Mr. President, teens run away and become homeless for many reasons. They are also at high risk of victimization, abuse, criminal activity, and even death. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that, in 2017, one in seven of nearly 25,000 youth reported to them as runaways were sex trafficking victims. In Maine, recent reports show that of the more than 10,000 reported human trafficking cases last year, 26 percent involved minors. Several hundreds of these victims identified as runaway or homeless youth. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile justice system.

Our bill focuses on this tragic problem by supporting wrap-around services for victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. Congress has passed legislation in recent years to combat these horrific crimes and support survivors, and the policies and tools included in the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act are important pieces of the Federal response to human trafficking.

The data also show that a growing number of homeless youth identify as LGBT. According to the Voices of Youth Count report, LGBT young people are twice as likely to be homeless. Our bill would ensure that those seeking services through these Federal programs are not denied assistance based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability.

Mr. President, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support those young people who run away, are kicked out, or are disconnected from families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, study, and develop is critical for all young people. The programs reauthorized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2922. A bill to permit Amtrak to bring civil actions in Federal district court to enforce the right set forth in section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, which gives intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. 2922

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 ''Rail Passenger Fairness Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(1) Congress created Amtrak under the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–158).

(2) Amtrak began serving customers on May 1, 1971, taking over the operation of most intercity passenger trains that private, freight railroads were previously required to operate. In exchange for assuming these passenger rail operations, Amtrak was given access to the national rail network.

(3) In return for relief from the obligation to provide intercity passenger service, railroads over which Amtrak operated (referred to in this section as ''host railroads'') were expected to give Amtrak passenger trains preference over freight trains when using the national rail network.

(4) In 1973, Congress passed the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–146), which gives intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing. This right, which is now codified as section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, states, ''Except in an emergency, intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation provided by or for Amtrak has preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing unless the Board orders otherwise under this subsection. A rail carrier affected by this subsection may apply to the Board for relief. If the Board, after an opportunity for a hearing under section 553 of title 5, decides that preference for intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation materially will lessen the quality of freight transportation provided to shippers, the Board shall establish the rights of the carrier and Amtrak on reasonable terms.''.

(5) Many host railroads have ignored the law referred to in paragraph (4) by refusing to give passenger rail the priority to which it is statutorily entitled and giving freight transportation the higher priority. As a result, Amtrak's on time performance on most host railroads is poor, has declined between 2014 through 2019, and continues to decline.

(6) According to Amtrak, 6,500,000 customers on State-supported and long-distance trains arrived at their destination late during fiscal year 2019. Nearly 70 percent of these delays were caused by host railroads, amounting to a total of 3,200,000 minutes. The largest cause of these delays was freight train interference, which accounted for more than 1,000,000 minutes of delay for Amtrak passengers, or approximately 2 years, because host railroads chose to give freight trains priority.

(7) Poor on-time performance wastes taxpayer dollars. According to a 2019 report by Amtrak's Office of Inspector General, a 5 percent improvement of on-time performance on all Amtrak routes would result in $12,100,000 in cost savings to Amtrak in the first year. If on-time performance on long-distance routes reached 75 percent for a year, Amtrak would realize an estimated $41,900,000 in operating cost savings, with a one-time savings of $336,000,000 due to a reduction in equipment replacement needs.

(8) Historical data suggests that on-time performance on host railroads is driven by the existence of an effective means to enforce Amtrak's preference rights:

(A) Two months after the date of the enactment of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), which included provisions for the enforcement of these preference rights, was enacted, the on-time performance of long-distance trains improved from 56 percent to 77 percent and Class I freight train interference delays across all routes declined by 40 percent.

(B) One year after such date of enactment, freight train interference delays had declined by 54 percent and the on-time performance of long-distance trains reached 85 percent.

(C) In 2014, after some of the provisions in the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 related to enforcement of preference were ruled unconstitutional by a D.C. Circuit Court, long-distance train on-time performance declined from 72 percent to 50 percent, and freight train interference delays increased 59 percent.

(D) The last time long-distance trains achieved an on-time rate of more than 80 percent in a given month was February 2012.

(9) As a result of violations of Amtrak's right to preference, Amtrak has been consistently unable on host railroad networks to meet its congressionally mandated mission and goals, which are codified in section 24101 of title 49, United States Code (relating to providing on-time and trip-time competitive service to its passengers).

(10) Amtrak does not have an effective mechanism to enforce its statutory preference right in order to fulfill its mission and goals. Only the Attorney General can bring a civil action for equitable relief in a district court of the United States to enforce Amtrak's preference rights.

(11) In Amtrak's entire history, the only enforcement action initiated by the Attorney General was against the Southern Pacific Transportation Company in 1979.

(12) Congress supports continued authority for the Attorney General to initiate an action, but Amtrak should also be entitled to bring a civil action before a Federal district court to enforce its statutory preference rights.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZE AMTRAK TO BRING A CIVIL ACTION TO ENFORCE IT PREFERENCE RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended, by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding sections 24103(a) and 24308(f), Amtrak shall have the right to bring an action for equitable or other relief in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or in any jurisdiction in which Amtrak resides or is found, to enforce the preference rights granted under this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 24103(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''of this subsection'' and inserting ''and subsection 24308(c)''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 435—REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE GENERAL SECURITY OF MILITARY INFORMATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA AND JAPAN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 435

Whereas the General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) between the Republic of Korea and Japan is crucial to safeguarding United States and allied interests in Northeast Asia and the broader Indo-Pacific region;

Whereas bilateral information sharing between the Governments of the Republic of Korea and Japan is critical to increasing trust and growing cooperation that advances shared defense and security interests;

Whereas the Governments and people of Japan and the Republic of Korea have made significant contributions to advancing our shared defense partnership and promoting trilateral cooperation;

Whereas defense cooperation among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea serves as a deterrent against aggression from adversaries and external security threats as well as against new and non-traditional challenges;

Whereas the suspension of GSOMIA directly harms United States national security at a time when the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is engaging in an increased level of provocations, including 12 tests of over 20 ballistic missiles this year, including new types of nuclear-capable land and sea-launched ballistic missiles;

Whereas the Governments of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the Russian Federation are seeking to capitalize on friction between the Republic of Korea and Japan, and the resulting strain on trilateral cooperation and on our bilateral alliances;

Whereas the Government and people of the United States value the partnership of Japan and the Republic of Korea in upholding regional security and prosperity, including by safeguarding maritime security and freedom of navigation, promoting investment and commerce, advocating for the rule of law, and opposing the use of intimidation and force in the Indo-Pacific; and

Whereas strengthening intelligence sharing is fundamental to the future of trilateral cooperation, and to enabling the Governments of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea to face the challenges posed by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's destabilizing actions, the People's Republic of China, and other emerging security threats: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the importance of the General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) between the Republic of Korea and Japan as a crucial military intelligence-sharing agreement foundational to Indo-Pacific security and defense, and specifically to countering nuclear and missile threats from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(2) underscores the vital role of the alliances between the United States and Japan and the United States and the Republic of Korea in promoting peace, stability, and security in the Indo-Pacific region;

(3) highlights that friction between the Republic of Korea and Japan only fractures the region and empowers its agitators;

(4) urges the Republic of Korea to consider how to best address potential measures that may undermine regional security cooperation;

(5) encourages the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea to take steps to rebuild trust and address the sources of bilateral friction, insulate important defense and security ties from other bilateral challenges, and pursue cooperation on shared interests, such as a denuclearized Korean peninsula, market-based trade and commerce, and a stable Indo-Pacific region; and

(6) commits to strengthening and deepening diplomatic, economic, security, and people-to-people ties between and among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1249. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1250. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1249. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 14, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 1603. BIPARTISAN AMERICAN MINERS ACT OF 2019.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Bipartisan American Miners Act of 2019''.

(b) TRANSFERS TO 1974 UMWA PENSION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (i) of section 402 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''$490,000,000'' and inserting ''$750,000,000'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—

''(A) CALCULATION.—If the dollar limitation specified in paragraph (3)(A) exceeds the aggregate amount required to be transferred under paragraphs (1) and (2) for a fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an additional amount equal to the difference between such dollar limitation and such aggregate amount to the trustees of the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan to pay benefits required under that plan.

''(B) CESSATION OF TRANSFERS.—The transfers described in subparagraph (A) shall cease as of the first fiscal year beginning after the first plan year for which the funded percentage (as defined in section 432(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan is at least 100 percent.

''(C) PROHIBITION ON BENEFIT INCREASES, ETC.—During a fiscal year in which the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan is receiving transfers under subparagraph (A), no amendment of such plan which increases the liabilities of the plan by reason of any increase in benefits, any change in the accrual of benefits, or any change in the rate at which benefits become nonforfeitable under the plan may be adopted unless the amendment is required as a condition of qualification under part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(D) CRITICAL STATUS TO BE MAINTAINED.—Until such time as the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan ceases to be eligible for the transfers described in subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the Plan shall be treated as if it were in critical status for purposes of sections 412(b)(3), 432(e)(3), and 4971(g)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and sections 302(b)(3) and 305(e)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act;

''(ii) the Plan shall maintain and comply with its rehabilitation plan under section 432(e) of such Code and section 305(e) of such Act, including any updates thereto; and

''(iii) the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) of section 432 of such Code and subsections (c) and (d) of section 305 of such Act shall not apply.

''(E) TREATMENT OF TRANSFERS FOR PURPOSES OF WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY UNDER ERISA.—The amount of any transfer made under subparagraph (A) (and any earnings attributable thereto) shall be disregarded in determining the unfunded vested benefits of the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan and the allocation of such unfunded vested benefits to an employer for purposes of determining the employer's withdrawal liability under section 4201 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

''(F) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN CONTRIBUTION RATE.—A transfer under subparagraph (A) shall not be made for a fiscal year unless the persons that are obligated to contribute to the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan on the date of the transfer are obligated to make the contributions at rates that are no less than those in effect on the date which is 30 days before the date of enactment of the Bipartisan American Miners Act of 2019.

''(G) ENHANCED ANNUAL REPORTING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the 90th day of each plan year beginning after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan American Miners Act of 2019, the trustees of the 1974 UMWA Pension Plan shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation a report (including appropriate documentation and actuarial certifications from the plan actuary, as required by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate) that contains—

''(I) whether the plan is in endangered or critical status under section 305 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 432 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as of the first day of such plan year;

''(II) the funded percentage (as defined in section 432(j)(2) of such Code) as of the first day of such plan year, and the underlying actuarial value of assets and liabilities taken into account in determining such percentage;

''(III) the market value of the assets of the plan as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year;

''(IV) the total value of all contributions made during the plan year preceding such plan year;

''(V) the total value of all benefits paid during the plan year preceding such plan year;

''(VI) cash flow projections for such plan year and either the 6 or 10 succeeding plan years, at the election of the trustees, and the assumptions relied upon in making such projections;

''(VII) funding standard account projections for such plan year and the 9 succeeding plan years, and the assumptions relied upon in making such projections;

''(VIII) the total value of all investment gains or losses during the plan year preceding such plan year;

''(IX) any significant reduction in the number of active participants during the plan year preceding such plan year, and the reason for such reduction;

''(X) a list of employers that withdrew from the plan in the plan year preceding such plan year, and the resulting reduction in contributions;

''(XI) a list of employers that paid withdrawal liability to the plan during the plan year preceding such plan year and, for each employer, a total assessment of the withdrawal liability paid, the annual payment amount, and the number of years remaining in the payment schedule with respect to such withdrawal liability;

''(XII) any material changes to benefits, accrual rates, or contribution rates during the plan year preceding such plan year;

''(XIII) any scheduled benefit increase or decrease in the plan year preceding such plan year having a material effect on liabilities of the plan;

''(XIV) details regarding any funding improvement plan or rehabilitation plan and updates to such plan;

''(XV) the number of participants and beneficiaries during the plan year preceding such plan year who are active participants, the number of participants and beneficiaries in pay status, and the number of terminated vested participants and beneficiaries;

''(XVI) the information contained on the most recent annual funding notice submitted by the plan under section 101(f) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974;

''(XVII) the information contained on the most recent Department of Labor Form 5500 of the plan; and

''(XVIII) copies of the plan document and amendments, other retirement benefit or ancillary benefit plans relating to the plan and contribution obligations under such plans, a breakdown of administrative expenses of the plan, participant census data and distribution of benefits, the most recent actuarial valuation report as of the plan year, copies of collective bargaining agreements, and financial reports, and such other information as the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, may require.

''(ii) ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.—The report required under clause (i) shall be submitted electronically.

''(iii) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate shall share the information in the report under clause (i) with the Secretary of Labor.

''(iv) PENALTY.—Any failure to file the report required under clause (i) on or before the date described in such clause shall be treated as a failure to file a report required to be filed under section 6058(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, except that section 6652(e) of such Code shall be applied with respect to any such failure by substituting '$100' for '$25'. The preceding sentence shall not apply if the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate determines that reasonable diligence has been exercised by the trustees of such plan in attempting to timely file such report.

''(H) 1974 UMWA PENSION PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term '1974 UMWA Pension Plan' has the meaning given the term in section 9701(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to the limitation on participation to individuals who retired in 1976 and thereafter.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2016.

(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 402(i)(4)(G) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232(i)(4)(G)), as added by this subsection, shall apply to plan years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INCLUSION IN MULTIEMPLOYER HEALTH BENEFIT PLAN.—Section 402(h)(2)(C) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232(h)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2017'' both places it appears in clause (ii) and inserting ''the Bipartisan American Miners Act of 2019'';

(2) by striking '', would be denied or reduced as a result of a bankruptcy proceeding commenced in 2012 or 2015'' in clause (ii)(II) and inserting ''or a related coal wage agreement, would be denied or reduced as a result of a bankruptcy proceeding commenced in 2012, 2015, 2018, or 2019'';

(3) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii)(I), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii)(II) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after clause (ii)(II) the following new subclause:

''(III) the cost of administering the resolution of disputes process administered (as of the date of the enactment of the Bipartisan American Miners Act of 2019) by the Trustees of the Plan.'',

(4) by striking ''January 1, 2017'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''January 1, 2019''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vi) RELATED COAL WAGE AGREEMENT.—For purposes of clause (ii), the term 'related coal wage agreement' means an agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and an employer in the bituminous coal industry that—

''(I) is a signatory operator; or

''(II) is or was a debtor in a bankruptcy proceeding that was consolidated, administratively or otherwise, with the bankruptcy proceeding of a signatory operator or a related person to a signatory operator (as those terms are defined in section 9701(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(d) REDUCTION IN MINIMUM AGE FOR ALLOWABLE IN-SERVICE DISTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 401(a)(36) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''age 62'' and inserting ''age 59½''.

(2) APPLICATION TO GOVERNMENTAL SECTION 457(b) PLANS.—Clause (i) of section 457(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''(in the case of a plan maintained by an employer described in subsection (e)(1)(A), age 59½)'' before the comma at the end.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SA 1250. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, add the following:

SEC. _____. REDUCTION IN RATE FOR OPERATIONS.

The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116–59) is further amended by inserting after section 150, as added by section 101 of this division, the following:

''SEC. 151. REDUCTION IN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE SAVINGS FOR THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE.

''(a) REDUCTION IN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the rate for operations provided by section 101 is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The rate for operations shall not be reduced under paragraph (1) for the following:

''(A) Amounts made available from the Highway Trust Fund established by section 9503(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(B) Amounts for purposes described in section 147.

''(C) For the Environmental Protection Agency, Infrastructure Assistance, amounts made available for the following:

''(i) The Clean Water State Revolving Funds and the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.

''(ii) The Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act Program Account.

''(iii) The America's Water Infrastructure Act Grant Programs under section 1459A of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–19a).

''(b) TRANSFER OF SAVINGS.—

''(1) DETERMINATION OF SAVINGS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the amount of the reduction in amounts made available under section 101 of this division that is attributable to subsection (a).

''(2) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount determined under paragraph (1), as follows:

''(A) For the Highway Trust Fund established by section 9503(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, 95 percent of such amount.

''(B) For the Clean Water State Revolving Funds and the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, 3 percent of such amount.

''(C) For the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act Program Account, 1 percent of such amount.

''(D) For the America's Water Infrastructure Act Grant Programs under section 1459A of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–19a), 1 percent of such amount.

''(3) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (2) shall remain available until expended.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 13 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing the following nominations: Mitchell A. Silk, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary, and David Carey Woll, Jr., of Connecticut, and John Bobbitt, of Texas, both to be an Assistant Secretary, all of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Peter J. Coniglio, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Export-Import.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nominations of Sean O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Stephen E. Biegun, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

The Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

The Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2920

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2920) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. 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 6:20 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 20, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADRIAN ZUCKERMAN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ROMANIA.

THE JUDICIARY

BARBARA LAGOA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING HOWARD BLACKBURN

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the late Howard Blackburn of Hays, North Carolina for his recent induction into the Wilkes County Agricultural Hall of Fame.

Howard Blackburn epitomized a life of excellence and service. He served in the military during World War Two and the Korean War. Howard Blackburn influenced thousands of lives through his leadership in education and agriculture. Through his work at Wilkes Community College, where he served as director of the life sciences program, Mr. Blackburn helped thousands of students develop farming skills.

Howard Blackburn is perhaps best known throughout Wilkes Country for his contributions to beekeeping. He helped found the Beekeepers of Wilkes, and personally served as an instructor and mentor for decades. He helped many, many other people understand the importance of bees to our lives. He always maintained the highest standards of meticulous conduct and expected others to strive to the same level of excellence. Howard Blackburn is a shining example of service that we should all seek to emulate.

HONORING THE POLISH HIGHLANDERS ALLIANCE OF NORTH AMERICA ON ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Polish Highlanders Alliance of North America as the organization prepares to celebrate its 90th anniversary. I am proud of the relationship I've developed over many years with the Polish Highlanders Alliance and President Jozef Cikowski. It is a privilege to represent so many Polish Highlanders and I look forward to gathering with them on Saturday, November 23rd for this historic celebration.

The Polish Highlanders Alliance traces its roots back to 1929 when its first chapter, known as a circle, was founded in Chicago. Since its inception, the Alliance has sought to organize Polish Highlanders throughout North America into a unified Highlander family. For the last 90 years, members of the Alliance have worked hard to preserve the unique cultural heritage of the Polish Highlands region, including music, dance, folk costumes, and other traditions. Through the years, the organization has grown to over 80 circles throughout the U.S. and Canada.

Today, the Polish Highlanders Alliance is headquartered on the Southwest Side of Chicago in the Highlander Home on Archer Avenue. The Alliance organizes many cultural events for the Highlander and the Polish-American community including the Highlander Picnic which attracts nearly 3,000 people every year. For its numerous cultural activities, the Alliance has received awards including the Gloria Artis Cultural Achievement Medal. The medal was awarded by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage of the Republic of Poland for the Alliance's distinguished contributions to Polish culture. In addition to cultural activities, the Polish Highlanders Alliance raises money to provide assistance to churches, schools, and other establishments within Poland and the Highlands region.

This year marks 100 years of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Poland. I am overjoyed that as we celebrate this anniversary, the U.S. is finally including Poland in the Visa Waiver Program. As a result, as of November 11 citizens of Poland no longer need a visa to visit the United States. For years I helped constituents obtain visas for their Polish relatives to visit the U.S. for baptisms, weddings, and other family events, and I advocated alongside the Polish Highlanders Alliance for Poland's inclusion in the VWP.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing all that the Polish Highlanders Alliance of North America does to promote unique Polish cultural traditions and to support strong ties between Poland and the United States. The members' devotion to their community and their mission is commendable and I wish them the best as they continue to impart their traditions for generations to come. Good wishes (Sto lat).

RECOGNIZING COLLIN COUNTY ORGANIZATIONS WORKING TO END HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, each year during the week prior to Thanksgiving, communities across the country come together to bring awareness to the problems of hunger and homelessness. Today, I want to recognize the Collin County organizations working to end hunger and homelessness throughout our community.

Today, there are nearly 42 million Americans facing hunger and on any given night, more than 194,000 people will sleep on the street.

While these numbers are sobering, we are incredibly grateful to those in our community who work so hard to ease the suffering of others. Organizations such as the Collin County Homeless Coalition, Family Promise of Collin County, North Texas Food Bank, Minnie's Food Pantry, and Hope's Door New Beginning Center, Allen Community Outreach, and many, many others work year-round to take care of those less fortunate.

Through these organizations, volunteers, businesses, and faith communities come together to provide necessities like shelter and nutritious meals. They go above and beyond to ensure those in need have access to basic medical care and hygiene products and even provide job training and placement resources to those struggling with homelessness.

As we approach the holidays, let us not only remember and support those facing hunger and homelessness, but also those in our community who give so much for their fellow man.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present during roll call vote number 630. Had I been present, I would have voted: on roll call vote number 630 YES.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM O'HALLERAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, on November 19, 2019, I voted in favor of H.R. 5084, the Improving Corporate Governance Through Diversity Act, on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. However, my vote did not register on Roll Call 630. I would like the record to reflect that I supported passage of this legislation on the House floor.

RECOGNIZING MS. MEGAN HANDAL

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I wish to recognize Ms. Megan Handal, upon her departure as Clerk, Readiness Subcommittee and Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, House Armed Services Committee to the U.S. House of Representatives.

In this role, Ms. Handal was personally responsible for ensuring that the Chairs of the Readiness Subcommittee and Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee had the appropriate administrative information and hearing details, handled all logistics for each hearing, and ensured all hearings ran on time. Ms. Handal coordinated with Congressional Members, Congressional staff, and all witnesses for

each hearing she oversaw. Ms. Handal was also responsible for quality control of Congressional transcripts, military construction tables, and subcommittee bill and report language. Before her time as Clerk, Megan interned with the House Armed Services Committee in 2015, as well as the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe in the summer of 2016.

Megan is a graduate of Villanova University, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and is an avid supporter of Villanova Wildcats basketball.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation to Ms. Megan Handal for her dedicated service to the U.S. House of Representatives and to our Nation. We wish her the best as she moves on to her next role.

HONORING COMMANDER JIM MOODY

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the service of Commander Jim Moody with the Collin County Sheriff's Department. Following a distinguished thirty-seven year career in law enforcement, a grateful community thanks Commander Moody for his leadership and dedication to the citizens of Collin County.

In 1981, Mr. Moody began his career in law enforcement with the Atoka County Sheriff's office in Oklahoma. During his time in Atoka, Jim worked in several areas, including Dispatch, Patrol, Civil, Mental, and Warrants. In 1985, Jim joined the Collin County Sheriff's Office as a Detention Officer. Due to his stellar efforts, he was promoted to the rank of Captain over the Detention Facility and as well as Professional Standards. Later, he would hold the position of Support Services Captain and Public Information Officer prior to serving in his current capacity as a Commander.

I would like to ask my colleagues to join me today in thanking Commander Jim Moody for his steadfast service to Collin County and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING HERMANN HIGH SCHOOL VOLLEYBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS II STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Hermann Bearcats volleyball team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class II State Volleyball Championship.

This is Hermann High School's fourteenth state championship win in the history of their volleyball program. This team and Coach Phil Landolt should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the Hermann Bearcats volleyball team for a job well done.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF LINDA JAY

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Linda Jay, a community leader from Tehachapi, California which I represent, who is retiring from her position as the CEO of the Bakersfield Association of Realtors after an illustrious, decades-spanning career.

As a 30-year veteran of the real estate industry, she managed the Coldwell Banker in Tehachapi, served as President of the Tehachapi Area Association of Realtors, contributed extensively to the Tehachapi News as a real estate expert, and most recently held the position of CEO of the Bakersfield Association of Realtors, one of Kern County's largest trade organizations.

Linda's community involvement hardly ends there. In addition to her real estate experience and leadership, Linda has long been an active member on numerous local boards and commissions, including the Tehachapi City Planning Commission, Habitat for Humanity Golden Empire, and the Kern Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors, to name a few. Linda's public service also extended to local politics, where she served on the Tehachapi City Council for twelve years and was elected Mayor of Tehachapi in 2009.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Linda met her husband Bruce through her work as a realtor when he came to the Bakersfield Association of Realtors in search of advice for a business he was starting. Since getting married in 2012, the Jays have become known as a local power couple heavily involved in all things Tehachapi and Kern County. When retired, Linda and Bruce are looking forward to more family time with their 6 children and 12 grandchildren, and plan to travel throughout the country in their RV coach.

On behalf of the 23rd Congressional District of California, I want to congratulate Linda on a remarkable career, thank her for her dedicated service to the Tehachapi and Kern County, and wish her and Bruce all the best in retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE CRITICAL U.S.-INDIA RELATIONSHIP

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the critical relationship with our ally India. I recently had the great pleasure of sitting down with India's ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Harsh Vardhan Shringla to discuss the critical issues facing India and the importance of the bilateral relationship between India and the United States.

India faces many regional and geopolitical threats. Islamic insurgents are a constant threat, spreading terror throughout Jammu and Kashmir and elsewhere in India. We should support the government in Delhi in the continued fight against terror. India also faces an increasingly aggressive and assertive China that continues to export its malign influence throughout the Indo-Pacific region. China's behavior is destabilizing India's near-abroad, saddling its neighbors with unpayable debts, as was the case with the port project in Hambantota, Sri Lanka. India is also on constant alert with a hostile and unstable nuclear-armed state to their West—Pakistan.

India is a critical trading partner with the United States. India accounts for about 3 percent of the United States' world trade, which continues to grow year after year. Likewise, the United States is India's second largest trading partner—accounting 16 percent of India's exports. We must continue to work towards strengthening our trade relationship with India, increasing bilateral foreign direct investment, and consider the negotiation of a free trade agreement.

Most importantly, India and the United States share the same values. As the two largest democracies in the world, our countries dually respect freedom and human dignity. It is then no surprise that the population of Indian-Americans grew by 38 percent between 2010 and 2017. Going forward, our relationship with India will only grow in importance. By sharing the same values, we inherently share similar interests and concerns. We must continue working together to confront dangers abroad, strengthen our economic relationship, and advance the cause of freedom and democracy around the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on the 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 (H.R. 3055). Had I been present for roll call No. 631, I would have voted "AYE."

RECOGNIZING MR. MIKE VANCE

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mr. Stephen "Mike" Vance for his longtime service to Collin County as an officer of the law.

At the age of three years old, Mike moved to Richardson, Texas, with his family where he attended St. Paul Apostle Grade School and Allen Military Academy. "Mooky," as he is known by many, would go on to graduate from the Leadership Command College at Sam Houston State University and also earned a degree in Management and Technology from Richland Junior College.

Mike Vance's career in law enforcement began in 1985 when he became an Officer of

the Collin County Reserve unit where he was employed as a Detention Officer in the Collin County Detention Facility. After moving to Anna, Texas in 1988, he would become a full-time Patrol Deputy.

During his time with the Collin County Sheriff's Office, Mike held a variety of responsibilities, including serving warrants and civil papers, working as a narcotics officer and supervisor, and working as a patrol office supervisor. He continued to serve for 17 years as a member of the SWAT team, seven years of which he served as Commander. Additionally, for an impressive twenty-six years, he worked in the Criminal Investigation Division as a Criminal Investigator.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me today in commending Mike Vance upon his retirement for his thirty-plus year career in law enforcement and for his dedication to ensuring the safety of Collin County and its residents.

RECOGNIZING JODIE PENROD JOLLY FOR THE 2019 MONTANA CONGRESSIONAL VETERAN COMMENDATION

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jodie Penrod Jolly of Dillon for Montana Congressional Veteran Commendation for her service to her country and her support of fellow veterans in her community.

Ms. Jolly is a veteran of the United States Air Force where she served as a nurse for over thirty years. She has received multiple commendations over her time in the Air Force including the USAF National Defense Medal and the Saudi-Kuwait Liberation Medal.

Ms. Jolly had one goal when she came to Dillon: to support and help veterans in the community. She started the Beaverhead Chapter of Joining Community Forces and hosts an annual dinner to honor veterans, active duty personnel, and their family in the community. Ms. Jolly is known to be a go-to person in the community for veterans seeking assistance, connecting them with Veteran service providers. She is also active with the VFW Bill Carroll Post 9040, serving as Senior Vice-Commander.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending Jodie Penrod Jolly for her dedication to and support of veterans in her community.

RECOGNIZING DON S. HAVENS

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Don S. Havens on his retirement from the office of Mayor of Tipton, Indiana. A well-respected public official for many decades, Don's career has been defined by his faithful service to his fellow citizens. Don's record of electoral victories is a testament to his ability to connect with constituents and to deliver results. Throughout his 12 years on the Tipton City Council and 8 years as Mayor, Don has led the City of Tipton into the new millennium, helping to bring new ideas to fruition by directing projects aimed at building a better community for all of Tipton's citizens.

Growing up in Tipton, Don graduated from Tipton High School in 1963, and furthered his education at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. In 1965, Don became a reporter and editor for the Kokomo Morning Times, a position he would hold until 1967. It was in 1967 that Don was called into service for the United States Army and deployed to Vietnam, where he served until 1968. His military service overseas as a Private First Class garnered Don the Vietnam Service Medal. His training and experiences in the military also helped prepare Don for the next four decades of leadership roles he held in both the public and private sectors.

After his time in the United States Army, Don reentered the workforce as a Manager with Anixter Brothers, a wire manufacturing company in Tipton. In 1975, Don started Havens Realty, where he has been at the helm for over 45 years, continuing to grow the business and further strengthen the local economy. Don became a founding member of the Tipton Economic Development Corporation, a group created to help strengthen and develop the Tipton County business community.

Ever the man on a mission, Don continued to be heavily involved in the public sphere of the Tipton community. Spending 12 years on the Tipton Utility Service Board, Don helped to lead this municipally-owned group in its effort to deliver affordable electric power, water and wastewater collection and treatment to the citizens of Tipton. Throughout his career in public office Don has been an innovative force helping to move Tipton forward, opening new economic opportunities to the citizens of the community. He spent a total of 20 years in elected office, never losing an election, including the post-Watergate election during which Don was the only Republican to win his local race. His service record over his 12 years as a member of the Tipton City Council solidified his sterling reputation as an outstanding civic leader.

Later in his career Don was elected to two consecutive 4-year terms as Mayor of Tipton, first in 2011 and then again in 2015. Taking office at a time of economic tumult for cities throughout the country, Don's experience and leadership were integral to the continued success of the local Tipton economy. While many municipalities were struggling to attract new business and limiting civic programs, the city of Tipton was able to grow the local economy and embark on bold public initiatives as a result of the tireless work of Mayor Havens. Working together with fellow city and state leaders, Mayor Havens was able to attract Chrysler FCA to move operations and massive investment to Tipton.

When Tipton was impacted by extreme flooding in April 2013, Mayor Havens and fellow city leaders worked closely with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to acquire grants that allowed for homes to be rebuilt and renovated for multiple Tipton residents. Furthering his pride in the city, Don was integral in the creation of the Tipton Main Street Association, a volunteer organization with a mission of helping to build a better Tipton. Recent projects have focused on the beautification of the downtown area, with landscaping and flower planting transforming downtown Tipton into a vibrant and exciting center for public gatherings. The Alley project revamped an empty downtown alley into an engaging gathering place for the residents and visitors to come and enjoy the heart of the city.

Mayor Havens has also overseen efforts to undertake demolition projects of dilapidated properties throughout the city, as well as a $3 million investment in parks and recreations infrastructure. Over his last 8 years in office, Mayor Havens and fellow Tipton municipal officials have led a city initiative to invest $2.5 million into construction projects aimed at fixing and replacing the city's streets, sidewalks, and drainage infrastructure, furthering the efforts to improve the city of Tipton and better serve citizens.

For over four decades, Mayor Don Havens has consistently served the best interests of the City of Tipton, as a member of the Utility Service Board, the City Council and as Mayor. His career record in government has shown Don to be an honest, ethical, and transformative public servant who has had an immensely positive impact on the citizens of Tipton. On behalf of all Hoosiers I thank my friend, Mayor Don Havens for his decades of exemplary service to the citizens of Tipton and wish him, his wife and fellow leader in the Tipton community Tami, and his family all the best in a well-deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING COACH BRYANT WRIGHT OF FESTUS HIGH SCHOOL FOR HIS 2019 HALL OF FAME INDUCTION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Bryant Wright on being inducted into the Missouri Track and Cross Country Coaches Association Hall of Fame.

Throughout his 18-year Hall of Fame career, Coach Wright's teams accomplished unbelievable success. He has led the boys cross country team to seven state championship, including the last five in a row, and the girls cross country team to two state championships. He has been a wonderful asset to the school and Festus community. I wish him many more years of success in all of his endeavors.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Coach Bryant Wright on an extraordinary career and wish him all the best in his much-deserved Hall of Fame induction.

RECOGNIZING ERIC AND DAVID GROOS AS CONSTITUENTS OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Eric and David Groos,

two constituents from San Juan Capistrano, as my Constituents of the Month for April.

Each month, I recognize constituents who have gone above and beyond to help their neighbors, give back to their community, and make the country stronger. As co-founders of a non-profit that provides under-served and at-risk youth with outdoor recreational activities, there is no question that Eric and David are deserving of this recognition.

The brothers' non-profit, Great Opportunities, has served over 3000 young people in my district, mainly coming from San Juan Capistrano's geographically identified gang induction zones where kids are most at-risk of being drawn toward gang activity. Organizations like theirs play a critical role in generating opportunity in socioeconomically disadvantaged communities, and I am extremely grateful for the services they provide.

Eric and David provide kids in my district with more than just recreational activities—they are providing experiences that will help kids develop leadership and problem-solving skills, which will serve them well throughout their lives. I believe we must do more at the local, state, and federal to support organizations like theirs that provide under-served youth with the skills they need to succeed in life, and that will continue to be one of my priorities.

I am proud to recognize Eric and David as my constituents of the month for April, and I am deeply grateful for everything they do to give back to our community.

VAN WEZEL 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Van Wezel Performing Arts Hall as it prepares to celebrate its 50th Anniversary.

An architectural landmark and a cultural treasure, the Van Wezel Performing Arts Hall was built on Sarasota Bay in 1968 and 1969 and dedicated to the City of Sarasota on January 5, 1970.

Designed by Frank Lloyd Wright's son-in-law, architect William Wesley Peters and inspired by a seashell found by Wright's widow Olgivanna near the Sea of Japan, the Van Wezel is the world's only purple seashell-shaped theater.

A true pioneer in the cultural development of Sarasota, the Van Wezel has a history of presenting spectacular Broadway musicals, national and international performers, popular comedians and a compelling mix of classical productions.

Some of the stars that have visited the theatre throughout the years include Lucille Ball, Ray Charles, Bob Dylan, Van Cliburn, Liberace, Luciano Pavarotti, Josh Groban, Carol Burnett, Crosby, Stills & Nash, Hall & Oates, Tony Bennett, Dolly Parton, Jay Leno, Steve Martin and Martin Short, Ringo Starr, Renee Fleming, Vladimir Horowitz, John Legend, Sheryl Crow, Red Skelton, Count Basie and many more.

The Van Wezel's powerhouse 2019 through 2020 Broadway season features seven Sarasota premieres including Come From Away, based on the events that took place in Newfoundland on September 11, 2001 and the days after, as well as the critically-acclaimed production of Beautiful: The Carole King Musical, detailing the life and career of the iconic songwriter. They are also thrilled to present returning favorites Les Misérables and The Book of Mormon.

Furthermore, the Van Wezel Performing Arts Hall is implementing its 2nd National Endowment for the Arts Grant to bring arts integration to schools. This is done through Schooltime Performances, teacher training, classroom workshops, and family workshops that serve over 30,000 students, teachers, and family members each year.

The Van Wezel has a long tradition of enriching the community and supporting arts education. I appreciate this opportunity to help commemorate its 50th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS STRAUGH FOR THE 2019 MONTANA CONGRESSIONAL VETERAN COMMENDATION

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas Straugh of Dillon for the Montana Congressional Veteran Commendation for his service and leadership in his community.

Mr. Straugh served with the U.S. Navy for 30 years and served in Vietnam. Mr. Straugh received many commendations during his time in the Navy, including the Vietnam Service Ribbon and the National Defense Ribbon.

Mr. Straugh is a known leader in his community. He served on the city council and multiple committees to improve the community, such as the site selection committee for the Veteran Home in Butte. Mr. Straugh is active in the American Legion, serving as Commander and Vice Commander during his time. Additionally, Mr. Straugh volunteered his time driving with DAV van and logged more than 7,500 hours.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending Thomas Straugh for his service to our country and his leadership in the community.

RECOGNIZING THE GARY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 12TH ANNUAL LAKESHORE CLASSIC

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great admiration that I recognize the Gary Chamber of Commerce as the organization celebrates the 12th annual Lakeshore Classic basketball invitational. In observance of this special event, the Gary Chamber of Commerce will host a celebratory corporate luncheon at the Majestic Star Casino Event Center in Gary, Indiana, on Tuesday, November 26, 2019, followed by the basketball invitational at West Side Leadership Academy on Friday, November 29, 2019, and Saturday, November 30, 2019.

The Lakeshore Classic aims to support the education and guidance of the youth of our communities to positive paths, actions, and endeavors. The Gary Chamber of Commerce has invited Mr. Kenny Lofton, an East Chicago native and retired Major League Baseball (MLB) player, to be the keynote speaker for the event. Born and raised in East Chicago, Mr. Lofton graduated from Washington High School and was an all-state basketball player. Following high school, Kenny accepted a basketball scholarship to the University of Arizona, where his unprecedented skills led his teammates and coaches to believe that he was able to play any professional sport. During Mr. Lofton's junior year, he joined the University of Arizona baseball team. Kenny's speed and potential were widely recognized by baseball scouts, and he was soon drafted in the 17th round of the 1988 MLB draft. During his outstanding major league career, he played on several different teams and was a six-time All-Star and four-time Gold Glove Award winner. Mr. Lofton was also inducted into the Cleveland Indians Hall of Fame and the Negro League Baseball Museum Hall of Game. In addition, he is one of only two men that played in a college basketball Final Four and an MLB World Series. In 2007, Mr. Lofton retired from his seventeen-year MLB career, and for his hard work and determination, he is to be commended.

Upon retirement, Mr. Lofton created his own film company, FilmPool, Inc., a full-service production company with a mission to bring diversity to the screen. He is also a board member for the Still Got Game Foundation, a not-for-profit organization for former professional athletes and philanthropic individuals that provides charitable resources in promotion of social change in our local communities and throughout the world. Recently, Mr. Lofton presented the Cleveland schools with $15,000 from the foundation and his celebrity poker tournament. Kenny Lofton's contributions to the youth of our communities and his support for positive social reform will have an unforgettable impact for generations to come.

At this time, I would like to recognize the schools participating in the Lakeshore Classic basketball tournament. These schools are dedicated to positively impacting Northwest Indiana through academic excellence and sportsmanship, and they are successful in their efforts. The participating schools include West Side Leadership Academy of Gary, John Marshall Metropolitan High School of Chicago, Thea Bowman Leadership Academy of Gary, East Chicago Central High School, George Washington High School of Indianapolis, 21st Century Charter High School of Gary, and Charles Tindley Accelerated High School of Indianapolis.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing the Gary Chamber of Commerce, the organizers and sponsors of the 12th annual Lakeshore Classic, and the devoted volunteers who make this event possible. Their influence, passion, and dedication to our youth in Northwest Indiana are truly commendable.

RECOGNIZING COL BOBBY TOWERY, JR.

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and military service of Colonel Bobby Towery, Jr., who passed away on October 26 at the age of 59.

Colonel Towery answered the call to serve our great nation with the United States Army in 1983 from the University of Mississippi Army ROTC. He retired as a Colonel after 30 years of active duty service. Colonel Towery married his wife, Lisa, in 1984, and together they lived in 19 different homes before settling in Oxford, Mississippi, after his retirement.

Colonel Towery set an example of faith for his family to follow. He was an active member of St. Peters Episcopal Church in Oxford, Mississippi, serving as an acolyte, Chair of the Stewardship Committee, and head of ushers. Colonel Towery was also an active volunteer in his community, from sports coaching to booster clubs. He also had a passion for fitness and enjoyed spending time outdoors with his family and friends.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife, Lisa Carver Towery of Southaven, Mississippi; his two sons, Captain Patrick Towery of Fort Carson, Colorado and Nathan Towery; as well as many friends and extended family members.

Colonel Bobby Towery's life was one of service, grace, love for his family, and community. He will be greatly missed by all whom he encountered.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAILY GLOBE IN IRONWOOD, MICHIGAN

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Daily Globe in Ironwood, Michigan, upon the occasion of its 100th Anniversary. Through a century of community investment and growth, the Daily Globe has become an indispensable part of the Upper Peninsula.

Seeing the need for a daily newspaper in the Western Upper Peninsula, Frank E. Noyes founded the Globe Publishing Company in the fall of 1919. The Daily Globe's first edition was published on November 20th, 1919. Its headline covered the tension between President Woodrow Wilson and the Senate regarding the proposed League of Nations following World War I. In 1936, construction began on its current location, under the leadership of Frank's son, Linwood. Over its century of operations, the Daily Globe would grow to be the local institution it is today.

In addition to their daily publications, the Daily Globe publishes two annual visitors guides, sports previews, home improvement guides, and other specialty pieces. They have also found success in the 21st century, with a large online presence and daily updates to its website and social media. They provide a critical service to the people of Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties, and the impact of their work cannot be overstated. Day after day, the Daily Globe shows what can be achieved when a group of people work together for the betterment of their community. An open house will be held in honor of their centennial on November 20th.

Madam Speaker, it's my honor to congratulate the Daily Globe in Ironwood for its 100 years of success, community growth, and service to the people of the Upper Peninsula. On behalf of my constituents, I wish it all the best as it ventures into the future.

CONGRATULATING FATIMA HIGH SCHOOL'S CROSS COUNTRY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS II STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fatima Comets cross country team for winning both the boys and girls 2019 Missouri Class II State title.

This is the Fatima High School girls' sixth state championship and the boys' second state championship in the history of their cross country program. This team and Coach Marc Bridges should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state title to their school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the Fatima Comets cross country team for a job well done.

CONGRATULATING IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored for the second time as a National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Immaculate Heart of Mary School in Indianapolis, Indiana, in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the United States Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students, and parents who have worked so hard to ensure our children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am very proud that Immaculate Heart of Mary School is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While hundreds of schools nationwide were nominated, only 362 schools were designated as 2019 National Blue Ribbon Schools. Of the 362 schools, Immaculate Heart was one of 12 Indiana schools to receive recognition, making this recognition all the more impressive. Furthermore, this is the second time the Warriors of Immaculate Heart have been named a prestigious Blue Ribbon school, achieving this designation also in 2005. Under the guidance of the Archdiocese of Indianapolis and the leadership of Principal Ronda Swartz, Immaculate Heart has become a beacon of educational excellence.

Immaculate Heart of Mary School is committed to providing a nurturing environment for the intellectual, physical, and social development of each child. As a Catholic institution it has been the mission of the Immaculate Heart of Mary School to provide an exceptional academic experience grounded in making God known, loved and served. This commitment to the well-being and development of the student body is led by a dynamic staff of teachers, working to shape the future through the lives they are positively influencing in their classrooms daily. The dedicated staff at Immaculate Heart engages students in meaningful educational tasks that promote thinking and reasoning and it is because of their hard work that Immaculate Heart of Mary School has been deservedly honored with this Blue Ribbon Award.

As an advocate for education and youth, I want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at Immaculate Heart give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators, and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Immaculate Heart of Mary School. I am very proud of them.

CONGRATULATING ALYSHA BUTLER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Alysha Butler, a social studies teacher at McKinley Technology High School in the District of Columbia, for being named the 2019 National History Teacher of the Year by the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History. She was honored on October 2, 2019, at the Yale Club in New York City.

Butler is the first teacher in D.C. to be recognized with this award. As a social studies teacher, she brings history to life for her students and challenges herself to bring them the untold stories of the past. As the granddaughter of a World War II veteran and Bahamian immigrant, she recognized the absence of stories like her family's in public education. She works to bring these voices and stories into the classroom each day.

Butler is known to teach history through art and storytelling, and frequently uses the District itself as an educational resource. By taking her students on trips around D.C., which

provides many historic sites, she has earned the title, ''Queen of Field Trips.''

The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History was founded in 1994 to promote history teaching by providing resources and support to those in education and recognize the efforts of leaders in the field. Each year, the Institution selects one exemplary American history teacher who encourages a passion for history in their students as the National History Teacher of the Year, and awards them $10,000. We are proud that Butler represents D.C. with this year's award.

Butler has also received the 2019 Daughters of the American Revolution Outstanding Teacher of United States History Award; a 2019 GrantEd award; and was selected as the 2010 Miramar High School Teacher of the Year.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Alysha Butler for being named the 2019 National History Teacher of the Year by the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History and for her dedication and commitment to D.C. students.

IN RECOGNITION OF JERRY VEHAUN

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jerry VeHaun, who will retire after forty-seven years of dedicated service with Buncombe County Emergency Services.

Mr. VeHaun's dedication to serving those in crisis has been evident throughout his life. He served as the Director of Emergency Services where he saw the Buncombe County Emergency Medical Services grow from only employing first aid trained personnel to an advanced life support service employing paramedics and advanced EMTs.

Throughout his career he has led various emergency management and response organizations. He served as President of the North Carolina Emergency Management Association and was awarded the General Edward Foster Griffin Award twice. He also served as President and Certification Commission Chairman of the International Association of Emergency Managers, where he was a recipient of the Clayton R. Christopher Award. He served as President of the Western North Carolina Safety Council. He served as Chairman for the North Carolina Domestic Preparedness Region 9 and was a member of the North Carolina State Emergency Response Commission. Mr. VeHaun also served on the Boards of the Asheville/Mountain Area Chapter of the American Red Cross; Metropolitan Sewerage District; Aston Park Healthcare Center; MANNA Food Bank; and the Buncombe County Rescue Squad, where he served as Chairman.

Mr. VeHaun's heart of service is displayed by his dedication to the people of North Carolina, and also to the nation in times of tragedy. As a member of a federal Disaster Mortuary Operations Team, he was deployed to New York following the September 11th attacks and to Louisiana after Hurricane Katrina.

It is my great pleasure to celebrate Mr. Jerry VeHaun before the United States House of Representatives and thank him for his diligent service to his community, the great State of North Carolina, and this country.

CONGRATULATING JAY HILDEBRANDT

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jay Hildebrandt on an incredible broadcasting career. Award-winning anchor and reporter Jay Hildebrandt, has been a staple in the community for decades. Jay began his career in Twin Falls, Idaho at KMVT–TV where he anchored for two years. After moving away for a few years, Jay found his home in Idaho Falls where he has co-anchored with Karole Honas for nearly 30 years.

Besides his day to day anchoring and reporting, Jay has been involved in a number of special projects for the newscasts over the years. For 28 years Jay produced weekly Wednesday's Child reports. Each week, a child living in a temporary foster home, who needed an adoptive family was featured. Many viewers were touched by the children's stories, and hundreds of them were adopted due to Wednesday's Child.

Hundreds of outstanding high school seniors were also featured by Jay in his weekly Distinguished Student series of reports.

Along with his Local News 8 job, Jay keeps busy a couple mornings a week as an adjunct instructor at Brigham Young University Idaho teaching public speaking and broadcast performance classes, which he finds extremely rewarding.

During his years in Idaho Falls, Jay has been involved in a number of local community activities. He has served on the Governor's Children's Trust Fund Board, the Region VII Health and Welfare Advisory Board, and the Safe Place Advisory Board.

Madam Speaker, Jay Hildebrandt will be missed throughout Eastern Idaho, but his career has provided an incredible template as to how the news ought to be reported.

CONGRATULATING FESTUS HIGH SCHOOL BOYS CROSS COUNTRY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS III STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Festus Tigers boys cross country team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class III State title.

This is Festus High School's fifth consecutive state title. This team and Coach Bryant Wright should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the Festus Tigers boys cross country team for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SETH MOULTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained from the floor on Tuesday, October 29, 2019 and missed three votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 587, YEA on Roll Call No. 588, and YEA on Roll Call No. 589.

HONORING CHARLES MOIR

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Charles Moir, who died on November 15, 2019 at the age of 88. Mr. Moir was a highly successful basketball coach and mentor at both Virginia Tech and Roanoke College.

Charles Moir started his career in basketball by playing in college for three years before becoming a high school coach. In his eleven years coaching high school basketball, he finished with a career record of 224 wins and 43 losses. His time coaching high school basketball prepared him to become the assistant coach for Virginia Tech in 1963. Four years later, Mr. Moir assumed the head coach position at Roanoke College.

During Mr. Moir's time at Roanoke College, his strong leadership led the team to five conference championships, four NCAA tournament appearances, and even a national championship in 1972 during his six-year tenure. In his time at Roanoke College, he amassed an impressive record of 133 wins and 44 losses.

After Mr. Moir's time at Roanoke College, he became the head coach for Virginia Tech in 1967. His time at Virginia Tech was ripe with success, evident through his record-breaking career of 213 wins throughout his 11-year tenure. Additionally, Mr. Moir led the Hokies to four NCAA Tournament appearances and four National Invitational Tournaments.

Charles Moir was inducted into the Roanoke College Hall of Fame, the Virginia Tech Sports Hall of Fame, and the Virginia Sports Hall of Fame.

Mr. Moir was known as a coach who invested in his players on and off the court. Dell Curry, a former Virginia Tech and NBA star told the Roanoke Times, ''He helped me grow into a man . . . A great father figure, a great coach.''

Charles Moir was the type of basketball coach that brings out the best in student athletes, and his passion for his players and the game will always be remembered.

He resided in my hometown of Salem during his time at Roanoke College and moved back after leaving Virginia Tech. He was held in high regard by the Salem community. His son Page, who played for his father at Virginia Tech and followed him into coaching, remembered, ''He was a good dad, just like he was as a coach.'' I offer my condolences to the Moir family on their loss.

RECOGNIZING GWEN SANDERS AS CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Gwen Sanders, a North County San Diego resident, as my Constituent of the Month. Gwen has dedicated her life to giving back to our community and volunteering for a wide range of organizations throughout the region, including the North County Chapter of the NAACP, the City of Oceanside, the Communications Workers of America (CWA), and more.

As a longtime civil rights activist, Gwen received the NAACP Woman of the Year Award, the Oceanside Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Service Award, as well as several recognitions for her community service. She has volunteered for the Oceanside Police and Fire Commission, the Community Relation Commission, and led a program to help local students pursue higher education. Gwen's long track record of public service goes on, and there is no question that her dedication to serving our community has made Oceanside and all of North County a better place to live. Gwen personifies John F. Kennedy's famous quote: ''Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.''

Gwen's public service is commendable, and it's important to note that she did all of this work while also raising two children, two grandchildren, and three great grandchildren. She is also a two-time breast cancer survivor, liver transplant recipient, and awaiting a kidney donor. I'm in awe of all that Gwen has accomplished in the face of these extraordinary challenges, and I am deeply grateful for her service. I am proud to recognize her as my Constituent of the Month.

CONGRATULATING MOHAWK TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ON BEING NAMED A 2019 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2019 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Mohawk Trails Elementary School of Carmel, Indiana, in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the United States Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students, and parents who have worked so hard to ensure our children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am very proud that Mohawk Trails Elementary School is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While hundreds of schools nationwide were nominated, only 362 schools were designated as 2019 National Blue Ribbon Schools. Of the 362 schools, Mohawk Trails Elementary School was one of only 12 Indiana schools to receive recognition, making this recognition all the more impressive. Under the guidance of a dedicated staff and dynamic Principal Jennifer Greene, the Mohawk Trails Turtles have become a beacon for success in youth education.

Mohawk Trails Elementary School is committed to providing a nurturing environment for the intellectual, physical, and social development of each child. This commitment to the well-being and development of the student body is led by a dynamic staff of teachers, working to shape the future through the lives they are positively influencing in their classrooms daily. The dedicated staff at Mohawk Trails engages students in meaningful educational tasks that promote thinking and reasoning and it is because of their hard work that Mohawk Trails Elementary School has been deservedly honored with this Blue Ribbon Award.

As an advocate for education and youth, I want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at Mohawk Trails give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators, and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Mohawk Trails Elementary School. I am very proud of them.

RECOGNIZING MR. BRIAN GREER

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I wish to recognize Mr. Brian Greer, upon his departure as Professional Staff Member, Readiness Subcommittee, House Armed Services Committee to the U.S. House of Representatives.

In this role, Mr. Greer was responsible for a portfolio consisting of Army readiness, training, logistics, and maintenance policies and programs; organic industrial base policy; the Defense Logistics Agency; civilian personnel and service contracts. Brian has served as a Professional Staff Member in the House Armed Services Committee since October of 2016. Prior to his time in the House of Representatives, Brian served as the Military Legislative Assistant to Senate Minority Leader Senator CHARLES SCHUMER, where he advised the Senator on defense, foreign policy and energy issues. Brian has also served as a Legislative Assistant for Representatives John Boccieri, Parker Griffith, and DAVID SCOTT. Finally, Brian spent time working as a Special Assistant in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs focusing on installations and environment as well as operational energy plans and programming. His vast experience in defense policy, both on the Hill and in the Pentagon, has helped senior leaders make informed decisions for over a decade.

Brian is a native of Marietta, Georgia, holds a Master of International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs where he focused on international security policy and a Bachelor of Arts in international relations from the University of Virginia. Brian is also an avid supporter of the Atlanta Falcons.

Brian is married to Natalie, who continues to support him in his service to our nation.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation to Brian Greer for his dedicated service to the U.S. House of Representatives and to our Nation. We wish him the best as he moves on to his next role.

ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT GAZETTE 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette on its 200th anniversary of the first issue of the Arkansas Gazette.

As the state's leading news source, the Gazette has delivered reliable local, national, and international news for Arkansans for two centuries. Its first issue appeared on November 20, 1819.

The Gazette has also recently unveiled a convenient digital format of the latest news.

A new digital subscription to the newspaper provides access to a large package of news related to business developments, feature stories, and sports, which can be viewed using a phone, tablet, or computer.

This is a generation of advanced technology and it is important to produce easy-to-access journalism for newspaper readers.

I would like to extend my congratulations to President and General Manager Lynn Hamilton, and the entire Arkansas Democrat-Gazette team, and wish the company much continued success for generations of Arkansans to come.

JOHN J. MCGRAW, SR.

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, today I recognize East Tennessee Orthopedic Surgeon and U.S. Army Colonel John Jay McGraw, Sr. as he announces his upcoming retirement from OrthoTennessee.

Not only is Dr. McGraw known for his remarkable contributions to the medical profession and 34-year military career, but he has long been a community leader in East Tennessee where he has held public office and served on numerous boards.

In 2018, Dr. McGraw was appointed to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Pain Management Best Practices Inter-

Agency Task Force. In this role, he identified best practices for pain management and issued recommendations for addressing the opioid epidemic. These findings are now used by Congress to advance legislation on this issue.

I am honored to call Dr. McGraw my friend, and I know I speak for many in East Tennessee when I say congratulations and best wishes for a happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH SWEAT, JR.

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Joseph Alton Sweat, Jr., a journalist, longtime civil rights and good government advocate and a friend, who died Friday at the age of 83.

I knew Joe as a lobbyist for and executive director of the Tennessee Municipal League, which he represented when I was in the state Senate. He was highly respected as a lobbyist and was always well-informed and he wrote a regular column on politics and legislation for the municipal league newspaper that members of the General Assembly always appreciated. Before that, he had been a respected reporter for The Associated Press, covering Elvis Presley's return to Memphis in uniform; the plane crash that killed country music star Patsy Cline in 1963; and the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1968. Joe also created the news bureau at Vanderbilt University and edited The Vanderbilt Hustler and later was the first lay editor of The Catholic Register.

As a representative of the Tennessee Municipal League, he twice served on the board of directors of the National League of Cities. Later, representing the National Democratic Institute, he was sent to Bulgaria and Ukraine as the former Soviet satellites transitioned to democracies. After retiring in 1998, Joe joined his good friend Hedy Weinberg in lobbying for the American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee and became a board member of both the Tennessee and national ACLU.

Joe and I shared a love of Memphis State University and Memphis politics as well as a devotion to justice. I want to express my sincere condolences to his wife Marilyn; his sons Joseph, Stephen and Michael and daughter Cynthia and their extended families; and his many friends and colleagues. His was a life well-lived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ILHAN OMAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 556; YEA on Roll Call No. 558; YEA on Roll Call No. 559; YEA on Roll Call No. 560; YEA on Roll Call No. 573; YEA on Roll Call No. 585; YEA on Roll Call No. 615; YEA on Roll Call No. 616; YEA on Roll Call No. 617; NAY on Roll Call No. 618; YEA on Roll Call No. 619; NAY on Roll Call No. 620; YEA on Roll Call No. 621; YEA on Roll Call No. 622; NAY on Roll Call No. 623; and NAY on Roll Call No. 624.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SETH MOULTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained from the floor on Monday, November 18, 2019 and missed three votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 625, YEA on Roll Call No. 626, and YEA on Roll Call No. 627.

CONGRATULATING THE ST. FRANCIS BORGIA VOLLEYBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS III STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the St. Francis Borgia Knights volleyball team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class III State Volleyball Championship.

This is St. Francis Borgia's eleventh state championship win in the history of their volleyball program. This team and Coach CJ Steiger should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the St. Francis Borgia Knights volleyball team for a job well done.

REMEMBERING ROBERT LAVENTURE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and service of Robert LaVenture, a committed organizer and unyielding advocate for workers, who devoted over 49 years of his life to fighting for the American worker in the labor movement.

Robert first became involved in labor organizing after graduating high school when he began work at an International Harvester foundry in Waukesha. During his time in Waukesha, Robert's stalwart advocacy allowed him to proudly serve as trustee, local union steward, vice president and of Local 3740. His dedication was recognized by his peers and led him to be elected president of the union. As president, Robert helped to create the state of Wisconsin's first employee education center and later developed other centers throughout the state when he served as Wisconsin's AFL–CIO Coordinator.

Robert embodied the greatest traits of a union organizer by devoting himself to building the labor movement and improving the lives of workers across the country. After serving as state coordinator for the AFL–CIO, Robert served as a United Steel Workers International Staff Representative in the San Francisco Bay Area and then in Oklahoma. In 2009, recognizing Robert's tireless and effective work on behalf of United Steel Workers, he was made district director of District 12, coordinating USW work in Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah and Washington. While serving as director, Robert used his decades of committed work to successfully negotiate countless contracts on behalf of steel workers across the western U.S.

Robert's legacy is that of a tireless union organizer, devoting countless hours to fighting on behalf of American industry and workers in the U.S. and abroad. Robert's work will continue to help the lives of countless people and his spirit will be missed. Please join me in celebrating his life and his memory.

RECOGNIZING FIRST LADY OF ANDREWS, SC, MAJOR DANISHA L. McCLARY ESQ.

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major Danisha L. McClary, a United States Army veteran and First Lady of Andrews, South Carolina.

Major McClary has served our nation with honor and distinction. As a Judge Advocate General, she served as the Chief of Administrative Law for the 2nd Infantry Division in Korea, Trial Counsel for the 1st Brigade Combat Team at Fort Hood, Texas, Chief of Foreign Claims for the Multi-National Division in Iraq, and as the Chief of Military Justice at Port Jackson, South Carolina.

Additionally, Major McClary served as the Program Manager for the U.S. Army Sexual Assault Prevention Program at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. She earned high awards and accolades including the Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, and Army Commendation Medal.

Major McClary officially retired from the Army in the summer of 2016 and immediately opened her law practice. Since then, she has served her community as chair of the Andrews Economic & Community Development Committee and as a member of the Georgetown County Accommodations Tax Committee.

Madam Speaker, I join the people of Andrews in recognizing Major Danisha L. McClary for being chosen as the Grand Marshal of the 2019 Veterans Day Parade in Andrews, South Carolina. We honor her and thank her for her past and continued service to her community and the nation.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES ANDERSON AS CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, this Veterans Day, it is my honor to announce

that Mr. Charles Anderson, a relentless fighter for veterans throughout North County, is my Constituent of the Month. Mr. Anderson has dedicated his life to supporting veterans and their families, serving as Commander of the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) Tri-Cities Chapter 95, and belonging to the Oceanside Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 10577 and the Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH) Chapter 493.

As Commander of the local Disabled American Veterans chapter, Mr. Anderson has made sure that veterans in our community receive rides to medical appointments and helped veterans receive the Veterans Affairs benefits they've earned. He's helped veterans find gainful employment and financial security, and he's worked to ensure that veterans do not become homeless.

Mr. Anderson's service with local veterans groups is commendable, but there are also several cases where he went above and beyond to help a local veteran and their family in a desperate time of need. When my office heard that a Marine Gulf War veteran was struggling to make ends meet due to a service-connected terminal illness, it was Mr. Anderson who immediately made arrangements to support the veteran's family financially until the Veterans Benefits Administration could deliver benefits. When I heard from a caregiver of a Marine veteran who was at risk of becoming homeless, Mr. Anderson stepped up to cover the veteran's rent until we could work out aid from the VA.

On this Veterans Day, we must do more than pay lip service to our veterans. We need to fight for the support and resources that veterans have earned and deserve, and that's exactly what Mr. Anderson does every single day. As long as I have the privilege to serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I will look to Mr. Anderson as a shining example of what it means to serve our veterans with reverence and resolve. I am deeply grateful for Mr. Anderson's service to our veterans, and I am proud to recognize him as my Constituent of the Month.

CONGRATULATING SAINT MARIA GORETTI SCHOOL ON BEING NAMED A 2019 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2019 National Blue Ribbon School. I am delighted to congratulate Saint Maria Goretti School in Westfield, Indiana, for the second time since I've been in Congress, in celebration of this special occasion.

Started by President Reagan in 1982, the United States Department of Education awards the National Blue Ribbon designation to both public and private schools across our great nation. The award celebrates great American schools like Saint Maria Goretti that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. Throughout the country this award is given to recognize the upper echelon of educational institutions, that through the dedication and passion of their amazing educators, students, and parents have strived to ensure that every student reaches their full potential and maximizes their academic success.

Having previously received this prestigious award in 2013, the Fighting Angels of Saint Maria Goretti School have shown just how deep the commitment to excellence is ingrained in their staff, faculty, parents and student body. This honor is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing its students with an exceptional education. While hundreds of schools nationwide were nominated, only 362 schools were designated as 2019 National Blue Ribbon Schools. Of the 362 schools, Saint Maria Goretti School was one of 12 Indiana schools to receive recognition, making this achievement all the more impressive. Under the guidance of the Archdiocese of Lafayette and the leadership of Principal Vince Barnes, Saint Maria Goretti School has become a beacon of educational excellence.

Saint Maria Goretti School is committed to providing a nurturing environment for the intellectual, physical, and social development of each child. As a Catholic institution the clergy and staff work diligently with students to provide an excellent education, focusing on the spiritual, academic, emotional, and physical well-being of each child. This commitment to the well-being and development of the student body is led by a dynamic staff of teachers, working to shape the future by the lives they are positively influencing in their classrooms daily. The dedicated staff at Saint Maria Goretti School engages students in meaningful educational tasks that promote thinking and reasoning and it is because of their hard work that Saint Maria Goretti School has been deservedly honored with this Blue Ribbon Award.

As an advocate for education and youth, I have great respect and admiration for our nation's educators and their mission to provide the students of this great nation with the strong academic foundation critical to future success. Schools like Saint Maria Goretti School are an example of how we accomplish this vital mission. The outstanding educational techniques developed at Saint Maria Goretti School should stand as a model for school districts throughout the nation. The commitment to excellence from the students, parents and educators at Saint Maria Goretti School has transformed the school into a beacon of educational achievement. Once again, congratulations to Saint Maria Goretti School. I am very proud of them.

VOTE EXPLANATION ON H.R. 3055

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, yesterday I voted against H.R. 3055, a Continuing Resolution (CR) to fund the government through December 20, 2019.

Let me be clear: I strongly support the majority of the funding extensions and protections in this CR. This includes the well-deserved 3.1 percent pay raise to our men and women in uniform, of which I also voted in favor earlier this year in separate legislation. The compensation for our men and women in uniform should never be compromised by Congress's inability to pass annual funding legislation.

I am also pleased that this CR includes a provision that would protect federal highway funding and generate new jobs. Using my position as Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I worked to ensure that the CR included a provision that would repeal Section 1438 of the FAST Act of 2015. Section 1438, which was included at the insistence of Republican leaders in 2015, will rescind $7.6 billion of federal highway funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 if it is not repealed.

I strongly support repeal of Section 1438, which is long overdue. Transportation agencies in all 50 states and the District of Columbia are counting on Congress to prevent this massive, multi-billion dollar cut from going into effect. Although I unfortunately had to vote against the CR for unrelated reasons, I applaud my colleagues for taking this issue seriously and including the rescission repeal in this must-pass bill. I'm pleased we are taking a positive step to finally give states the certainty they need to carry out long-term projects that create jobs and help their communities.

Furthermore, I strongly support the extensions in the CR to protect funding for Community Health Centers, which provide a vital lifeline for health care services to thousands of Oregonians and millions of Americans across the country. I am also pleased that this legislation extends funding for the National Health Service Corps and the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program, two health care workforce programs that provide resources to support the training of health providers in rural and underserved areas.

In addition, I am pleased that this legislation protects funding for important health care programs including Medicare and Medicaid programs, disproportionate share hospitals, the Community Mental Health Services Demonstration Program, the Special Diabetes Program, and funds to respond to the Ebola outbreak in Africa.

I also strongly support the funding extensions provided to ensure the Census Bureau has the funding it needs to continue carrying out the 2020 Decennial Census.

Moreover, I support the CR's funding extension for the critical Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, which allows the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to match state child care expenditures and make scheduled contingency fund payments. The legislation also ensures that the current caseload in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, which serves low-income seniors, is maintained.

However, I opposed the CR because it includes absurd provisions to extend mass surveillance programs under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). This includes Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which has allowed for mass surveillance of Americans' call records, as well as roving wire tap provisions and so-called "lone wolf" authority.

I am strongly opposed to these data collection and mass surveillance programs, which I believe are unconstitutional. I voted against the original PATRIOT Act in 2001, and I have continued to oppose reauthorization of this and related mass surveillance programs unless and until significant reforms are made to protect the constitutional privacy rights of U.S. citizens.

For years, I have urged congressional leadership under both parties to take up meaningful reform of these government spying programs and allow for sincere, robust debate on how to restore Americans' constitutional rights to privacy while also protecting our nation's security. In July, I was one of 7 Democrats to vote against the Intelligence Authorization Act because it did not contain any significant reforms to curb government surveillance.

That's why I joined my colleagues in sending a bipartisan letter to the House Judiciary and Intelligence Committees urging them to finally take up meaningful surveillance reform legislation before Section 215 and related FISA provisions expire on December 15 of this year.

Regrettably, this CR is yet another example of Congress's habit of kicking the can down the road instead of engaging in long-overdue, substantive debate on surveillance reform legislation. Congress owes it to the American people to end government mass surveillance and restore Americans' civil liberties and constitutional rights.

As I've always said, while we must ensure that law enforcement officials have the tools they need to assess, detect, and prevent future terrorist attacks, I don't believe we have to shred the Constitution and Bill of Rights in order to fight terrorism.

The bottom line is that it is beyond time for Congress to provide long-term stability and funding in its annual appropriations process. The Democratic-led House completed nearly all of its appropriations bills before September 30, the end of the Fiscal Year. Because the Senate did not get its work done in time, bridge funding in the form of continuing resolutions has been needed to keep the government open. Congress needs to get its act together and halt the ridiculous and irresponsible lurching from short-term fix to short-term fix.

I hope the Senate can get its work done so we can finally stop the budget gimmicks and spend our time working on important issues like fighting climate change, improving access to health care, upgrading our dilapidated infrastructure, investing in public education, and more. That is what Americans expect, and that is what they deserve.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, November 21, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine testimony from the Government Accountability Office on privatized housing findings to include responses from the military services on ongoing reports of substandard housing conditions and services.

SD–G50

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the future of United States policy towards Russia.

SD–419

DECEMBER 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management to examine United States Navy ship and submarine maintenance.

SD–106

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold hearings to examine testimony about servicemember, family, and veteran suicides and prevention strategies.

SR–222

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

SD–342

DECEMBER 11

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Inspector General's report on alleged abuses of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

SD–226

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6681–S6724

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2902–2922, and S. Res. 435. **Pages S6717–18**

House Messages:

Further Continuing Appropriations Act and Further Health Extenders Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, November 21, 2019, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020; that Senator Paul, or his designee, be recognized to offer a motion to concur with further amendment, the text of which is at the desk, and that following two minutes of debate, equally divided, Senator Shelby, or his designee, be recognized to make a motion to table the Paul motion; that following disposition of the Paul motion, the Majority Leader, or his designee, be recognized to make a motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment; and that notwithstanding Rule XXII, if cloture is filed on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment, that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture occur immediately, and that if cloture is invoked, the post-cloture time be yielded back and Senate vote on the motion to concur, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S6707**

Brouillette Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy. **Pages S6694–S6707**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, November 22, 2019. **Pages S6706–07**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6694**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6694**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, November 21, 2019. **Page S6707**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 80 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. EX. 360), Barbara Lagoa, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Pages S6682–88**

By 65 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. EX. 362), Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Romania. **Pages S6688–94**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 65 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. EX. 361), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6688**

Messages from the House: **Page S6711**

Measures Referred: **Page S6711**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S6711**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6712–14**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S6714–17**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6718–20**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6720–22**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6710–11**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6722–23**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6723–24**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—362) **Pages S6687–88, S6694**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:20 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, November 21, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6707.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDIT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Defense audit, after receiving testimony from David L. Norquist, Deputy Secretary Of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CYBER STRATEGY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded a closed hearing to examine implementation of the 2018 Department of Defense Cyber Strategy, after receiving testimony from John W. Wilmer, Deputy Chief Information Officer for Cybersecurity, Vice Admiral Ross A. Myers, USN, Deputy Commander, United States Cyber Command, Lieutenant General Mary F. O'Brien, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and Cyber Effects Operations, Air Force, and Major General Dennis A. Crall, USMC, Deputy Principal Cyber Advisor and Senior Military Advisor for Cyber Policy, all of the Department of Defense.

BIOLOGICAL THREATS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded a hearing to examine biological threats to United States national security, after receiving testimony from Thomas V. Inglesby, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Center for Health Security; Tara J. O'Toole, In-Q-Tel; and Julie L. Gerberding, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 2877, to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mitchell A. Silk, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary, and David Carey Woll, Jr., of Connecticut, and John Bobbitt, of Texas, both to be an Assistant Secretary, all of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Peter J. Coniglio, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Export-Import, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

HIGHLY AUTOMATED VEHICLES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine highly automated vehicles, focusing on Federal perspectives on the deployment of safety technology, after receiving testimony from Joel Szabat, Acting Under Secretary for Policy, and James C. Owens, Acting Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, both of the Department of Transportation; and Robert L. Sumwalt, III, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Sean O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Health Care concluded a hearing to examine Alzheimer's awareness, focusing on barriers to diagnosis, treatment, and care coordination, after receiving testimony from Jason Karlawish, University of Pennsylvania Penn Memory Center, Philadelphia; Janet Tomcavage, Geisinger, Winfield, Pennsylvania; Marc A. Cohen, UMass Boston LeadingAge LTSS Center, Newton, Massachusetts; and Lauren Kovach, Brighton, Michigan.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Stephen E. Biegun, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of State, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Roxanne Cabral, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia, Kelley Eckels Currie, of Georgia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues, Kelly C. Degnan, of California, to be Ambassador to Georgia, Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand, David T. Fischer, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, Robert S. Gilchrist, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania, Peter M. Haymond, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Yuri Kim, of Guam, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Alina L. Romanowski, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, John Joseph Sullivan,

of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Morse H. Tan, of Illinois, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice, and Leslie Meredith Tsou, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman, all of the Department of State, Andeliz N. Castillo, of New York, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, Alma L. Golden, of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS IN THE UN SYSTEM

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy concluded a hearing to examine challenges and opportunities for advancing United States interests in the United Nations system, after receiving testimony from Kip Tom, Permanent Representative, U.S. Mission to the United Nations Agencies in Rome, Jonathan Moore, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, and Scott Busby, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, all of the Department of State; and Brett D. Schaefer, Heritage Foundation, Peter Yeo, Better World Campaign, and Amy K. Lehr, Center for Strategic and International Studies, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 227, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 982, to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

HONORING NATIVE VETERANS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine honoring a nation's promise to Native veterans, including S. 1001, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska Native veteran receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and S. 2365, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize urban Indian organizations to enter into arrangements for the sharing of medical services and facilities, after receiving testimony from Robert L. Wilkie, Secretary, Richard Stone, Executive in Charge, Veterans Health Administration, and Kameron Matthews, Deputy Under Secretary for Community Care, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Rear Admiral Chris Buchanan, Deputy Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; Mark N. Fox, Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, New Town, North Dakota; and Jestin Dupree, Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Poplar, Montana.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 5186–5207; 1 private bill, H.R. 5208; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 76; and H. Res. 717–723 were introduced. **Pages H9120–21**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H9122–23**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 370, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities (H. Rept. 116–303, Part 1); and

H.R. 1132, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–304, Part 1). **Page H9120**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H9061**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:29 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H9064**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Steven Abraham, Beth El Synagogue, Omaha, Nebraska. **Page H9064**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:07 p.m. and reconvened at 1:33 p.m. **Page H9072**

Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 713, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, by a yea-and-nay vote of 209 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 633, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 632. **Pages H9068–72, H9098–99**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Extending the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission: H.R. 182, to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission; **Pages H9072–74**

Big Bear Land Exchange Act: H.R. 255, amended, to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest; **Pages H9074–75**

Renaming the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge: H.R. 263, to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge; **Pages H9075–76**

Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2019: H.R. 737, amended, to prohibit the sale of shark fins, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 310 yeas to 107 nays, Roll No. 634; **Pages H9076–83, H9099–H9100**

North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act: H.R. 925, to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024; **Pages H9083–84**

First Infantry Recognition of Sacrifice in Theater Act: H.R. 1088, amended, to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in Presidential Park in District of Columbia; **Pages H9084–86**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal Land in President's Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."; **Pages H9084–86**

Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019: H.R. 1446, amended, to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold; **Pages H9086–87**

To rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park: H.R. 1472, to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park; **Pages H9087–88**

Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act: H.R. 1487, amended, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in the State of California to evaluate alternatives for protecting the resources of the coastal area; **Pages H9088–89**

Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019: S. 1838, to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 635; and **Pages H9089–96, H9100**

Prohibiting the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force: S. 2710, to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 417 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 636. **Pages H9096–98, H9100–01**

Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representative Huizenga. **Page H9101**

Rebuilding Small Businesses After Disasters Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 862, to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans. **Pages H9101–02**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, November 21st. **Page H9102**

Senate Referrals: S. 1838 was held at the desk. S. 2710 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H9068.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H9098, H9098–99, H9099–H9100, H9100, and H9100–01. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S ROLE IN ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''The Department of Energy's Role in Addressing Climate Change''. Testimony was heard from Vi Lyles, Mayor, Charlotte, North Carolina; and public witnesses.

REEXAMINING THE ECONOMIC COSTS OF DEBT

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reexamining the Economic Costs of Debt''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE POLICIES AND PRIORITIES OF THE LABOR DEPARTMENT'S APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Policies and Priorities of the Labor Department's Apprenticeship Program''. Testimony was heard from John Pallasch, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, Department of Labor.

BUILDING A 100 PERCENT CLEAN ECONOMY: THE CHALLENGES FACING FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled ''Building a 100 Percent Clean Economy: The Challenges Facing Frontline Communities''. Testimony was heard from Alfredo Gomez, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Lilian Sotolongo Dorka, Director, External Civil Rights Compliance Office, Environmental Protection Agency; Helena Wooden-Aguilar, Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 3432, the ''SAFER Pipeline Act of 2019''; H.R. 2339, the ''Reversing the Youth Tobacco Epidemic Act of 2019''; H.R. 4995, the ''Maternal Health Quality Improvement Act of 2019''; H.R. 4996, the ''Helping Medicaid Offer Maternity Services Act of 2019''; H.R. 1603, the ''Alan Reinstein Ban Asbestos Now Act of 2019''; H.R. 535, the ''PFAS Action Act of 2019''; H.R. 2699, the ''Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2019''; H.R. 3851, the ''Brand USA Extension Act''; H.R. 4779, to extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006, and for other purposes; H.R. 4229, the ''Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological Availability Act''; H.R. 4227, the ''Mapping Accuracy Promotes Services Act''; H.R. 5000, the ''SHARE Act''; H.R. 4998, the ''Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act''; H.R. 4461, the ''Network Security Information Sharing Act of 2019''; H.R. 2881, the ''Secure 5G and Beyond Act of 2019''; H.R. 4500, the ''Promoting United States Wireless Leadership Act of 2019''; H. Res. 575, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all stakeholders in the deployment of 5G communications infrastructure should carefully consider and adhere to the recommendation of ''The Prague Proposals''; and H.R. 5035, the ''Television Viewer Protection Act''. H.R. 3432, H.R. 1603, H.R. 4995, H.R. 2339, H.R. 5035, H.R. 2699, H.R. 535, H.R. 4996, H.R. 4229, H.R. 5000, H.R. 4998, H.R. 4461, H.R. 2881, H.R. 4500, H. Res. 575, and H.R. 3851 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 4779 and H.R. 4227 were ordered reported, without amendment.

AN EXAMINATION OF REGULATORS' EFFORTS TO PRESERVE AND PROMOTE MINORITY DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled ''An Examination of Regulators' Efforts to Preserve and Promote Minority Depository Institutions''. Testimony was heard from Beverly Cole, Deputy Comptroller for the Northeastern District and Designated Federal Officer for the Minority Depository Institutions Advisory Committee, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury; Betty J. Rudolph, National Director, Minority and Community Development Banking,

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Arthur W. Lindo, Deputy Director, Division of Supervision and Regulation, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Martha Ninichuk, Director of the Office of Credit Union Resources and Expansion, National Credit Union Administration.

SAFE AND DECENT? EXAMINING THE CURRENT STATE OF RESIDENTS' HEALTH AND SAFETY IN HUD HOUSING

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''Safe and Decent? Examining the Current State of Residents' Health and Safety in HUD Housing''. Testimony was heard from Susan Rollins, Executive Director, Housing Authority of St. Louis County, Missouri; Margaret Salazar, Executive Director, Oregon Housing and Community Services Department; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a business meeting on A Resolution Offered by Chairman Bennie G. Thompson Authorizing Issuance of Subpoena on documents related to U.S. Customs and Border Protection Operations. A Resolution Offered by Chairman Bennie G. Thompson Authorizing Issuance of Subpoena on documents related to U.S. Customs and Border Protection Operations was agreed to, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 5038, the ''Farm Workforce Modernization Act of 2019''; H.R. 3884, the ''Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019''; H.R. 5140, the ''Satellite Television Community Protection and Promotion Act of 2019''; H.R. 3991, the ''Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Improvements to Patent Litigation Act of 2019''; and H.R. 5133, the ''Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act of 2019''.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup H.R. 307, the ''Preserving America's Battlefields Act''; H.R. 1708, the ''Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act''; H.R. 2199, the ''Central Coast Heritage Protection Act''; H.R. 2215, the ''San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act''; H.R. 2250, the ''Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forests Act''; H.R. 2546, the ''Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019''; H.R. 2854, the ''Protect Our Refuges Act of 2019''; H.R. 3794, the ''Public Land Renewable Energy Development Act of 2019''; and S. 216, the ''Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act''. H.R. 307, H.R. 2854, and S. 216 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1708, H.R. 2199, H.R. 2215, H.R. 2250, H.R. 2546, and H.R. 3794 were ordered reported, as amended.

FIGHTING FLU, SAVING LIVES: VACCINE SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Fighting Flu, Saving Lives: Vaccine Science and Innovation''. Testimony was heard from Daniel B. Jernigan, M.D., Director, Influenza Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

A TASK OF EPIC PROPORTIONS: RECLAIMING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN WEATHER MODELING AND PREDICTION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled ''A Task of EPIC Proportions: Reclaiming U.S. Leadership in Weather Modeling and Prediction''. Testimony was heard from Neil Jacobs, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, performing the duties of Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5078, the ''Prison to Proprietorship Act''; H.R. 5065, the ''Prison to Proprietorship for Formerly Incarcerated Act''; H.R. 5130, the ''Capturing All Small Businesses Act of 2019''; and H.R. 5146, the ''Unlocking Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019''. H.R. 5078, H.R. 5065, H.R. 5130, and H.R. 5146 were ordered reported, without amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a business meeting on adoption of Subcommittee Membership assignments; and a markup on H.R. 5120, the ''SAFER Pipelines Act of 2019''; H.R. 5047, to require the Administrator of General Services to conduct an annual audit of properties leased to private parties, and for other purposes; H.R. 5139, the ''Stop Sexual Assault and Harassment in Transportation Act''; and H.R. 5119, to

amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventative maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes. Subcommittee Membership assignments were approved. H.R. 5119 and H.R. 5047 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 5120 and H.R. 5139 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3495 and legislation to establish a pilot program for the issuance of grants to eligible entities. Testimony was heard from Robert Wilkie, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

GO-LIVE MARCH 2020: THE STATUS OF EHRM READINESS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Technology Modernization held a hearing entitled ''Go-Live March 2020: The Status of EHRM Readiness''. Testimony was heard from James Byrne, Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

U.S.-JAPAN TRADE AGREEMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled ''U.S.-Japan Trade Agreements''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY: AMBASSADOR SONDLAND

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Impeachment Inquiry: Ambassador Sondland''. Testimony was heard from Gordon Sondland, U.S. Ambassador to the European Union.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY: MS. COOPER AND MR. HALE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Impeachment Inquiry: Ms. Cooper and Mr. Hale''. Testimony was heard from Laura Cooper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russian, Ukrainian, and Eurasian Affairs, Department of Defense; and David Hale, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Department of State.

CREATING A CLIMATE RESILIENT AMERICA: REDUCING RISKS AND COSTS

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Creating a Climate Resilient America: Reducing Risks and Costs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

CONNECTING MORE PEOPLE TO WORK

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine connecting more people to work, after receiving testimony from Veronique de Rugy, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia; Oren M. Cass, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, and Jose Ortiz, Jr., New York City Employment and Training Coalition, both of New York, New York; and Jay C. Shambaugh, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

RUSSIAN INFLUENCE IN BELARUS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Russian influence in Belarus, after receiving testimony from Andrei Yeliseyeu, International Strategic Action Network for Security, Warsaw, Poland; Sofya Orlosky, Freedom House, and Brian Whitmore, Center for European Policy Analysis, both of Washington, D.C.; and Franak Viacorka, U.S. Agency for Global Media, Belarus.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to hold an oversight hearing examine the Federal Communications Commission, focusing on the spectrum auctions program, 11 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine Federal payments to local governments provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes programs, including S. 430, to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, S. 1643, to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the Forest and Refuge County Foundation, to provide for the establishment of the Natural Resources Permanent Fund, and S. 2108, to amend section 6903 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for additional population tiers, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Philip M. Halpern, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Bernard Maurice Jones II, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Barbara Bailey Jongbloed, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, and Thomas Michael O'Connor, to be United States Marshal for the

Southern District of Texas, and Ralph Ignatius Sozio, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, both of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''The Department of Defense Organic Industrial Base: Challenges, Solutions and Readiness Impacts'', 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Task Force on Financial Technology, hearing entitled ''Banking on Your Data: The Role of Big Data in Financial Services'', 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Member Day: Committee on House Administration'', 8:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 5038, the ''Farm Workforce Modernization Act of 2019''; H.R. 3884, the ''Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019''; H.R. 5140, the ''Satellite Television Community Protection and Promotion Act of 2019''; H.R. 3991, the ''Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Improvements to Patent Litigation Act of 2019''; and H.R. 5133, the ''Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act of 2019'', 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Impeachment Inquiry: Dr. Hill and Mr. Holmes'', 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, November 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

At 11:30 a.m., Senate will begin consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 3055, Further Continuing Appropriations Act and Further Health Extenders Act, and vote on or in relation to motions to concur in the House message.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, November 21

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 1309—Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E1479
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1477, E1479, E1481, E1483
Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E1478
Burchett, Tim, Tenn., E1481
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1482
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1483
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1476
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1475
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E1475
Garamendi, John, Calif., E1475, E1481, E1482
Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E1477, E1478
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1480
Hill, J. French, Ark., E1481
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E1479
Levin, Mike, Calif., E1477, E1481, E1482
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1475
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1476, E1477, E1479, E1480, E1482
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E1476
Meadows, Mark, N.C., E1480
Moulton, Seth, Mass., E1480, E1482
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1479
O'Halleran, Tom, Ariz., E1475
Omar, Ilhan, Minn., E1482
Rice, Tom, N.C., E1482
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E1476
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1480
Taylor, Van, Tex., E1475, E1476, E1476
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1478

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.