United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2020 No. 3

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another year.

We ask Your blessing upon the Members of this people's House as they reconvene for the Second Session of the 116th Congress. May they anticipate the opportunities and difficulties that are before them, and before so many Americans, with steadfast determination to work together toward solutions that will benefit their countrymen.

Grant that they be worthy of the responsibilities they have been given by their constituents and truly be the people You have called them to be. May the walls of disagreement that have divided this assembly be put aside and replaced by a spirit of respect and dignity and, where needed, cooperation.

May Your spirit, O God, be in all of our hearts and minds and encourage us to do the works of peace and justice, now and always.

May all that we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2020.

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 January 7, 2020, at 12:18 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 3076.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the House Democratic Caucus:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to House of Representatives Rule X, Clause 5(b)(1), I am writing to inform you that Representative Jefferson Van Drew has resigned as a Member of the House Democratic Caucus.

Sincerely,

HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Chairman, House Democratic Caucus.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 7, 2020.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: This letter is to advise you that Representative Jefferson Van Drew's election to the Committee on Agriculture has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule X effective today.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 7, 2020.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: This letter is to advise you that Representative Jefferson Van Drew's election to the Committee on Natural Resources has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule X effective today.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. A call of the House is ordered to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—384

Abraham	Bacon	Bishop (GA)
Adams	Baird	Bishop (NC)
Aderholt	Balderson	Bishop (UT)
Aguilar	Banks	Blumenauer
Allen	Barr	Blunt Rochester
Allred	Barragán	Bonamici
Amash	Bass	Bost
Amodei	Bera	Boyle, Brendan F.
Armstrong	Bergman	Brady
Arrington	Beyer	Brindisi
Axne	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Bilirakis	

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gallagher
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
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
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
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
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
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
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—47

Beatty
Buchanan
Butterfield
Byrne
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Correa
Crawford
DeGette
Deutch
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Griffith
Grijalva
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Kelly (IL)
Kind
LaMalfa
Lewis
Lipinski
Loudermilk
Luria
Marchant
Massie
McEachin
Meng
Nadler
Ratcliffe
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Sarbanes
Scott, David
Serrano
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Walker
Waters
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth

□ 1855

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). On this roll call, 384 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the proceedings of January 3, 2020, and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PAYNE 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.

PROVIDING FOR A COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 776

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the House has assembled and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 776

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 776, the Chair appoints the following Members to the committee to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the House has assembled and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make:

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and

the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT A QUORUM OF THE HOUSE HAS ASSEMBLED

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 777

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1900

PROVIDING FOR THE HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 778

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 2 p.m. on Mondays; noon on Tuesdays (or 2 p.m. if no legislative business was conducted on the preceding Monday); noon on Wednesdays and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2019, providing for morning-hour debate be extended for the remainder of the 116th Congress, except that House Resolution 778 shall supplant House Resolution 10.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 535, PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 116–366) on the resolution (H. Res. 779) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2895

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman MO BROOKS be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2895, the Conrad State 30 and Physician Access Reauthorization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

JANUARY 7, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I write to inform you of my resignation, effective close of business on January 13, 2020. as United States Representative for the 50th District of California. Attached is a copy of the letter I submitted to the Governor of California.

Since the day I joined the Marines in the aftermath of 9/11, I have had the honor of serving my country, both at home and abroad. After three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, I was elected to the House and brought with me the lessons I learned during my service in the Marine Corps and the values instilled by my father who held this seat before me. Growing up in East County San Diego, I learned from an early age the importance of liberty, the value of patriotism, and what a strong and secure border can bring to a community.

During my time in Congress. I had the privilege of helping thousands of individuals in my district—from making sure veterans received the benefits they earned, to helping Social Security and Medicare recipients cut through red tape, to assisting immigrants seeking legal citizenship, and countless others going up against the IRS, ATF or other government agencies.

I also sought to enact policies that will make our country better off. As Chairman of the Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee, I worked to enhance student outcomes and empower parents with greater choice in where they send their children to school. I was also a strong advocate for college transparency and introduced the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act, which would give parents and students a better understanding of college costs and possible outcomes.

As Chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, I worked to protect the Jones Act and ensure that our country has a strong maritime industrial base, including a skilled pool of American shipyard workers and mariners that would form the backbone of our response to any maritime conflict. I pushed the Coast Guard to act like the military service that it is, and made it a priority to modernize our nation's ice breaker fleet, which is critical for our nation's continued access to the artic.

Perhaps the contribution I am most proud of is giving a voice to our men and women in uniform. As a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I brought attention to inefficient military programs and worked to make sure our war fighters had the resources they needed to carry out their mission. I helped shine light on a broken military awards process that failed to recognize true heroism, and I fought for warriors like Clint Lorance, Eddie Gallagher and Matt Golsteyn that were treated unjustly by an abusive military justice system. I will always be proud to stand with the men and women who protect our freedoms.

It has been an honor to serve the people of California's 50th District, and I greatly appreciate the trust they have put in me over these last 11 years.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 7, 2020.

GOV. GAVIN NEWSOM,
Sacramento, CA.

DEAR GOVERNOR NEWSOM: I write to inform you of my resignation, effective close of business on January 13, 2020, as United States Representative for the 50th District of California. Attached is a copy of the letter I submitted to the Speaker of the House,

Since the day I joined the Marines in the aftermath of 9/11, I have had the honor of serving my country, both at home and abroad. After three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, I was elected to the House and brought with me the lessons I learned during my service in the Marine Corps and the values instilled by my father who held this seat before me. Growing up in East County San Diego, I learned from an early age the importance of liberty, the value of patriotism, and what a strong and secure border can bring to a community.

During my time in Congress, I had the privilege of helping thousands of individuals in my district—from making sure veterans received the benefits they earned, to helping Social Security and Medicare recipients cut through red tape, to assisting immigrants seeking legal citizenship, and countless others going up against the IRS, ATF or other government agencies.

I also sought to enact policies that will make our country better off. As Chairman of the Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee, I worked to enhance student outcomes and empower parents with greater choice in where they send their children to school. I was also a strong advocate for college transparency and introduced the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act, which would give parents and students a better understanding of college costs and possible outcomes.

As Chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, I worked to protect the Jones Act and ensure that our country has a strong maritime industrial base, including a skilled pool of American shipyard workers and mariners that would form the backbone of our response to any maritime conflict. I pushed the Coast Guard to act like the military service that it is, and made it a priority to modernize our nation's ice breaker fleet, which is critical for our nation's continued access to the artic.

Perhaps the contribution I am most proud of is giving a voice to our men and women in uniform. As a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I brought attention to inefficient military programs and worked to make sure our war fighters had the resources they needed to carry out their mission. I helped shine light on a broken military awards process that failed to recognize true heroism, and I fought for warriors like Clint Lorance, Eddie Gallagher and Matt Golsteyn that were treated unjustly by an abusive military justice system. I will always be proud to stand with the men and women who protect our freedoms.

It has been an honor to serve the people of California's 50th District, and I greatly appreciate the trust they have put in me over these last 11 years.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER,
Member of Congress.

PRAISING UNSUNG HEROES OF JERSEY CITY SHOOTING

(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 praise the unsung heroes of the terrible shooting in Jersey City, New Jersey, last month.

When tragedy strikes a community, we all hear about the criminals who committed the horrible acts. Only now and then do we hear about the heroes who risked their lives to save others.

In Jersey City, it was heroes like Sergeant Majorie Jordan. She walked into the line of fire to pull a wounded police officer to safety.

Heroes like Anayah Bey; she cared for one of the shooting victims until help arrived.

These are two of the many stories of individual bravery, from officers and civilians alike, that happen during national tragedies like Jersey City. These unsung heroes represent the best of America during the worst of times, and they deserve our thanks and praise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing these brave and honorable citizens and their care for their fellow man.

TRANSMIT ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT TO SENATE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Democratic leadership to answer the question from my constituents as to why the Articles of Impeachment were not yet transmitted to the Senate.

It was urgent enough to have the first-ever partisan articles pass this institution almost 3 weeks ago but not urgent enough to follow our Constitution by walking them from this House, out that door, through Statuary Hall, under the Capitol dome, and to the Senate floor.

It will take only a matter of minutes to get them there, and it will codify the first-ever partisan impeachment process in our Nation's history.

History will not judge this process and this impeachment favorably. If you don't like who gets elected, work to elect someone else.

Instead, Democrats will ask themselves years from now, ''Why did we allow partisanship and hatred of this President to change history and precedent?'' when this institution is paralyzed by future partisan impeachments of duly elected Presidents of both parties.

TIT-FOR-TAT IS NOT A POLICY

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House cannot sit still and allow Trump to become an imperial President, answerable to no one.

Without consultation with House leadership or even leaders in the Republican Senate, Trump ordered the killing of a major military leader, Iranian General Qasem Soleimani.

Like countless officials worldwide, Soleimani was a bad actor whose forces were responsible for the deaths of Americans. However, Soleimani was not killed on the battlefield but was targeted by President Trump in Baghdad. Trump may have been seeking revenge for the storming and damaging of the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, the largest, most fortified embassy in the world.

Tit-for-tat is not a policy. It is a childish and dangerous response that could lead to all-out hostilities.

The U.S. lacks credibility to start diplomatic efforts. I hope that our allies will intervene as emissaries before it is too late.

CONDEMNING RECENT ANTI-SEMITIC ATTACKS

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, we have seen a troubling rise in anti-Semitic crimes and activity across the United States and the world.

In 2019, 229 anti-Semitic hate crimes were reported in New York City. There was a 46 percent increase in anti-Semitic hate crimes in Chicago. From January to October, there were 58 reported anti-Semitic crimes in Los Angeles.

The facts are indisputable. These heinous acts of violence were not the result of random, isolated incidents. These acts were deliberately orchestrated with a clear intent to target and harm the Jewish community.

Attacks of any kind on communities of faith are unacceptable. Simply broaching the issue of anti-Semitic crime is not enough to protect these communities. Those responsible for committing these senseless acts of violence must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. We must foster engagement between law enforcement and targeted communities, and we must all work together to confront this issue.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO PASS WAR POWERS RESOLUTION IMMEDIATELY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the American people and Members of Congress cannot ignore being on the brink of war. Nor can we ignore the fact that the Constitution indicates in Article I that it is the Congress that has the responsibility and duty to declare war.

Nor can we ignore the breaking news of 10 rockets that have just hit a base in Iraq that houses U.S. troops or the 4,000 troops that have been sent in the last 24 hours or the reckless decision made by this administration to kill a very bad man in a manner that has created havoc in the Mideast.

It is interesting to suggest that our allies are supportive when, in the last 24 hours, Israel said they had nothing to do with it. Presidents Obama and Bush, competent and prepared, indicated that this was not the right thing to do.

My concern is that we, as a Nation, are defenders, and we can defend ourselves. We are powerful. That is not the point.

The point is that we can do a tactic, but where is the strategy? It is crucial that we do not send young men and women into battle recklessly.

I believe the Congress needs to pass a war powers resolution, an AUMF, immediately.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S ORDER WAS CORRECT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, universally respected Senator Joe Lieberman provided an extraordinary op-ed in The Wall Street Journal: ''President Trump's order to take out Qasem Soleimani was morally, constitutionally, and strategically correct. . . . No American can dispute that Soleimani created, supported, and directed a network of terrorist organizations that spread havoc in the Middle East.'' In Syria, ''more than 500,000 Syrians have died.''

''During the Iraq war, Soleimani oversaw three camps in Iran.'' These trained fighters have killed more than 600 American troops.

The claim that President Trump ''had no authority to order this attack without congressional approval is constitutionally untenable and practically senseless. Authority to act quickly to eliminate a threat to the U.S. is inherent. . . . Democrats should leave partisan politics at 'the water's edge' and . . . stand together against Iran and dangerous leaders like Qasem Soleimani.''

Senator Joe Lieberman tells the truth.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism, with the courage and leadership of President Donald Trump.

□ 1915

PRESIDENT TRUMP VISITS OHIO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week, President Trump will travel to the great and compassionate city of Toledo, Ohio, my lifelong home. Like all people, the President is welcome in Toledo.

Toledo is a city of industry, where the mighty Jeep has rolled off the assembly line every year since 1941. We are also the city that embraces the future and launched America's leading solar energy company, First Solar. Our diverse city and people truly make America great.

I urge the President to bring a message of unity to our city, not one of division.

I also urge President Trump to keep his promises to our people: Make medicine and healthcare more affordable; save our Great Lakes; negotiate enforceable trade agreements that actually stop job outsourcing. Protect, don't gut, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Get MITCH MCCONNELL to pass the Butch Lewis Act to save the pensions of 60,000 Ohioans, and select our 180th Fighter Wing for the F–35 tranche planes that they have so duly earned.

Let us work on a bipartisan basis to improve the lives of all people. And, in furtherance of that, this Thursday, I urge all Toledo area religious leaders to offer prayers for nonviolence and peace, and I urge all of our citizens to light a candle in their home and put on a porch light to shine a ray of hope skyward for a new year of peace and prosperity for all.

May God bless our troops.

CONGRATULATING THE BLUM HIGH SCHOOL BOBCATS ON THEIR FIRST STATE TITLE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the 2019 Blum High School Bobcats football team on winning their first ever six-man State championship title.

For Texans, high school football is not just a sport; it is a way of life. Each week in the fall, we gather under Friday night lights and cheer our team on to victory.

The young men and coaches on our teams spend countless hours running drills, watching film, and getting ready for their moment in history. During the 2019 season, Blum High School's dedication paid off as they rose from behind and secured a 58–52 win over the McLean Tigers at AT&T Stadium.

On behalf of the 25th District of Texas, I congratulate the Bobcats on their first State championship victory, and I wish them the very best in their bright futures.

In God we trust.

Bless our troops.

Go Bobcats.

PRESIDENT TRUMP UNITES FACTIONS IN IRAN AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump has demonstrated the limitation of his reality show, go-it-alone, incoherent approach, which helped him eke out an electoral college victory while losing the popular vote by 3 million votes, but is spectacularly ill-equipped to govern, let alone respond to a crisis that he has made worse.

Maybe there was a reason that Bush and Obama didn't kill Soleimani when they could. Evidently, his advisors put General Soleimani's assassination on the list of options because they thought it was so outrageous they didn't think he would choose it.

If you thought abandoning our Kurdish allies who helped us fight ISIS was a heartless disaster, now Trump has managed to unite factions in Iran against us, delaying reform for years, while pushing us to the brink of war and making it more likely that Iran develops nuclear weapons after Iran followed the nuclear agreement that the President broke.

Reportedly, Iranian missiles are launched on Americans in bases that the Iraqi Parliament said we should abandon.

Congress must act to rein in this reckless President.

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

DISTRICT 16 LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP FOR NORTHFIELD, NEW JERSEY

(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, Northfield, New Jersey's Little League baseball team, a little while back, won their second straight District 16 Little League baseball title.

Their pitcher, Finn Haines, who was selected to compete in the Little League Derby in Atlanta, pitched their final two innings to clinch the win.

Brady Arena, their leadoff hitter, scored their winning run, ensuring that Northfield beat Ocean City 3–2.

The District 16 baseball teams are made up of 11-and 12-year-olds in Atlantic and Cape May Counties in south Jersey, and winning this title means that Northfield advanced to the Section 4 tournament.

When they won, the Northfield team ran a victory lap around the field holding the District 16 championship banner in pride, along with the United States flag.

So to all players on the team: Congratulations on your win. You have exciting futures ahead of you. I am sure you have many, many more wins to come.

FASTEST GROWING CITY IN AMERICA, SUGAR LAND, TEXAS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas, keeps setting records and leaving all the others in the dust. Today, we found out we are the fourth fastest growing city in America, growing 49.3 percent over the last decade.

That growth would not have happened without Philip Savko. Philip ran Sugar Land Regional Airport for nearly 21 years. Under his leadership, his two decades of leadership, our airport went from flying Cessna 152's and crop dusters to being the go-to airport in the Houston region for Fortune 500 corporate jets. One hundred of these jets use our airport on a regular basis.

Philip delivered these birds by arranging to have on-call U.S. Customs service at our airport. Philip brought 692 jobs to Sugar Land, with the impact of $93 million.

Philip took his last flight from our airport. He flew up to heaven over the holidays. We imagine Philip, on approach, God in the control tower, saying: ''Philip, you are on course, on glide slope. You are cleared to land. Welcome home, dear man.''

Rest in peace, Philip, with our many, many thanks.

SUPPORT FOR GUN RIGHTS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my strong support for the Second Amendment and stand up for the constitutional right for all Americans to keep and bear arms.

At a time when efforts are underway across the country to restrict gun ownership, patriotic Americans are rising up in strong defense of the Second Amendment. This is especially true in my home State of Kentucky, where there is significant grassroots energy on the side of defending a right that our Founding Fathers considered to be of critical importance.

Whether it be red flag laws or other proposals aimed at limiting access to firearms or ammunition, politicians across the country are seeking to roll back the basic rights of law-abiding Americans. As a member of the Congressional Second Amendment Caucus, I pledge to strongly oppose these proposals as well as any effort to infringe on the fundamental freedom of gun ownership.

HONORING VETERAN OF THE MONTH OLIVER GREEN

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to a distinguished veteran from my district.

At the age of 17, Private Oliver Green enlisted in the Army just before the Korean war; and on his 18th birthday, Private Green landed at Wonsan, North Korea, in a tank landing ship.

As a machine gunner assigned to the Third Infantry Division, Seventh Regiment, First Battalion, D Company, Oliver Green was quickly put into the fight, experiencing a number of combat engagements with the enemy. After being seriously wounded, Private Green was awarded the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart for his combat heroism.

Oliver Green went on to attend the University of Alabama and Stetson School of Law. He later became a Polk County judge, rising to become chief judge of the tenth judicial circuit in 1979.

Oliver Green is a patriot. His commitment and service to our Nation and our community have been outstanding.

I am grateful for brave individuals like Oliver Green who go, and have gone, above and beyond the call of duty to serve their fellow man and to serve our Nation.

HONORING SCOTT WINTERS FOR HIS WORK SUPPORTING VETERANS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Scott Winters, the readjustment counselor at the DuBois Veterans Center in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

Mr. Winters provides a wide range of psychosocial services offered to eligible veterans, servicemembers, and their families. His efforts assist our veterans in making a successful transition from the military to civilian life.

Recently, Mr. Winters was recognized by the Spring Creek Chapter of Trout Unlimited for presenting a listening skills course to their Veterans Service

Partnership streamside mentors and other interested members to support veterans in crisis situations.

The VSP program is a Trout Unlimited initiative to serve veterans, Active-Duty military, and their families by engaging them through the recreational benefits of angling, with the support of the Trout Unlimited community.

Mr. Winters' service that he provided in training has been utilized by at least one volunteer to save a veteran's life who was in crisis.

Mr. Speaker, Scott Winters has gone above and beyond to be available at a moment's notice to support veterans in his community, and his service is greatly appreciated.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, obviously, it is a new year, and we return to Washington with an agenda that is completely full and, in many, many ways, a tragic and an extremely dangerous agenda out ahead of us.

Last December, this House undertook the issue of how to deal with the issue of a President who was not paying attention to his oath of office, and so we passed an impeachment resolution. That issue is now over in the Senate and in their hands. I could spend some time talking about that.

Then, last Friday, another issue occurred, and I will spend more time talking about that a little later.

But what I came to the floor tonight for is to talk about what our Democratic Caucus, our leadership, and the 230-plus members of our Caucus have been working on diligently over the last year for the people, a series of legislative initiatives that address the fundamental concerns that America has, that Americans talk about, as we like to say, at their breakfast table or dinner table: the concerns about their family's education, about their job, about their retirement, and, as I learned yesterday from my neighbor, a rancher, about the extraordinary cost of health insurance.

I come to the floor tonight for that purpose, but I am going to delay my discussion of that and ask the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, BOBBY SCOTT, to talk about the extraordinary work that his committee has done on the issue of education and for the working men and women of America.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) represents one of the largest military districts in the Nation, and I know that the thoughts of his constituents are on our minds. I also know that it is time for America to recognize the work that he has done on the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1930

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and, yes, we have a lot of military installations in the Hampton Roads area, and we are very concerned about the present situation in the Middle East.

We want to talk about what is going on in the Committee on Education and Labor, and I just want to share a few things that we have been doing over the last year.

Comments have been made of what Congress is or is not doing. Well, we have been protecting the income of hardworking Americans by the House passing the Raise the Wage Act, which will gradually increase the Federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 an hour by 2025, giving 33 million workers a raise and lifting over a million people out of poverty.

We haven't had an increase in the minimum wage for over a decade. The last minimum wage was over 10 years ago, and inflation has eroded the value of that minimum wage so much to the point where one study concluded that a full-time, 40-hours-a-week, minimum-wage worker cannot afford a modest two-bedroom apartment in any county in the United States.

We are not talking about San Francisco or Manhattan. Not a single county in the United States can a full-time minimum-wage worker afford a modest two-bedroom apartment. So we voted in the House to increase the minimum wage.

The Paycheck Fairness Act addresses pay inequity by holding companies accountable for gender-based wage disparities and protecting a worker's right to challenge systemic pay discrimination. We passed that bill.

The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, or Butch Lewis Act, will prevent the imminent collapse of our multiemployer pension system, saving over 1 million hardworking Americans their pension, while protecting those benefits and the taxpayer's dollars.

We also passed the Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act to prevent violence and the injuries that occur because of that.

In addition, the committee has reported the PRO Act, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, which will enable workers to negotiate for better wages and better working conditions.

We also passed the legislation to help in the area of children's access to quality education and a safe learning environment.

We passed in the committee the Rebuild America's Schools Act which will invest $100 billion to repair our public schools' crumbling digital and physical infrastructure and will create 1.9 million jobs.

We passed two important civil rights bills in the area of education: the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act and Strength in Diversity Act, which will empower students, parents, and communities to challenge discriminatory education policies and increase school diversity.

The committee passed the College Affordability Act, which will comprehensively overhaul our higher education system so that students will be able to achieve a college degree without incurring crushing debt.

We also passed legislation to protect children from school shootings.

In the area of healthcare, the House has passed legislation to protect consumers from junk health plans by trying to overturn the Trump administration's short-term, limited duration insurance rule, as well as passing the Lower Drug Costs Now Act which will reduce out-of-pocket costs for customers, lower prescription drug prices, and increase transparency.

We passed legislation that will protect children from child abuse, the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

We protected seniors by passing legislation, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

All of those bills have passed the House. None have been taken up by the Senate, and so we need to make sure that the hard work of our committee is rewarded by the passage of those bills in the Senate.

But as I have said, our committee has been busy. All of the committees have been busy doing the people's work. We are doing the people's agenda, and I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to do a little bragging about what we have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can use the word ''brag,'' but I would recommend that it is not bragging. It is simply a fact; not an alternate fact, but it is a fact that the gentleman's committee and this House—now under Democratic control—has passed well over 250 bills that are for the people.

The work that the Committee of Education and Labor has done for the working men and women of this Nation is an extraordinary example of what can be done when we focus on legislation that is for the people.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to mention these bills for the people. The people will be much better off if we can get a little cooperation down the hall and improve education, improve healthcare, and improve working conditions.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did mention the grim reaper, I don't think by name, but, clearly, the Senate leader intends to delay legislation that would be in the interest of the American people: higher wages, better healthcare, better insurance products, jobs, making it in America, all of the things that I know the gentleman and his committee have worked so hard on.

So I thank the gentleman for that, and I look forward to the days ahead when I know that the gentleman has an additional agenda of legislation that he is going to be putting on the floor of the House.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman will. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I am really torn. I want to continue discussing the legislation that is out there, but I really stand in front of this Chamber—which at the moment is empty—with a very, very heavy heart and extraordinary concern.

I am looking at where we are as a nation this evening, and I am going to really ponder tomorrow what fate may behold our men and women in the military.

A couple of hours ago the inevitable happened. I think I was a freshman in high school and my science teacher was trying to give me some of the principles of physics. He was talking about for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction.

He was showing various examples of that and, of course, I was then playing football and I could really understand. I hit somebody, and they would hit me back; or I would push somebody and they would push back. I would like to think that I was more than equal.

Last Friday, our President took an action and launched missiles at the highest commander of the Iranian military and killed him, along with one of the major, if not the major commander of the militia units in Iraq.

That attack took place just outside the Baghdad International Airport. That was an action, presumably, to prevent some future action that might be taken by the Iranians and by their leader or directed by their leader, Soleimani.

My high school science teacher could not have been more correct. For every action, there is a reaction. And we will undoubtedly engage in a debate here on the floor and in the Congress and across the United States about whether the first action taken by the President to take out the leader of Iran's Revolutionary Guard was an appropriate action.

I think not, for a variety of reasons. And then we will also debate whether the Iranian reaction to that action which occurred a couple of hours ago was appropriate.

I am quite sure that our military on the base in Iraq at Al Asad views the Iranian action as a very serious threat. We don't yet know the results of the bombardment of missiles, but we can assume that there was certainly destruction of buildings or airfields and we pray that there was no destruction of life.

But perhaps we may find that prayer unanswered. Where do we go from here? Where do we go from here? We are not on the verge of war. In a very, very unfortunate, tragic sense, we are in a war and some would claim that war is now 40 years old and started way back with the embassy in Tehran being occupied, and we could say that is correct.

This is different. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I have had the briefings and I know, as do our generals and our intelligence community, the capabilities of the Iranian military. Furthermore, we know the capabilities of their proxies, the various military units that they have set up, or quasi-military units that they have set up: the militias, Yemen, Houthis, Hezbollah, and others.

It is really a moment this evening for us to hold our anger, which is a normal and natural thing that certainly I, and I am sure every one of my colleagues possesses: anger at the attack on our military base.

I suppose we should also think that perhaps Iran should hold its anger, although they certainly expressed it in the streets, in the funeral ceremonies, and in the launching of ballistic missiles at an American air base.

We should hold our anger. We should say: Where does this go from here? What is the next tit for tat? Unfortunately, I don't believe our President thought about the next move, about the equal and opposite reaction when he ordered the launching of the missiles that took out a very dangerous, bad, bad person.

I don't think he thought about the next order, nor do I think he thought about the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth order. Where does it go from there?

But we have a chance this evening and tomorrow, and in the days ahead, to stop and think about the next event, the next tit for tat. What does it mean now for those of us in Congress, 435—I guess 434 since one of our colleagues resigned today—and the Senate—undoubtedly occupied with impeachment?

It is time for us to reach into our desk drawer and pull out the Constitution of the United States and read Article I, and for the American people to do the same. When we read that, we will find that only Congress can declare war; not the President, not the Secretary of State, not the Secretary of Defense, and not a general, but only Congress.

□ 1945

Maybe we could argue that it is already starting, in which case, stop, come to Congress, Mr. President, and tell us why you must, why we must, why America must, and why our military must pursue the next tit for tat. Stop and tell us where it leads. Tell us how you think it might end.

I know that our Secretary of Defense says that we are not going to start a war but that we will end it. Okay, then you come here. You come to the floor of this House as Roosevelt did and as others have done, and you tell us why we should have a war with Iran. Tell us how you intend to pursue that war and at what cost in human lives and the treasury of this Nation.

Then, let us ponder your wisdom or lack of wisdom. Let us ponder—no, not ''let us.'' This is not a matter of the President letting us. This is a matter of the Congress of the United States asserting its constitutional obligation.

At this moment and on this day, when it is easy to argue that America has been attacked, on this day, stop, come to us, Mr. President, and tell us why you want to pursue a war with Iran. Tell us what equipment you will need. Tell us the number of troops that will be dispatched.

Then it is our responsibility—535 of us—to say that, yes, we will go to war with Iran, or, no, we will not.

This is a critical moment. This is a moment when I am thinking about that science teacher who said that for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. We have seen an action and a reaction. Yes, we attacked Iran by taking out their top general, and, yes, they attacked us by launching their missiles into our airbase and quite possibly harming our military personnel and others.

Now stop. Come here, Mr. President. Stand before us. Stand before the American people, and tell us why, how, and what it will cost to pursue this.

That is his responsibility. Then it is our responsibility on behalf of the American people and people beyond this Nation to say that, yes, we will pursue a war, or, no, we will not.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that the existing authorizations to use force do not apply to this situation, not the authorization to use force that was established for al-Qaida and Afghanistan, not the authorization to use force to go after Saddam Hussein in Iraq. No. Those don't apply.

This is different. This is demonstrably different. This requires the President to come to the Congress and explain why we should conduct a war with Iran.

It is not to say we cannot protect ourselves. But the next action by our military likely would be far more an action of protection but, rather, an action in response to what happened a couple of hours ago.

I would have loved and would have desired not to be here at this moment, talking about this issue but, rather, following what Mr. SCOTT had said about what has been done this last year for the American people, about the efforts that we have made to bring down healthcare costs, to provide pharmaceuticals that people can afford, and to guarantee that Americans do not lose their right to health insurance, as the President and our Republican colleagues are attempting and have attempted to do for the last 10 years.

I would love to have spent this evening talking about that. I would have loved to talk about the education programs that Mr. SCOTT has already brought to our attention and to talk about raising the minimum wage. But that is not where I am tonight.

My thoughts are with those military personnel, the airmen, many of whom

are from my district and probably at the bases there in the Middle East. My thoughts are with them and their families. I pray that all are safe.

And I pray that tonight or tomorrow morning a tweet says: ''I, the President of the United States, will come to Congress and explain why we should or should not pursue a war with Iran.''

It is a good time for all of us to pray. It is a good time for all of us to take a deep breath and realize the path that we are on and where it might lead.

I am deeply, deeply disturbed by what has happened. I am willing to take up my responsibility here, and I anxiously await what the President of the United States of America has to say as he stands here in the Congress and explains to a joint session of the Senate and the House why we should pursue a war with Iran. That is his responsibility, and then it is our responsibility—elected by the people of America—to go to war or not to go to war. We shall see.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 2020, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3392. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Gary J. Volesky, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3393. A letter from the Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report on the Truth in Lending Act, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, and the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1613; Public Law 90-321, Sec. 114 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1100A(2)); (124 Stat. 2107); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3394. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Team, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program [Docket No.: RHS-18-SFH-0020] (RIN: 0575-AD09) received December 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary of State's Determinations Under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 and Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act of 2016; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Idaho: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R10-UST-2019-0363; FRL-10003-28-Region 10] received December 19, 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.

3397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alabama; Approval of Plan for Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0183; FRL-9996-80-Region 4] received December 19, 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.

3398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Interstate Transport [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0666; FRL-10003-56-Region 4] received December 19, 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.

3399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Limited Maintenance Plans for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS; Evansville, Fort Wayne, Greene County, Jackson County, Muncie, and Terre Haute areas [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0267; FRL-10003-54-Region 5] received December 19, 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.

3400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0203; FRL-10003-55-Region 4] received December 19, 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.

3401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0165; FRL-10002-05-Region 9] received December 19, 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.

3402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tennessee; Approval of Plan for Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0186; FRL-9997-01-Region 4] received December 19, 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.

3403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Adjustments to the Allowance System for Controlling HCFC Production and Import, 2020-2029; and Other Updates [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0271; FRL-10003-80-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU26) received December 19, 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.

3404. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting a report on Oversight of Institutions for Mental Diseases, pursuant to Public Law 115-271, Sec. 5012(a); (132 Stat. 3962); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3405. A letter from the Executive Director, Southeast Compact Commission for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management, transmitting the 2016-2017 and the 2017-2018 Annual Reports of the Southeast Low-Level Radioactive Waste Commission that include the Annual Commission Audits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3406. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3407. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3408. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-58, proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3409. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Fourth Quarter FY 2019, July 1 — September 30, 2019, pursuant to Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3410. 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 Annual Report, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); Public Law 107-296, Sec. 705; (116 Stat. 2219); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3411. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Semiannual Report to Congress from the Office of Inspector General, for the period April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019, pursuant to Section 5 of the Inspector General Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3412. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 647(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3413. A letter from the Chairman, Labor Member, Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2019, including the Office of Inspector General's Audit's Report, 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.

3414. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, transmitting the Library's fiscal 2018 financial statements and accompanying opinion of the independent auditors, 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 House Administration.

3415. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports created by the Clerk, pursuant to Rule II, clause 2(b), of the Rules of the House (H. Doc. No. 116—85); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3416. 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; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2019 Winter II Quota [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XX014) received December 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.

3417. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Annual Report to Congress on Investigation, Enforcement, and Implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act Requirements, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 20991; Public Law 109-248, Sec. 635; (120 Stat. 644); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3418. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule [FRL-10003-77-OECA] received December 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3419. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Innovative Materials and Advanced Technologies Report, August 2019, pursuant to Public Law 115-270, Sec. 1208; (132 Stat. 3808); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3420. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0481; Product Identifier 2019-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-21002; AD 2019-24-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3421. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0674; Product Identifier 2019-NM-079-AD; Amendment 39-21003; AD 2019-24-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3422. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of the Phase-in Period for the Enforcement and Administration of Section 871(m) [Notice 2020-2] received December 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on 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:

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4329. A bill to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. SCANLON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 779. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Rept. 116–366). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4500. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information to take certain actions to enhance the representation of the United States and promote United States leadership in communications standards-setting bodies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–367, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Resolution 575. Resolution 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 recommendations of ''The Prague Proposals''; with amendments (Rept. 116–368, Pt. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2881. A bill to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 116–369, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of January 2, 2020]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 535 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2881 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to section 1703E(f)(3)(D)(i) of title 38, United States Code, H.J. Res. 80. Approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H. Res. 575 referred to the House Calendar.

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:

[Submitted January 3, 2020]

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 5540. A bill to require, pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, disclosure of the introduction of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances into treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5541. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to reauthorize programs to assist consenting Indian Tribes in meeting energy education, planning, and management needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 5542. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program for States to provide incentives to natural gas distribution companies for the improvement of natural gas distribution systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CROW, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 5543. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for unauthorized military force against Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5544. A bill to create jobs and drive innovation and economic growth in the United States by supporting and promoting the manufacture of next generation technologies, including refrigerants, solvents, fire suppressants, foam blowing agents, aerosols, and propellants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5545. A bill to promote the domestic manufacture and use of advanced, fuel efficient vehicles and zero emission vehicles, encourage electrification of the transportation sector, create jobs, and improve air quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5546. A bill to regulate monitoring of electronic communications between an incarcerated person in a Bureau of Prisons facility and that person's attorney or other legal representative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5547. A bill to provide assistance for the acquisition and preservation of manufactured housing communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 5548. A bill to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5549. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Doris Miller posthumously for acts of valor while a member of the Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5550. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations regarding disposal of materials containing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances or aqueous film forming foam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5551. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title 5, United States Code, to require group health plans, health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage, and Federal Employees Health Benefits Program health benefits plans to meet certain requirements with respect to medical child support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.J. Res. 82. A joint resolution direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 776. A resolution providing for a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 777. A resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 778. A resolution providing for the hour of meeting of the House; considered and agreed to.

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.

[Submitted January 3, 2020]

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 5540

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II Section 8

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 5542.

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. KHANNA:

H.R. 5543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5546.

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 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5547.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5549.

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. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 5550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.J. Res. 82.

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:

[Submitted January 3, 2020]

H.R. 41: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1315: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2895: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2912: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4148: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 4874: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 5299: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

H.R. 96: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 99: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 303: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 366: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 444: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 663: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 749: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 945: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1049: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1073: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1126: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1128: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1139: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1175: Mr. ROY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PENCE, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1185: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1230: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1254: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1325: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1379: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. BERA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. PENCE, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1440: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1527: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1530: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1551: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1597: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1652: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1674: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1679: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1713: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1715: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1753: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 1771: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1776: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1786: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1864: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1923: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 2062: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2086: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2150: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2153: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 2222: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2235: Mr. VELA and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2256: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2271: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2275: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2311: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2328: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2339: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2344: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2456: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2468: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2501: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 2581: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2584: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2594: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 2602: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2651: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2676: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2708: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2711: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2771: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2772: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2777: Ms. WILD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2802: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2829: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2895: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2896: Ms. FINKENAUER and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2897: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2905: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 2964: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 2977: Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3077: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 3103: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 3107: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3137: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 3138: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3192: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3219: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WILD, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3250: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 3332: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3522: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 3744: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3760: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3763: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 3799: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3815: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3884: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3918: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3975: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4056: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4078: Mr. ROUDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. WILD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4092: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4098: Mr. ROY and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 4296: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4305: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. DEAN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GUEST, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4370: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4381: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4468: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4489: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4500: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 4701: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4708: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4709: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4768: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 4817: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 4820: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4838: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 4843: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 4932: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4945: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4980: Mr. COX of California and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4990: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5010: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 5036: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5092: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 5104: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 5118: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5138: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5170: Mr. LEVIN of California and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 5195: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 5200: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5216: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5221: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 5240: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 5262: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5265: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 5297: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 5298: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5317: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 5319: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5334: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5376: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5390: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5399: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5403: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5424: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5431: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 5434: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5439: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 5448: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5469: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5483: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5485: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 5487: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5492: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 5517: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5528: Mr. COOPER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5531: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 5534: Mr. RUSH and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.J. Res. 66: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. RYAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. PINGREE.
H. Res. 50: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. ROY.
H. Res. 114: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Res. 189: Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 255: Ms. FINKENAUER and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 495: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H. Res. 675: Mr. NORMAN.
H. Res. 682: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H. Res. 734: Mr. KINZINGER.
H. Res. 735: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 745: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

[Submitted January 7, 2020]

H.R. 2895: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2020 No. 3

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our Nation needs Your mercy. The challenges are too great to be met with mere human ingenuity. You have been our protection. Shelter us until the violent storms are passed. Let Your glory shine on Your lawmakers. May their thoughts, words, and deeds prompt people to glorify You. Inspire our Senators to place their confidence completely in You. Eternal God, You are our salvation. We will trust and not be afraid, for You are our strength and song.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2020.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I spoke yesterday about President Trump's decision to remove the chief architect of Tehran's terrorism from the battlefield, and I discussed the Senate's obligation to approach this in a manner that is serious, sober, and factual.

It is right for Senators to want to learn more about the President's major decision. Once again, I encourage all of our colleagues to attend the classified briefing which the administration will provide tomorrow. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the CIA Director will give a classified context behind the President's decision, and they will discuss the administration's strategy to protect our personnel and defend our Nation's interests in the new landscape. I would ask every Senator on both sides to bring an open mind to this briefing.

In particular, we should all remember that the history of Iranian aggression began long, long before this news cycle or this Presidency. In the decades since the Islamic revolution of 1979, as the White House has changed parties and our administrations have changed strategies, Tehran's simmering anti-American hatred, proxy violence, and steady support for terrorism worldwide have remained entirely constant through all of these years.

In effect, Iran has been at war with the United States for years. While it has taken pains to avoid direct conflict, Iran's authoritarian regime has shown no compunction about kidnapping, torturing, and killing Americans since its earliest days—or Iraqis or fellow Iranians, for that matter. From the 52 diplomatic personnel held hostage in Tehran for 444 days back in 1979, to the hundreds of U.S. servicemembers killed in bombings carried out by Iran's proxies—Beirut in 1983, Riyadh in 1995, Khobar in 1996—to the hundreds more killed or maimed in Iraq by the explosives and indirect fire attacks ordered by General Soleimani himself, to the constant flows of resources and equipment that prop up despots and terrorist organizations throughout the region, Iran's game plan has been an open book: Use third-party terrorism to inflict death and suffering on its enemies while avoiding direct confrontation.

The threat Iran poses is, certainly, not new. Its violence is not some unique reaction to President Trump or to Prime Minister Netanyahu or to any other current leader. Violence runs in the bloodstream of this evil regime.

In particular, our colleagues who apparently want to blame President Trump for Iranian provocative foreign policy should reflect on the previous administration's recent history.

Iran exploited President Obama's withdrawal from Iraq. Soleimani and his agents filled the void and dramatically expanded Iranian influence inside Iraq. They were able to impose a sectarian vision on Iraq that disenfranchised the Sunnis, fueled the rise of ISIS, and plunged the region into chaos.

Over in Syria, more weakness from the Obama administration opened yet another door for Iran. The Democratic administration failed to confront the Iranian-backed Assad regime as it slaughtered literally hundreds of thousands of Syrians and displaced millions more. Once again, amid the chaos, Soleimani worked and thrived.

Of course, all of this was the backdrop for the brazen, legacy-shopping

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

Printed on recycled paper.

nuclear arrangement that sent billions of dollars to fuel Iran's further violence.

Even my friend the current Democratic leader knew it at the time. Before he himself voted for a resolution of disapproval on President Obama's deal, Senator SCHUMER said: ''After 10 years, if Iran is the same nation as it is today, we will be worse off with this agreement than without it.'' That was the Democratic leader, who opposed President Obama's Iran nuclear deal, and the Democratic leader was prescient, for that is exactly what happened.

The previous administration failed to confront Iran when necessary. So the mullahs used their windfall from the disastrous nuclear deal to double down on hegemonic aspirations all across the Middle East. A Democratic administration just had 8 years to deal with the growing threat posed by Iran, and it failed demonstrably. Iran was stronger and more lethal at the end of the Obama Presidency than at the beginning.

So I would ask my Democratic colleagues today not to rush to lash out at President Trump when he actually demonstrates that he means what he says—when he enforces his redlines, when he takes real action to counter lethal threats against Americans.

Wishing away tensions with Iran is really not an option. The Iranians have spent decades making that perfectly clear to all of us. The question is whether we as a body would prefer the administration to stand by as Iran kills Americans or whether we are prepared to work with the President to stand up to Tehran's terrorism and shadow wars.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, every day that the House Democrats refuse to stand behind their historically partisan impeachment, it deepens the embarrassment for the leaders who chose to take our Nation down this road. You can't say we didn't warn them. You can't even say they didn't warn themselves.

It was less than 1 year ago that Speaker PELOSI said: ''Impeachment is so divisive . . . unless there's something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path.'' That was the Speaker a year ago.

Back during the Clinton impeachment, it was Congressman JERRY NADLER who said: ''An impeachment substantially supported by one of our major political parties and largely opposed by the other . . . will lack legitimacy.'' Chairman NADLER was right 20 years ago.

At this point, they may wish they had taken their own advice.

Instead, what the country got was the most rushed, least thorough, and most unfair Presidential impeachment in American history, and now the prosecution seems to have gotten cold feet. Nearly 3 weeks after the rushed vote they claim was so urgent, they are still debating whether or not they even want to see the trial proceed. They voted for it 3 weeks ago.

The House Democrats say they are waiting for some mythical leverage. I have had difficulty figuring out where the leverage is. Apparently, this is their proposition: If the Senate does not agree to break with our own unanimous, bipartisan precedent from 1999 and agree to let Speaker PELOSI handdesign a different procedure for this Senate trial, then, they might not ever dump this mess in our lap.

It is one cynical political game right on top of another. It was not enough for the House to blow through its own norms and precedents and succumb to the partisan temptation of a subjective impeachment that every other House had resisted for 230 years. Now it needs to erode our constitutional order even further. Those in the House want to invent a new, sort of pretrial hostage negotiation wherein the House gets to run the show over here in the Senate.

Meanwhile, they are creating exactly the kind of unfair and dangerous delay in impeachment that Alexander Hamilton specifically warned against in the Federalist Papers. This is already the longest delay in American history between the impeachment vote and the delivery of the House's impeachment message. It is almost as though this House Democrat majority systematically took all of the Framers' warnings about partisan abuses of the impeachment power—took everything the Founders said not to do—and thought: Now, there is an idea. Why don't we try that?

Impeaching a President is just about the most serious action that any House of Representatives can ever take. How inappropriate and how embarrassing to rush forward on a partisan basis and then treat what you have done like a political toy. How contemptuous of the American people to tell them, for weeks, that you feel this extraordinary step is so urgent and then delay it indefinitely for political purposes. How embarrassing, but also how revealing.

Speaker PELOSI's actions over the past 3 weeks have confirmed what many Americans have suspected about this impeachment process all along—that the House Democrats have only ever wanted to abuse this grave constitutional process for partisan ends right from the beginning.

Well, here is where we are. The Senate is not about to let the Speaker corrode our own Senate process and precedents in the same way. The first organizing registration resolution for the 1999 Clinton trial was approved unanimously, 100 to nothing. It left midtrial questions to the middle of the trial where they belong.

If that unanimous bipartisan precedent was good enough for President Clinton, it should be our template for President Trump. Fair is fair. The Speaker of the House is not going to handwrite new rules for the Senate. It is not going to happen.

Look, these are serious matters. At some point in time, the Democrats' rage at this particular President will begin to fade, but the sad precedent they are setting will live on. The American people deserve a lot better than this.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now, in the aftermath of the U.S. military operation that took out Iranian General Soleimani, we need to be asking the right questions and remain clear-eyed about what might happen next.

I have grown increasingly concerned about the strike against Soleimani and what it might mean for the safety of American troops in the region and the future of America's involvement in the Middle East. The President has promised that he would not drag the American people into another endless war in the Middle East. The President's actions, however, have seemingly increased the risk that we could be dragged into exactly such a war.

Unfortunately, this contradiction is far too typical of how the President has conducted foreign policy over the last 3 years. The President's decision making has been erratic, and it has been impulsive, without regard to the long-term consequences of America's actions abroad. He prefers reality show diplomacy and photo ops with foreign leaders to substantive progress. As a result, the President's foreign policy has been dangerously incompetent.

When you look at nearly every hotspot around the globe, he has made

the situation worse, not better. North Korea—3 years after failed ''negotiations,'' North Korea remains belligerent, defiant, and intent on developing ICBMs. Syria—after years of sacrifice and struggle against ISIS, one impulsive decision to withdraw our troops risks undoing all our progress. Russia—every meeting the President holds with Putin always seems to result in Putin's coming out ahead. We are now at risk of the situation with Iran heading for a similar deterioration.

The President's foreign policy actions so far in North Korea, in Syria, in Russia, and just about everywhere else can be described in two words: ''erratic'' and ''impulsive.'' I am worried that a few months from now his Iran policy will be described in exactly the same way.

As the President's circle of advisers has gotten smaller and more insular and as nearly all of the dissident voices have been forced out of the administration, there seems to be no one left to tell the President no. At times like this, skeptical voices need to ask the right questions, and Congress—Congress must provide a check on the President and assert our constitutional role in matters of war and peace.

In my view, President Trump does not—does not—have authority for a war with Iran. There are several important pieces of legislation by both Senators KAINE and SANDERS to limit further escalation with Iran and assert Congress's prerogative on these matters. Both should receive votes in the Senate.

I plan to ask pointed questions of this administration at a briefing for the Gang of 8 later this afternoon. We need answers to some crucial questions, and there are many. Here are the two that are most on Americans' minds: What are Iran's most probable responses to the strike on Soleimani? Are we prepared for each of these responses, and how effective will our counterresponses be?

There was some alarming confusion yesterday about the military's position on the future of U.S. troops in Iraq. What, in truth, does the Soleimani strike mean for the long-term stability of Iraq and our presence there? How does the administration plan to prevent an escalation of hostilities and the potential for large-scale confrontation with Iran in the Middle East? These are just some of the questions the administration has to answer. The safety and security of our American troops and of the American people are at stake.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, on impeachment, this morning, I return to the most pressing question facing my colleagues at this moment: Will the Senate conduct a fair impeachment trial of the President of the United States of America?

The Framers suspected that any impeachment would ignite the passions of the public and naturally would create partisans who are either sympathetic or inimical to the President's interests. That is why the Framers gave the Senate the responsibility to try impeachment cases. When it came to a matter as serious as the potential removal of a President, they believed the Senate was the only body of government with enough independence to rise above partisan considerations and act with the necessary impartiality. Will we live up to that vision?

Right now, the Republican leader and I have very different ideas about what it means to conduct a fair trial. Democrats believe a fair trial considers all the relevant facts and allows for witnesses and documents. We don't know what the evidence will say. It may exculpate the President. It may further incriminate him. We only want a trial that examines all the facts and lets the chips fall where they may.

The Republican leader, in contrast, apparently believes that a trial should feature no witnesses, no relevant documents, and proceed according to the desires of the White House, the defendant. The Republican leader seems more concerned with being able to claim he went through the constitutional motions than actually carrying out our constitutional duty.

Because the Republican leader has been completely unwilling to help get the facts for a Senate trial, the question will have to be decided by the majority of Senators in this Chamber. That means four Republican Senators at any point can compel the Senate to call the fact witnesses and subpoena the relevant documents that we know will shed additional light on the truth.

I have heard several arguments from the other side as to why we shouldn't vote on witnesses and documents at the outset of the trial. The Republican leader and several Republican Senators have suggested that each side complete their arguments, and then we will decide on witnesses.

This idea is as backward as it sounds. Trials should be informed by witnesses and documents; they are not an afterthought. Their reasoning and MCCONNELL's reasoning has an ''Alice in Wonderland'' logic to it: Let's have each side make their case, he says, and then vote on whether the prosecutors and defense should have all the available evidence to make those cases.

We know what is going on here. Our Republican colleagues, even Leader MCCONNELL, knows that the American people want witnesses and documents. Sixty percent of Republicans do. They are afraid to say no, but they don't want to vote on them because that might offend the defendant in this trial, President Trump, so they are trying to kick the can down the road.

It is a strange position for Republican colleagues to take. They are willing to kick the can down the road, as I said, on questions of witnesses and documents, but they are not willing to say when or if they will ever support it.

Just yesterday, one of the four witnesses we have requested, former National Security Advisor Bolton, said he is ready to testify and has new information to share related to the case at hand. Republicans were dodging and twisting themselves into pretzels trying to explain why someone with direct knowledge of what the President did shouldn't testify under oath immediately.

I believe that illustrates the fundamental weakness of the Republican position. None of our Republican colleagues can advance an argument about why this evidence shouldn't be part of a trial from the beginning.

To put it another way, none of our Republicans have advanced an argument about why it would make sense for the Senate to wait until the end of the trial to obtain all the evidence.

Make no mistake, on the question of witnesses and documents, Republicans may run, but they can't hide. There will be votes at the beginning on whether to call the four witnesses we have proposed and subpoena the documents we have identified. America and the eyes of history will be watching what my Republican colleagues do.

Another argument I have heard from the other side is that it is not the Senate's job to go outside of the record established by the House impeachment probe. I would reply that it very much is the Senate's job. The Constitution gives the Senate the sole power to try impeachment cases, not review impeachment cases, not go over impeachment cases but the sole power to try them. It is not the Senate's job to put the House impeachment proceedings on a weeklong rerun on C–SPAN. Our job is to try the case, to hold a real, fair, and honest trial. That means examining the arguments. That means letting the prosecutors request witnesses and documents to make their case.

This is not just my view. It has been the view of every Senate facing impeachment trial in our history. Every single impeachment trial of a President has featured witnesses. Andrew Johnson's impeachment trial had 41 witnesses. Several of my Republican colleagues here today voted for witnesses in the Clinton trial. Except for one solitary case, every impeachment trial of any official, in the history of the Senate—and there have been a bunch—had witnesses.

A trial isn't a trial without evidence. A trial without all the facts is a farce. If the President is ultimately acquitted at the end of a sham trial, his acquittal will be meaningless. That is why the President himself should demand a full and fair trial.

President Trump, if you have nothing to hide, if you think the case is as flimsy as you say, call your Chief of Staff. Tell him to release the documents. Call Leader MCCONNELL and tell him what you already told the country; that you would ''love'' for your aides to testify in a Senate trial. President Trump, if you believe you have done nothing wrong, you have nothing to be afraid of from witnesses and documents. To the

contrary, if you are afraid of witnesses and documents, most Americans will believe you have something to hide and that you fear you have done something very, very wrong.

If my Republican colleagues believe the President has done nothing wrong, they should have nothing to fear from witnesses and documents. In fact, they should welcome them. What better way to prove to the American people that we are treating this matter with the gravity it requires. What better way to prove to their constituents that they are not just doing the President's bidding and not just making this a sham trial because of obeisance to the President of the United States.

If every Senate Republican votes to prevent witnesses and documents from coming before the Senate, if every Republican Senator votes for a rigged trial that hides the truth, the American people will see that the Republican Senate is part of a large and awful coverup.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

JAPAN TRADE DEAL

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I have come to the floor today to start this new year by really encouraging my friends on each side of the aisle to approach this coming legislative session with some optimism because there are some good things we can do.

We come to the floor and we hear about Iran and we hear about Soleimani. There are differences of opinion there. I am one of those. I represent a major military post, and I know that so many of our men and women in uniform said: You know what, this should have been done long ago. This is a known terrorist who has conducted terrorist attacks on six continents, even tried it here in the United States. They felt like the President was justified.

We hear about impeachment, and of course we know it has been widely reported that our friends across the aisle and over in the House started 3 years ago trying to find something they could impeach Donald Trump on—just something. It was going to be emoluments, or it was going to be collusion, or it was going to be coercion, or it was going to be Russia, or it was going to be bribery. There had to be something there because, you know what, they just don't like the guy. They don't like him. So they have been at it nonstop. They let that get in the way of some good things that people would like to get done.

For the next few minutes, I would like to encourage us to think beyond subpoenas and trial and negativity and witness statements and instead focus in on three things that are right in front of us: two successfully negotiated trade deals that will benefit farmers, manufacturers, and small business owners and producers not only in my State of Tennessee but across the entire country.

In the Volunteer State alone, we have 967 foreign-based businesses, and they have invested $37.3 billion in capital improvements, and currently they employ more than 147,000 Tennesseans. That is good for our State. Trade is important to us in Tennessee, insourcing these jobs.

Of particular importance to us is maintaining great trade relations with Japan. Do you know what is so amazing? We have so many people who didn't even know that the Japan trade agreement went into effect on January 1. The mainstream media was so busy focused on impeachment and other things that they didn't even realize this was a deal that will do a good job for us.

Our former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, who is a Tennessean, Ambassador Hagerty, had negotiated this before he left. This recently agreed-to Japan trade deal will support 40,000 jobs that are already provided by Japanese companies. The new deal will also solidify Tennessee's relationships with Japanese partners like Nissan North America, Toyota, Bridgestone, Nidec, and Denso Manufacturing—all with a presence in Tennessee and all employing Tennesseans.

It is going to create greater market access to Tennessee's agriculture products, specifically pork, cheese, and wine. It will eliminate or lower tariffs on 7.2 billion dollars' worth of U.S. exports, including beef, which will put Tennessee and American farmers on a level playing field with their competitors. That is a good thing for our agricultural community. I cannot overstate how big a win this is for Tennesseans and for Americans, and there is more on the horizon.

CHINA TRADE DEAL

Madam President, later this month, President Trump will solidify a trade deal with China that will eliminate or roll back the section 301 tariffs and provide some much needed protection for our patents and trademarks and copyrights that will allow innovators in our creative community, like our Tennessee songwriters, screenwriters, TV producers, and our actors, to enjoy the benefits of a free market. This has been a long time coming. There is a lot more to do.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Madam President, you may recall at the end of 2018—not 2019 but at the end of 2018—President Trump notified Congress that he would soon provide us with implementing legislation for the newly signed United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement. We call it the USMCA.

At that moment, at the end of 2018, our colleagues in the House were put on notice that this highly anticipated and desperately needed legislation was on its way. Get ready. It is coming to you. At that moment, the House majority leadership was presented with the opportunity to prioritize American workers over partisan politicking. What was their choice? Their choice was to choose partisan politicking and leave the American workers on the sideline, leave these auto manufacturing workers on the sideline while they focused in on partisan bickering. We all know what happened.

In 2019, petty revenge schemes took priority and trade relations with our closest allies were shoved aside to accommodate a yearslong campaign. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, for 3 years they have wanted to undo the 2016 election.

In May, instead of prioritizing the creation of nearly 176,000 jobs, House Democrats decided to spend their time drafting subpoenas. In June, instead of focusing on the 12 million jobs already depending on good trade relations with Canada and Mexico, House Democrats held four votes on these subpoenas.

It was the same story in July, in August, and in September. House Democrats pushed forward with their impeachment ambitions at all costs. They had to do it. They had made a promise that they were going to go get him. They neglected the owners of over 120,000 American small businesses that export goods throughout North America. They put themselves and their priorities before the needs of the American people.

Even as late as October, the Speaker of the House continued to stall, inventing excuse after excuse when it came to pushing the USMCA negotiations to the sidelines in favor of partisan attacks. Even Members of her own caucus sought to distance themselves from those attacks.

By the end of the year, the House majority's resolve to ignore their duty, finally began to splinter.

They struck a deal with the White House, but even then, the compromises they pushed for were barely, hardly worth wasting an entire year's worth of potential economic opportunity. There was a lot of opportunity cost to businesses to make way for House Democrats' partisan bickering.

We have brokered successful trade deals with Japan, with China—deals that America's farmers, manufacturers, producers, and small businesses have waited for, for a very long time. Now, after a year's worth of delays, excuses, and outright obstruction on the part of House Democrats, we are forced to ask those farmers and workers to wait just a little bit longer. It isn't fair, and it certainly is not what is best for our Nation's economy and certainly not what is best for Tennessee.

In the coming weeks, I encourage my colleagues to stay focused on policies that may not dominate the headlines but that are dominating the thoughts of Tennesseans from one end of the State to the other and certainly of Americans all across this country who are looking for trade opportunities and opportunities to grow their businesses in this robust and growing economy.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

IRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this morning, the Republican majority leader took to the floor and spoke at great length about the execution of General Soleimani. General Soleimani, who was the head of the military forces in Iran, was killed by a drone strike at the authorization of the President of the United States, Donald Trump.

Senator MCCONNELL, this morning, made a lengthy case about the background of General Soleimani. It is hard to argue with the facts he brought to the floor. In fact, I would concede and most would agree that General Soleimani, in his time, was an architect of terrorism and that, in the course of his career, there has been American blood on his hands. That is fact, but it wasn't a fact just discovered in the last few weeks. The Presidents of both political parties have known this about General Soleimani for a long period of time. They have had opportunities to end his life, yet they didn't seize those opportunities. Presidents of both parties decided it was prudent not to do it.

The question that has been raised now is why this President, at this moment, made the decision to execute the general. We know this general and his past activity have had an impact not only on the United States but on the Middle East and many other innocent people. The question that has been raised is, Why at this moment? Why did it make sense at this moment?

But for a few Members of the Senate, most of us have not had extensive briefings or an opportunity to ask questions of this administration about the timing of this critical decision. We will get our chance tomorrow. There is a classified briefing in which representatives at the highest level of this administration will come before us and explain why they believe the President's decision at that moment was the right thing to do for America. So many of those who come to the floor and defend the decision or criticize those who question that decision really have not had the benefit of a classified briefing, which will be offered to Members tomorrow.

I am going to withhold any comments about those elements, as much as I can possibly say publicly, until I get the chance to have more information. But this much I do know: Regardless of that decision on General Soleimani, we know for certain the Constitution of the United States empowers the American people, through their elected Representatives in the Senate and the House, to make the ultimate decision about whether the United States will go to war with Iran or any other country on Earth. We have learned, bitterly, that the ignorance or refusal of Congress to exercise that constitutional right can be disastrous.

Many of us have memories of the war in Vietnam, where 58,000 American lives were lost, 2 million Vietnamese were killed, and $170 billion—now, in today's terms, $1 trillion—was spent on a conflict that divided America and cost so many American lives. Congress did not exercise the authority given to it under the Constitution to make the initial decision about that war in Vietnam. Many times thereafter, people said: Why didn't you step up and make the decision before this costly mistake was made?

If there is to be a war with Iran, I join with Senator KAINE of Virginia in saying that the American people, once again, need to make this decision under the Constitution through Congress, article I, section 8, which provides, in clause 11, that only Congress has the power to declare war.

If we are going to proceed down a path to war with Iran, the American people have the right to know and the right to hear the fulsome debate. In the time I have served in the Senate, I have seen Presidents in the past who have come before the American people with flimsy evidence or even misleading evidence to justify military action. I know the bitter consequences of war. Even the best American troops are going to suffer casualties and deaths in the execution of a war.

Let us make certain that if we are going to move forward with hostilities against Iran, we do it under our constitutional requirement to have a fulsome debate before the American people and have an official declaration of war before we move forward. We owe the American people nothing less.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, secondly, I would like to address the issue of the impeachment trial, which the Senate majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, raised this morning.

Before I was elected to Congress, I made a living as a lawyer. I took many cases to trial. Few, if any, ever moved to a final decision without the introduction of evidence. The evidence, of course, consists of documentation, sometimes physical evidence, but often the testimony of people who were witnesses to events critical to a jury's final decision.

This impeachment trial should be nothing less. This is an opportunity for us—a rare opportunity in American history—to come forward and to demonstrate that we are going to handle a trial in the U.S. Senate in a professional manner. For the Senate majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, to announce that there will be no witnesses, there will be no evidence, there will be no documents in advance is to deny the very basis of a trial, as I understand it and as most Americans understand it.

If this President believes, as he has said so often, the charges in the impeachment articles do not rise to any serious or credible level, then, certainly, there is evidence that could prove his case. He will have his managers on the floor of the Senate when the articles are presented to us. They can certainly call witnesses. They can bring evidence before us. But so far, the record is not very strong for that to happen.

One of the Articles of Impeachment, the second one, relates to the President's refusal to cooperate with the investigation in the House, refusal to provide documentation and witnesses. For a President who is arguing that there is really nothing to these charges, he has refused to provide even the most basic evidence to prove his point, if it exists.

What we are saying on the Democratic side is that if there is to be a trial for impeachment in the U.S. Senate, common sense and the Constitution require that it be a fair trial with evidence for not only the Senators but the American people themselves to see. What we have asked for so far is limited in terms of what we are looking for: four witnesses and documents that can be clearly identified. Those are things I think should be part of this trial record so that regardless of the outcome of the trial, the American people will believe it was handled fairly, in a dispassionate and nonpartisan way.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Madam President, I have come to the floor many times to speak to the American people about an industry, the most heavily federally subsidized industry in America today. No, it is not a defense contractor. It has nothing to do with American agriculture. What I am speaking of are the for-profit colleges and universities of the United States. These colleges and universities, sadly, have written a notorious record when it comes to the treatment of their students. They have often cheated their students, luring them into signing up for expensive, often worthless college courses with false promises and inflated outcomes if they graduate.

At the end, the students are left with massive student debts, a diploma that is worthless, credits that can't be transferred to any other reputable college or university, and the prospects of a job that is almost impossible to find. In many cases, these sham operations actually go out of business in the middle of the student's education.

As an industry, for-profit colleges need to be remembered for two numbers—two numbers that tell the story of this industry. Nine percent of all postsecondary students go to for-profit colleges and universities in the United States. The University of Phoenix, DeVry—you have heard their names. They advertise quite widely. Nine percent of students are attracted to these for-profit colleges and universities. But 33 percent of all of the federal student loan defaults in the United States are by the students who chose to attend those colleges and universities.

What is going on here, with 9 percent of the students and 33 percent of the student loan defaults? The answer is obvious. The cost of education at for-profit colleges and universities is too

high. Students incur more debt than they would by attending community colleges, city colleges, or other universities and colleges that have good reputations.

Secondly, the education is substandard. You can advertise everything online about this great education. I can recall an ad that was on television in the Washington, DC, area a few years ago, and it showed a young woman—probably a teenager, not much beyond—in her pajamas, on her bed, saying: I am going to college on my laptop here.

Well, that kind of easy education, many times, is no education at all. At for-profit colleges and universities, too many students end up taking these expensive courses that are meaningless. It turns out that none of these courses can be transferred to some other school or university. When you take these courses and you spend your money and you spend your time and you end up with so-called college credits by for-profit colleges and universities, no one else will take them. No one else accepts them. They laugh at them. Then the students, if they can hang in there long enough with massive student debt, end up with a diploma that is a joke, a diploma that can't even lead to a job. That is what the for-profit colleges and universities are all about. Despite the fact that they have been pretty widespread across the United States, many of them have gone bankrupt.

What happens to you as a student if you have gone to one of these universities that has made all these promises to you along the way about taking college courses and how it is going to end up being an education that will lead to a job, and it turns out they were all lies, fraud, deceit, deception? You have the debt, right? You have the student debt, but you can't find a job. You went through 4, 5 years of these so-called courses at for-profit colleges and universities, and the only thing you have to show for it is a debt that is going to decide the rest of your life.

It is not just the for-profit college industry that is burdening and exploiting our students. I come to the floor this morning because, sadly, at this moment in time, an agency of our government is complicit. Secretary Betsy DeVos and the U.S. Department of Education have made a fateful decision for hundreds of thousands of American students that I have just described. Let me explain.

After a for-profit college defrauds a student—lies to the student—Federal law gives that student the right to have his or her Federal student loan discharged under a provision known as borrower defense. Follow me. I have gone to a school and incurred a debt. They lied to me about their courses leading to a certain degree or to a job. Now the college is going out of business, and I still have the debt, but, under American law, I am protected as a student.

The law says that if you were defrauded, you can use something called a borrower defense to discharge the student debt, wipe it clean, and get another chance at life. Congress has rightly decided with this law that we shouldn't leave students holding the bag when these schools should be held responsible.

Is that something most Americans agree with? Take a look at this New America poll. Americans agree that students should have their Federal student loan debt canceled if their college deceived them. For Republicans, 71 percent agree with that statement; Democrats, 87 percent. Seventy-eight percent of the American people say that if these colleges lied to them, the students shouldn't end up holding the bag. It is pretty obvious.

But sadly, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos is trying to make it difficult, if not impossible, for defrauded student borrowers to get the relief. Secretary DeVos has allowed a backlog of—listen to this—more than 223,000 claims of students with student debt who claimed they were defrauded by these colleges and universities. There are 223,000 queued up, waiting in line for the Department of Education to implement the law. For more than a year, she has also failed to approve one single claim of the 223,000 who say they were defrauded—not one. She couldn't help one student who was defrauded out of 223,000.

Now she wants to change the rules to make it impossible for future student borrowers to be relieved from their student debt when the schools have deceived them and defrauded them. She has put forward a new rule that places unreasonable burdens on student borrowers to seek and receive relief. Under this rule, the applicants looking for discharge of their student debt must prove that the school intentionally misled them. How is the student supposed to prove intention on the part of the school? Borrowers must also file a claim within 3 years of leaving the school, even though the conduct is often not discovered until many years later. The new rule also requires borrowers to apply individually instead of receiving automatic discharge when they are part of a group who has been harmed by similar widespread misconduct.

We have seen it before. Some of these names may ring a bell with you: Corinthian Colleges. They were all over the United States. They went bankrupt. It turned out they were defrauding students, saying: Go take these courses, and you can end up being qualified for these jobs.

It turned out it was a lie. After they went bankrupt, under the Obama administration, many of the students, as a group, were protected by this law, the borrower defense rule. Secretary DeVos says: Every student, you are on your own at this point. Lawyer up. You are going to have to prove your case as an individual.

This new rule requires borrowers to apply individually, instead of receiving this automatic discharge, which was the case under the Obama administration. With this new rule, Secretary DeVos is saying to borrowers: We are not on your side. You are on your own.

In addition, if a borrower's claim for relief is denied, they would not be allowed to appeal under Secretary DeVos's new rule. Even if more evidence of deception and misconduct is found.

This new rule also puts taxpayers on the hook for relief, shielding schools from being held directly accountable by students. The DeVos rule eliminated the current prohibition on institutions using class action restrictions and mandatory arbitrations as conditions of enrollment.

These practices, which you have seen over and over again by Corinthian and ITT Tech and others, require borrowers to sign away their rights when they go to school. Think about that. You are 19 years old, and you are starting your college education. You are going before one of these schools. They push in front of you that you have to sign up for $10,000 or $20,000 in tuition and sign the following contract. There you are, at age 19 without much life experience, being asked to sign up. Do you know what the fine print says? The fine print says that if I am lying to you, you can't go to court. Most students don't even understand that. They sign it because they are off to college, thinking, finally, here is our opportunity to be educated and have a life, a future. They don't know they are being deceived by these schools.

Secretary DeVos has said: Sorry students, you signed that paper when you were 19, and now you are stuck with it.

It is impossible for student borrowers to get relief under this new rule by Secretary DeVos. According to an analysis by the Institute of College Access & Success, the new Secretary DeVos rule will end up forgiving, at most, 3 percent of the loans associated with school misconduct. They will be able to recoup just 33 percent of that relief from the schools themselves, and taxpayers will foot the difference. The current rule is estimated to forgive 53 percent of loans associated with misconduct and recoup a greater percentage of the relief from schools. Secretary DeVos has loaded up the U.S. Department of Education with people who were in the for-profit college industry. These are folks who are devising rules good for their industry but not good for the American student borrowers. The bottom line is, the DeVos rule makes it harder for borrowers to receive relief, and the schools who commit the misconduct will pay for a lower portion of the relief that is given.

I introduced S.J. Res. 56 last September to overturn Secretary DeVos's borrower defense rule. Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada introduced a companion resolution in the House. Many organizations have endorsed my bill, including the Leadership Conference on

Civil and Human Rights, the AFL–CIO, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, Consumer Federation of America, Student Veterans of America, and the NAACP, but there is one most recently that I want to share with you because I think it is important that Members of the Senate of both political parties realize that we now have a major organization—a nonpartisan organization—that speaks for the veterans of America who have endorsed this effort.

I have in my hand a letter submitted to me by James Oxford, who goes by the nickname ''Bill,'' national commander of the American Legion of the United States of America, sent to me on December 18, 2019. He tells the story of veterans who were exploited by these for-profit colleges and universities. They ended up serving our country, earning their GI bill of rights, then losing their benefits to these schools—these worthless schools—and going further in debt to pay for their education.

Commander Oxford sent this letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 18, 2019.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the nearly 2 million members of The American Legion, I write to express our support for Joint Resolution 56, providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to, ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability.'' The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers of student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act. Affirming this position is American Legion Resolution No. 82: Preserve Veteran and Servicemember Rights to Gainful Employment and Borrower Defense Protections, adopted in our National Convention 2017.

Thousands of student veterans have been defrauded over the years—promised their credits would transfer when they wouldn't, given false or misleading job placement rates in marketing, promised one educational experience when they were recruited, but given something completely different. This type of deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors.

As veterans are aggressively targeted due to their service to our country, they must be afforded the right to group relief. The Department of Education's ''Borrower Defense'' rule eliminates this right, forcing veterans to individually prove their claim, share the specific type of financial harm they suffered, and prove the school knowingly made substantial misrepresentations. The preponderance of evidence required for this process is so onerous that the Department of Education itself estimated that only 3 percent of applicants would get relief.

Until every veteran's application for student loan forgiveness has been processed, we will continue to demand fair and timely decisions. The rule that the Department of Education has promulgated flagrantly denies defrauded veterans these dignities, and The American Legion calls on Congress to overturn this regulatory action.

Senator Durbin, The American Legion applauds your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's veterans and their families.

For God & Country,

JAMES W. ''BILL'' OXFORD,
National Commander, The American Legion.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me read one paragraph from Commander Oxford:

As veterans are aggressively targeted due to their service to our country, they must be afforded the right to group relief. The Department of Education's ''Borrower Defense'' rule eliminates this right, forcing veterans to individually prove their claim, share the specific type of financial harm they suffered, and prove the school knowingly made substantial misrepresentations. The preponderance of evidence required for this process is so onerous that the Department of Education itself estimated that only 3 percent of applicants would get relief.

Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, don't go waving that flag and tell everybody how much you love our veterans and ignore this letter. The leader of the largest veterans group in the United States of America—a nonpartisan group—told us these schools exploited veterans, and Secretary DeVos's new rule means that these veterans will never get relief. Ninety-seven percent will never get any relief.

In a matter of a few days—maybe weeks—I will be calling this matter to the floor. I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put the party labels outside, hang them up in the cloakroom, come on inside here, and stand up for students across America who did their best to get a college education and were deceived in the process, stand up for students who were loaded up with student debt, which could destroy their lives, and give them a fighting chance for a future by saying that Secretary DeVos's borrower defense rule is unfair to veterans, unfair to students, and unfair to American families.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing when the time comes and give these borrowers a second chance at being financially independent Americans who can contribute to their families and our national economic growth. For our veterans, please join me in making sure that Secretary DeVos's borrower defense rule is disapproved by both the House and the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Connecticut.

IRAN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, at a time of international turmoil and crisis like this, all of us, I think, are sometimes prone to hyperbole. I count myself as part of that club. I endeavor to do better.

It doesn't serve this body well to warn of bad decisions that could lead to war if we are only doing it to serve political ends or to bloody up a political opponent. Crying wolf also anesthetizes the public and risks dulling the country's senses at a moment when the peril is real. Anytime we are considering asking the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families to make further sacrifices for their country, we have to treat those moments with the gravity they deserve.

Let me state at the outset of my remarks that there are important reasons why I believe that both Iran and the United States do not want to enter into a conventional conflict that would likely involve the United States taking steps to remove the Supreme Leader from power and which would likely involve an invasion that would make Iraq in 2003 look like child's play.

The United States, of course, remembers the Iraq war—at least, I think we do. Our military leaders know that a short-term fight in Iran would be much bloodier and would be much more costly than the initial invasion of Iraq. Iran, for instance, has twice the population of Iraq. A long-term counterinsurgency in Iran would be endless, potentially costing hundreds of thousands of lives.

The Iranian leadership also knows that the United States might never defensively defeat a drawn-out insurgency on Iranian turf, but Iran's leaders also know they likely wouldn't be around to see that eventual conclusion because the United States would, at the very least, likely be successful in ending the existing regime.

So neither side is likely war-gaming for victory. Even those of us who are deeply critical of President Trump's Iran policy should acknowledge this, but as a student of history, I know that the annals of war are replete with cataclysmic conflicts that began not by choice but by accident, negligence, and incompetence.

So today, when I warn of the United States being on a potential path to war with Iran, that is my concern, that the utter lack of strategy, the complete absence of nuance, the abandoned communication and coordination with our allies, and the alarming deficiency of experienced counsel will end up getting thousands of Americans needlessly killed.

This is not the first warning of this kind I have presented. A year and a half ago, the President ignored the advice of his first Secretary of State and his first Secretary of Defense, and he unilaterally pulled the United States out of the Iran nuclear agreement, despite the fact that every expert agreed that Iran was in compliance. Then, to make things worse, President Trump enacted a series of devastating unilateral sanctions on Iran. No other nations joined with us. In fact, most of our allies actively and aggressively worked against us, trying to undermine and work around those sanctions in order to save the nuclear agreement. That fact, in and of itself, is simply extraordinary and a sign of how weak President Trump has made America abroad.

The sanctions still took a dramatic toll on Iran's economy, and like everybody predicted, the Iranian Government didn't sit still. They began to push back, attacking Saudi oil pipelines, capturing European oil tankers, and ratcheting up threats against U.S. forces in Iraq. During this time, the President changed his story every week. Some days he said he would sit down and negotiate with the Iranians without preconditions. Other days his top people said they wouldn't sit down unless Iran met an absurdly long list of preconditions. Other days, President Trump said he wanted to blast Iran off the map. It was a comedy of diplomatic errors, compounded nearly weekly with conflicting message after conflicting message that made it difficult for Iran to approach negotiations with us, even if they wanted to.

By this winter, the situation was spiraling out of control. Iranian-backed militias launched a rocket attack that killed a U.S. private contractor in Iraq. The United States responded by killing at least 24 Iraqi militia members. Then Iraqi militia, supported by Iran, stormed our Embassy, culminating, for now, in the drone strike that killed General Qasem Soleimani last week in Iraq. There is no reason things had to get to this point. When President Trump came into office, Iran had stopped their quest for nuclear weapons capabilities, and Iran was complying with an intrusive inspections regime that made sure they didn't cheat.

Iranian-backed militias had stopped firing rockets at U.S. personnel in Iraq. In fact, they were actually working on a U.S.-led project in Iraq—the eradication of ISIS.

President Obama had united the entire world against Iran. Even Russia and China were working side by side with the United States to constrict Iran's nuclear weapons program. And with the nuclear agreement secured, this global coalition was teed up and ready to be mobilized by President Trump to pressure Iran to make the next set of concessions on their ballistic missile program and their support for terrorist proxies across the region.

But Trump's bizarre and nonsensical Iran policy threw all that leverage away willingly, voluntarily. Despite the economic sanctions, Iran today is more powerful, is more menacing than ever before. Just weeks ago, Iran had been wracked by anti-government protests, but President Trump's recent actions have united the country against America and against our allies in one fell swoop. One only needs to look at yesterday, when millions of Iranians took to the streets for Soleimani's funeral—a mass outpouring of support that the Iranian regime could never have hoped to inspire on its own.

Compared to 3 years ago at the end of the Obama administration, today Iran is closer to restoring its proxy state in Syria, Iran is more influential in Yemen, Iran is more threatening to U.S. troops in Iraq and across the Middle East, and Iran is closer to a nuclear weapon.

The simple truth is that Iran is stronger and we are less safe today than when President Trump was inaugurated, but it gets, implausibly, even worse.

Because the strike on Soleimani is so destabilizing and so unstrategically provocative, the U.S. position in Iraq—where we are still battling ISIS—is unraveling. All U.S. civilians have been ordered to evacuate. All U.S. counter-ISIS operations have been suspended. NATO has stopped its ongoing efforts to fight ISIS. The Iraqi Parliament has begun the process of kicking out all U.S. forces from the country—exactly what Qasem Soleimani had worked for years to achieve.

All of that, on the back of Iran's newfound strength in the region, is the reason there is so much head-shaking happening right now about why President Trump has so willfully bungled Iran policy, emboldening Iranian hard-liners and putting our Nation's safety at risk.

With that for context, we come back to the crisis moment of today and the real possibility that more of President Trump's stumbling will lead us into a world-changing conflict with Iran.

We, the Senators, have seen no evidence that the assassination of Soleimani was necessary to prevent an imminent attack on the United States. I remain open to seeing that intelligence, but 5 days later, Congress has not received a briefing from the administration. We are apparently going to get that tomorrow. But both President Obama and President Bush had the ability to kill Soleimani. They didn't because their experts believed that executing the second most powerful political figure in Iran—no matter how evil he was, no matter how many American deaths he was responsible for—would end up getting more, not fewer, Americans killed.

We don't know in what form the reprisal from Iran will come or when, but it will come. And, listen, we shouldn't be afraid of reprisals in the wake of truly necessary military actions by the United States to protect our interests abroad. But when that attack arrives, President Trump has telegraphed that he is preparing to respond by committing war crimes against the Iranian people. He says he will bomb cultural sites, filled with civilian visitors, in retaliation. I can't believe this needs to be said on the floor of the U.S. Senate, but that is something terrorists do, not the United States.

Although this administration keeps saying they don't want war, there is no logic to their circular theory of Iran policy. Trump believes that to change Iran's behavior, we need to escalate our own actions. Then when our escalation begets more escalation from Tehran, Trump and his Iran hawks come to the conclusion that this must be due to the fact that our escalation wasn't serious enough. The theory becomes unprovable because the Iran hawks just contend, failure after failure, that we just need one more escalation and one more escalation and one more escalation. This is the exact behavior that could land us in a kinetic conflict with Iran that costs American lives.

As I said at the outset, this is likely not going to be a full-on conventional war—at least I hope it is not. It may be that Iran sends missiles into Israel or ramps up the temperature in Yemen. They may try to assassinate American military or political leaders or use cyber warfare to go after critical infrastructure. And maybe we don't invade Iran. Maybe we just blister their countryside with bombs or try to disable their military from above.

Of course, no matter the scope of the conflict, no matter how long this escalatory cycle lasts, the one thing we know is this: None of this has anything to do with making us safer. This cycle started with Trump's rejection of a diplomatic agreement with Iran that he didn't like just because it had Barack Obama's name on it.

A political grudge set off a series of events that now has us lodged in a crisis of harrowing scope, a crisis that this President—so unstable, so reckless, so capricious—likely cannot handle. Unfortunately, his rejection of diplomacy and lack of concern for our allies has left America more isolated than at any other perilous time in our history. At a moment when we cannot afford to be out on a limb, out on our own, we are.

Politics is part of what got us here, but maybe politics is part of how we get out of this mess. Congress can cut off funding for President Trump's war of choice with Iran. We can make clear, Republicans and Democrats, that the President cannot take military action without congressional consent. And of course the American people can have their say too. They can rise up, as they did in many cities this past weekend, and cry out in protest over President Trump's decision to put politics over our Nation's security. That public pressure may push allies of the President's here in the Senate to stand with Democrats in opposition to this reckless risk to our Nation's security. It is not too late to put a stop to this madness.

Iran is an adversary. I don't want anything I have said today to paper over all of that nation's misdeeds in the region. It is in our national interest to conduct a foreign policy that weakens Iran's ability to threaten us, our allies, and our interests. But for the last 3 years, President Trump has done exactly the opposite. Iran's nuclear program is back on. Iran has restarted attacks against the United States. Iran is more influential in the region. Everything the President has done has worked to degrade our Nation's safety and has worked to make Iran stronger.

The order to strike Soleimani has already been given, but what happens

next is not predetermined. My fear—my belief—is that last week's killing of Qasem Soleimani will end up fitting into this pattern. But we have serious choices to make in this body, and we can choose to get off this path of escalation and make decisions that correct this President's recklessness and keep America safe. I hope we step up to that challenge.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, Qasem Soleimani, the commander of the Quds Force, was killed by U.S. forces last week. That has already been well discussed and well understood. The failing regime in Iran has done everything it could, between his death and right now, to make the most of it, to make him a martyr to the cause of terrorism.

I think we should all understand that the cause of terrorism was his cause. He is not a general in any traditional sense of what that would mean. He has been described a number of different ways. He has been referred to as Iran's top general. Don't think for a minute that means anything like almost any other country's top general.

One newspaper called him Iran's ''most revered military leader.'' That might be true, but remember Iran's purpose as a State is to encourage terrorism all over the world.

I heard one news broadcast where he was referred to as ''an irreplaceable figurehead,'' though they went on to explain that he was a significant person. There apparently are no editors anymore because the term ''figurehead'' doesn't mean what they were suggesting. If they meant he was an irreplaceable figure, I hope that he is. I think he is hard to replace, and I hope he is hard to replace. I would like to think that in many ways he will not be able to be replaced, but that doesn't mean he deserves our sympathy, respect, or our grief.

He was, in fact, a bad person. He spent his career largely outside the boundaries of what any civilized nation would consider a military context. He led Iran's terrorism agenda around the world.

Iran funded and provided weapons to the Shia militias in Iraq. They provided arms depots and military forces to the Assad regime in Syria. They supported Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon. They provided advanced weapons to the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Hundreds of U.S. military personnel in Iraq were either killed or injured by the IED attacks encouraged and funded by Iran in Iraq. That is what the Soleimani agenda was all about.

Over this past year, Iran has continued its campaign of aggression against the United States and our allies. In almost every report of these activities, Soleimani was one of the persons mentioned as, again, structuring, masterminding, encouraging, or taking credit for these things as they happened in some cases and denying responsibility in others for activities for which he and Iran were responsible.

Last June, Iran shot down a U.S. intelligence drone flying in international space. In July, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps captured a British-flagged commercial vessel in the Strait of Hormuz. Iran was behind the attack on Saudi oilfields last September using drones and cruise missiles. Iran was been behind an earlier attack on a Saudi airport used by civilians. The Quds Force also launched a crackdown on Iranian citizens who protested oil prices and are vigorously seeking out others who are complaining about the failing economy in Iran's failing system.

Someone has already been named to replace Soleimani as the head of the Quds Force, but hopefully no one really can fully replace him.

I am not at all sympathetic to the idea that this action to eliminate this individual somehow came out of the blue. I think the President has been presented multiple times with this option as one of the things we could do if we wanted to send the clearest possible message to Iran. The President was criticized last year because when going down the list of things I mentioned, he was hesitant to act—until last week. The same exact critics in many cases decided, after a year of thinking what would be the best response, that when the President did act it was suddenly a hasty action. They went from calling his actions hesitant to calling this hasty, looking for a way to criticize the President.

The President took this action after an American contractor was killed by forces associated with Iran and Soleimani, after the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad was attacked and weapons were used to get into the building.

There have even been some suggestions that we shouldn't have done this because we should be afraid of how Iran will react. We do have to be thinking about how Iran would react. We need to be thinking about what their next aggressive act might be. It would not be their first aggressive act, and I have already gone down a pretty long list that others can expand upon of the aggressive acts Iran has done up until the last few days.

We do have to be thinking about what is an appropriate response, but maybe it is now time for Iran to be thinking about what our next response may be to their next aggression. The aggressive list is long, the response that the U.S. Government took was significant, but we can't fail to act decisively just because it might upset our terrorist enemies. We can't fail to act decisively just because it might upset the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism, Iraq.

Soleimani was not a high-ranking military official in any acceptable military structure. If your idea of a leading general is a general who leads in terrorist efforts, I think you have the wrong idea of what a military leader is supposed to do.

Soleimani was not a high-ranking government official in any job that a responsible government would have. Soleimani was the mastermind of terrorist activities of the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world today. Soleimani has been eliminated and hopefully will be impossible to fully replace.

I would say, in response to that decision, good job to the U.S. forces that executed the strike, and good job, Mr. President, in being willing to make the call. A bad person and a determined enemy of freedom and democracy in the United States of America has been eliminated. It is time for the Iranians to be thinking about what our next action might be instead of quietly and vigorously planning on what their next action might be.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, many of us here in the Senate thought we would be opening the new year with an impeachment trial, but that is not what is happening this week because the Senate is still waiting—waiting for Speaker PELOSI to actually send over the Articles of Impeachment.

Democrats rushed impeachment through the House, throwing fairness and due process to the winds in their haste to impeach the President, but now they are apparently content to just sit on the Articles of Impeachment for the foreseeable future. If Democrats really believe that this impeachment is a serious matter, that there is literally a crime spree in progress, as they have claimed, they would have already sent over the articles. The truth is, Democrats' impeachment efforts, which basically started before the President had even taken the oath of office, have been politically motivated from the start. Democrats thought they could damage the President politically by rushing to impeach him, and now they think they can damage the President politically by stalling a trial.

Speaker PELOSI is also attempting to force the Senate to conduct the trial she would like it to conduct in hopes of getting the outcome she would prefer—demonstrating once again the fundamentally political nature of the Democrats' impeachment quest. Here in the Senate, we will continue working on the business of governing until

the Speaker decides she is ready to stop playing games.

IRAN

Mr. President, on Friday, we learned that Iranian General Qasem Soleimani had been killed in a U.S. airstrike. Iran's terrorist activities throughout the Middle East are well known. Iran is a key backer of Hamas and Hezbollah and has fomented conflict throughout the entire Middle East—escalating sectarian conflict in Iraq, fueling civil war in Yemen, and supporting Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's brutal regime.

At the end of December, the Iran-backed militia Kataib Hezbollah, or KH, as they are called, fired more than 30 rockets at an Iraqi military base, killing an American contractor and wounding 4 U.S. troops. Days later, Iran-backed protesters stormed the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, conducting a 2-day siege of the Embassy before withdrawing—although not without setting fire to parts of the Embassy's exterior.

The list of Iranian terror activities is long, and at the center of all these activities has been General Qasem Soleimani. As head of the Quds Force of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, General Soleimani has been masterminding Iran's terrorist activities for two decades. Iran has been linked to one in six military deaths in Iraq, notably through the IEDs that have become so emblematic of the War on Terror. This was Soleimani's work. He is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and thousands of innocent civilians throughout the Middle East. It is a good thing that his reign of terror is over.

While I hope we can all agree that Soleimani was a just target, there are naturally questions about the timing of the strike and what options were laid before President Trump. The Senate will be briefed tomorrow, and I hope my colleagues and I will be given a clear intelligence picture of the imminent and significant threat Secretary of State Pompeo and other administration officials have described.

Soleimani's death provides Iran with an opportunity to change course and to rethink its participation in terrorist activities throughout the Middle East and its aggression against the United States. Unfortunately, Iran doesn't seem ready to take that opportunity, and there are rightfully concerns about how Iran might retaliate for Soleimani's death.

Iran has vowed severe revenge, but I hope Iran's leaders recognize that the United States will not tolerate Iran's aggressions. The United States is obviously closely monitoring any Iranian response or escalation, from attempted cyber attacks to threats against U.S. troops or citizens or our allies. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, has cautioned that there remains a significant risk, and we have seen the Department of Defense and the State Department adjust their postures accordingly.

As I said, with Soleimani's removal, Iran has the opportunity to change course. In both Iran and Iraq, we have seen protests bravely displaying the desire for a new way forward and, in the case of Iraq, for freedom from Iran's malign influence. The path to that new day is a difficult one. Soleimani's decades of work building terrorist networks will not easily be undone, and his replacement has already been named and has vowed revenge.

In addition, under pressure from Iran, Iraq's Parliament advanced a nonbinding resolution calling for the removal of U.S. troops from Iraq. I hope that cooler heads will prevail in Iraq and that we can come to an agreement that upholds our mutual security interests and is beneficial to both the United States and to the people of Iraq. We have invested a lot in regional security efforts that we should see through. As we know all too well from the rise of ISIS, the consequences of leaving a power vacuum can be dire. I hope that power vacuum will not be resurrected as the United States suspends counter-ISIS operations in order to defend our installations.

The world may enjoy a degree of closure with the killing of Qasem Soleimani. Citizens of the Middle East who suffered at the hand of Soleimani's terror may have hope for a safer future, but this will require the Iranian regime to recognize the opportunity it now has to rid itself of Soleimani's agenda and chart a new course.

Iran's leadership knows full well the consequences of maintaining its vendetta against America, our allies, and those who seek to live in peace and freedom. It got a preview of our military and intelligence capabilities last week. This is not a call for escalation but a frank acknowledgment that the United States will stand resolutely against those who threaten American lives.

While the initial reaction from Iran has not been promising, I hope General Soleimani's death will encourage Iran to think carefully before it proceeds any further on its path of terror. I look forward to talking with the Defense Secretary, the CIA Director, and others tomorrow about what we need to do to minimize the threat of retaliation and to keep Americans and our allies safe.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF JOVITA CARRANZA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am very happy that our first votes, not only of the session but of this decade, are going to be focused on supporting small businesses.

In America, we tend to speak about businesses with a sense of reverence that I think is absent in other countries, and there is good reason for that. So many of the great companies in this Nation started out as small businesses, and some of the greatest companies in America today are small businesses. We also have just under 60 million individuals who are employed by over 30 million small businesses throughout the country.

The Small Business Administration can play a very important role in our success and in the success of these businesses by providing entrepreneurs and firms with technical assistance and access to capital, so it is critically important for the country.

Today, as we consider the nomination of Jovita Carranza to serve as the SBA Administrator, I thought it was an important point to make. There are some additional points I would like to make.

First of all, the position of Administrator is really crucial to ensuring that the agency is functioning well and is successful. It is also important that the Administrator be someone who is open to and supportive of the need to modernize the Small Business Administration and its many programs.

As we move into this new decade, it is really important that the agency evolve to meet the unique and special needs of the entrepreneurs of today at a time in which we have ever-changing and increasing global and business climate adjustments that are occurring.

I think we sometimes forget that businesses today face a very different environment than we saw 10, 20, or 30 years ago. So as we are aware of these changes, it is important that, as policymakers, we have an obligation to identify the goals that achieve our national interests and that provide for our national defense, that create good jobs for American workers, and then that organize the laws that we propose and the reforms that we propose around those important items of national interest and how to achieve furthering them.

The last time the Small Business Administration was fully reauthorized was 20 years ago, in the year 2000, when just 42 percent of households, for example, had internet access. Nearly everyone was still using dial-up phones for access. It would be another 6 years before the iPhone even existed. Back in 2000, Americans bought fewer than 10,000 hybrid electric cars. From 2000 to 2020, those are the changes we have undergone, and that was the last time the SBA was reauthorized.

By the way, it also happens to be the year when China became a member of the World Trade Organization. I say that because, today, American small businesses—if you think our big businesses face unfair competition, imagine the unprecedented threat in competing against the Chinese Government and its Communist Party's systematic industrial espionage and coercion, its large-scale subsidies for their own industries, and its sweeping obstruction of market access to its own country.

The challenges are extraordinary, and they require resources that allow our small business sector to compete against these conditions and to operate dynamically, to grow, to be innovative, and to be creative.

Small businesses need access to services and programs that better position them to support not just our Nation's competitiveness on an international scale but particularly with regard to Beijing's continued economic aggression toward our Nation.

Just as the SBA was critical in building the technologies and helping to spur the creation of the technologies that allowed us to be successful both in the space race and, ultimately, in the Cold War, I believe the SBA can play an important role in our efforts to compete with Chinese economic hostility.

In that regard, it is important to note that the status quo is just not enough. We need an agency that incorporates new and creative programs, that focuses on spurring investment, supporting advanced manufacturing, promoting innovation, and expanding our export opportunities.

It is important to note, as I said earlier with regard to the SBA's role during the space race and the Cold War, that innovation breakthroughs we have often seen in our history have often been contingent on private-public collaboration, especially in the space program that also happens to have a commercial obligation and also furthers our national security.

Small businesses and startups have historically always been essential to developing the technologies and the commercialization of products that often come out of those partnerships. But unlike what we have seen in Silicon Valley—startups that venture capital firms tend to gravitate toward over there—these technologies—the ones that are in our national interests, which I just spoke about—require significant time and resources to finance.

So on the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, we are going to continue to work toward a comprehensive reauthorization of the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act to achieve these ends that I have just outlined. But the leadership and the guidance of a forward-thinking SBA Administrator is going to be essential, not just to get it passed but to make sure that modernization works.

As the chairman of the committee, I am very eager to see the position of Administrator be filled. President Trump nominated Ms. Carranza to serve in this critical role back in August of last year. She has a long and successful career, having spent many years in both the private sector and government service.

She started her service at UPS. After 29 years, she retired from there as vice president of air operations. Then she was nominated by President George W. Bush and was confirmed by this body—the Senate—to serve as SBA's Deputy Administrator back in 2006. She served there for 2 years and then went back into the private sector until returning in June of 2017, when President Trump named her Treasurer of the United States.

Last month, the Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee held a hearing to consider this nomination, and we voted favorably to report her nomination to the Senate floor.

In that hearing, Ms. Carranza made a commitment to work with Congress—to work with each of us—on the pressing issues that are facing the SBA and the program. She assured us—myself, ranking member, Senator CARDIN, and other members of the committee—that she would address the management challenges in the Office of Investment and Innovation to ensure the integrity of its programs but, most importantly, that she would appear before the committee after her confirmation to provide an update on how she is addressing these challenges.

She has committed to do other things that are important: to assess the far-reaching rule governing the agency's critical access to capital programs so that it is not restricting access to capital for small businesses; to be communicative and transparent with us on the subsidy models and calculations they are using for the Federal credit programs; to fill the backlog of staff that is needed to properly run the SBA's innovation programs; to ensure that Federal grant dollars are being properly used—the dollars especially associated with the entrepreneurial development programs to modernize the agency's disaster loan programs; and to establish better controls to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. She committed to expeditiously establish a women-owned small business certification program and to provide responses to Congress on several of our past communications to the agency outlining proposals to aid small businesses against cyber threats, which is a critical threat facing many of the small businesses in this country today.

In the business meeting we had after the hearing, we considered her nomination. I was pleased to see that the overwhelming majority of our members on both sides of the aisle, including the ranking member, supported sending the nomination to the full Senate because there is a lot of work to be done. Restoring and expanding the SBA's historic legacy of assisting businesses and meeting the international challenges at hand are very important and very crucial.

I look forward to working with Ms. Carranza to modernize our existing programs to meet the challenges we have before us and working toward solutions that ensure that small businesses have access to the resources they need to start, to grow, and to empower our Nation at large.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this nomination when we have a vote in a few minutes.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON CARRANZA NOMINATION

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Carranza nomination?

Mr. ROBERTS. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Feinstein	Peters	
Fischer	Portman	

NAYS—5

Gillibrand	Markey	Wyden
Harris	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Klobuchar	Warren
Booker	Perdue	
Cardin	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.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:12 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, before Congress adjourned for the holidays, our colleagues in the House of Representatives carried out their sole priority for 2019, which was to impeach President Trump. That was their No. 1 objective in 2019. While it is no secret that this is something they have been dreaming of since the day President Trump was inaugurated on January 20, 2017, it certainly took our colleagues in the House on a roller coaster ride and the country as well. I liken it, really, not to a roller coaster ride, but to a three-ring circus. It did not reflect particularly well on their body or on the seriousness of the process.

From March of last year, here is an important quote to remember. Speaker PELOSI cast a lot of doubt that an impeachment vote would even happen. This is from March 2019. She said:

> Impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there's something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path, because it divides the country. And he's just not worth it.

That is what Speaker PELOSI said in March of 2019.

As we have seen, it was only a matter of time before the radical Members of her caucus forced Speaker PELOSI's hand and sent the House down a partisan impeachment rabbit hole. That is where they ended up. House Democrats dove head first into—as something our majority leader has said here in the Senate—the most rushed, least fair, and least thorough impeachment inquiry in American history. We have only been through this three times before in American history. This is an extraordinary undertaking under our Constitution, to seek to impeach and remove a President less than a year before the upcoming election over something that does not even allege any crime but rather a disagreement with the way the President has conducted foreign policy, which is his role under our Constitution.

For as long as Democrats have been dreaming about this moment, you would think they would be well prepared for a thorough investigation and a presentation of their case to the Senate. Well, as it turns out, that is not even close. They moved through closed door depositions, public hearings, and a vote at an alarming pace, all to ensure that they could wrap up the process by the end of the year. Before the clock struck midnight, they managed to get it done.

Despite Speaker PELOSI's insistence less than a year ago that impeachment should be a bipartisan process, the House passed Articles of Impeachment with votes from just one party, which is the definition of partisan, not bipartisan.

In spite of the partisanship that has ensnared this process in the House of Representatives, we in the Senate have vowed to follow the framework set by the only modern precedent for an impeachment trial in the Senate, and that is of President Bill Clinton. In 1999, all 100 Senators, including both the current majority and minority leaders, voted in support of a pretrial resolution that laid the foundation for the trial ahead—this was in fairness to all concerned—so that the Senate could know how this would proceed and what they would be called upon to do.

Back in 1999, all 100 Senators decided to begin with opening arguments, to move to Senators' questions, and then to vote on a motion to dismiss. This would provide an opportunity to hear the case presented by the parties before the decision was made whether to hear from additional witnesses. I might add that I believe the House heard from 17 different witnesses.

All of the testimony certainly could be presented by the impeachment managers in the Senate. Sometimes, I hear people talking about whether we are going to have any witnesses or not. Well, of course, but witnesses come in different shapes, sizes, and form. There could be a live witness. There could be a witness's sworn testimony presented in a hearing or at a deposition outside of the Chamber and excerpts are read into evidence in the impeachment trial. This is not a question of whether we are going to have any witnesses or no witnesses. This is going to be a question of whether we are going to allow the impeachment managers from the House and the President's lawyers to try their own case. In an ordinary civil or criminal case, you don't have the jury trying the case for the prosecution or the defense or for the plaintiff or the defendant. The role of the jury is to sit and listen and then to decide after the evidence is presented.

Well, when the time came to vote on the motion to dismiss, during the Clinton trial, every single one of our Democratic colleagues who were here in 1999 voted to dismiss the charges—every single one. That was the Clinton trial in 1999. Then, when Members voted on whether or not to hear additional witnesses, every single one of our Democratic colleague who were here in 1999 voted no—no additional witnesses. Everyone voted no. That includes our friend the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, who said on the Senate floor yesterday that everyone who is opposed to additional witnesses is participating in a coverup. Talk about a change of heart. You know that is the danger here in the Senate. If you have been here long enough, you can find yourself on the opposite side of almost any question that could come up. Certainly, Senator SCHUMER has found himself, first, saying in President Clinton's case no additional witnesses and, now, in the case of President Trump, he has changed the standard and says, if you don't vote for additional witnesses, you are somehow engaged in a coverup.

Well, I think people are smart enough to understand what that represents. It represents not only a change of heart, but it represents hypocrisy and a double standard.

When President Clinton was on trial, Democrats had zero interest in hearing from additional witnesses beyond that presented by the impeachment managers and the President's lawyers or spending more time on the trial. The way they saw it, all the information had been presented, and so they voted to throw the charges out. Now, I am not faulting them for that, per se. All 100 members agreed to the process that gave them the opportunity to make that vote, and they had every right to do so. Now that a Republican President is on trial, instead of a Democrat, our Democratic colleagues say the same process is not good enough. In other words, what was good enough for President Clinton is not good enough, in their opinion, for President Trump.

Instead of following the exact same framework used in the Clinton impeachment trial, they want to set the rules for the entire trial before we have even had a chance to hear the opening arguments. Here, again, I realize we have a lot of type-A personalities here—people who like to take charge—but that is not the role of the Senate during an impeachment trial. We are here to listen to the case presented by the impeachment managers from the House and the President's own lawyers, not to try to take over the process. In fact, the hardest thing a Senator is going to have to do during this impeachment trial is to sit and be quiet and let the parties present their case.

Well, our Democratic colleagues are even going so far as requesting specific

witness lists even before NANCY PELOSI has sent the Articles of Impeachment over. They obviously are having buyer's remorse about voting out Articles of Impeachment now and essentially admitting that the evidence is so flimsy that it needs to be bolstered by additional witnesses here in the Senate. Well, I am sure it comes as no surprise that Senate Republicans are not on board with this partisan approach to impeachment.

As you can imagine, NANCY PELOSI isn't happy that the power to make this decision is in the Senate's hands. One thing I have learned here in the Senate and in the Congress is that the Senate and the House are pretty jealous about the prerogatives of their body to be able to make decisions for themselves. The last thing the House ordinarily wants to do is have the Senate tell them what to do. Certainly, the opposite is true. The last thing the Senate wants to do is to have the House try to direct how the impeachment trial is conducted here in the Senate. Well, that is not the way it works, and that is not going to happen.

The Speaker has pulled the emergency brake on this rushed impeachment process and is refusing to send the Articles of Impeachment over here to the Senate because she doesn't think the framework used in the Clinton trial is good enough. She is now trying to use her role as Speaker of the House—admittedly, a very powerful position in our Congress—to try to make the rules of the Senate. She wants to set the parameters for what the Senate's trial will look like, which is not in her job description. I know it is a terrible revelation, but it is beyond her authority, beyond her power, and it ain't going to happen.

The way I see it, this dogged determination to interfere in the Senate process isn't because the framework we are planning to use is unfair or partisan. Obviously, all the Democrats who were here during the Clinton trial agreed to a similar process then, and now they want to change the rules for President Trump.

Speaker PELOSI also wants the Senate to do the work that Members of her caucus were either too rushed or too lazy to do for themselves. Ordinarily, if the charges are going to be brought, let's say, in a criminal case, there would be an indictment, and then the case would be presented. It would rise or fall based on the presentation of the prosecutors.

Well, here, I think the analogy is apt that it is the responsibility of the House to prove the Articles of Impeachment that they have charged. It is their responsibility, not ours. We are supposed to be the jury.

Speaker PELOSI knows, as we do, that the House did not do a good job in investigating the facts, and she thinks the Senate should mop up after the House created the mess that they did. That is not going to happen.

The House had ample opportunity and time to look at all the facts. The problem the House has is that the facts they have discovered and alleged simply don't represent a high crime and misdemeanor, much less bribery or treason, which are the constitutional standards for an impeachment. What they have is a disagreement on the manner in which foreign policy was conducted with a President whom they hate. That is the reason they have impeached President Trump. It is not because of any bribery, treason, or high crimes and misdemeanors. As a matter of fact, they don't even charge a crime. What they do is charge obstruction of Congress.

Here is what happened. ADAM SCHIFF, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, issued subpoenas to certain witnesses. The White House said: Hey, wait a minute. We believe we have a valid claim of executive privilege. Ordinarily, that would then go to a court, and the court would say yes or no or cut the baby in half.

But when the witnesses said we need to go to court for direction, ADAM SCHIFF dropped them like a hot potato and didn't even bother to call the witnesses or go to court to pursue the testimony he said was important. Now, that is on him. That is not on President Trump. To claim that their own mismanagement of the impeachment inquiry is grounds to impeach the President for obstruction of Congress would be laughable if it weren't so serious.

At their own volition, they rushed through the impeachment inquiry with reckless abandon, and it is not the Senate's job to reopen and redo their inglorious investigation.

The Senate's role, as I said, is to take the evidence compiled by the House and presented by the impeachment managers and conduct a trial based on the evidence that they present, not to somehow initiate a new investigation before we have even heard from the impeachment managers from the House, or to somehow say: Well, we are going to essentially become the impeachment managers ourselves, a role that the Constitution gives to the House and not to the Senate.

The Senate's role is to listen and to decide, not to try to hijack the process and to try to do something for the House that they have been unable to do themselves. Once the Speaker transmits the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate, the House's role as a body is done, and they speak and act through the impeachment managers, who will be presenting the case on behalf of the House.

When the Speaker decides to send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate, we will be prepared to do our job. And unlike the House, we will do so in a serious and deliberative fashion and perform our constitutional duties under the Constitution and the rules of the Senate with regard to impeachment trials.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, for over 3 years now, everyday Americans, Members of this body, our diplomatic corps, and our allies and adversaries alike have wondered whether there is any sort of coherent strategy guiding the national security and foreign policy of President Donald Trump. If the events of recent days are any indication, the answer is a resounding no.

The Trump administration has no vision for how we might build a world that is more stable, peaceful, and prosperous for future generations. To be sure, the administration has some serious reports outlining global challenges and nicely drafted statements proclaiming their ''America First'' strategy. In practice, the President's erratic leadership and failure to invest in the very institutions we need to promote American national security have sowed chaos and increasingly left America alone. Our Nation has faced great challenges before. Yet, having served nearly three decades in Congress, I cannot recall a time when so many of them were of our own making and as predictable as they were avoidable.

Simply put, President Trump's foreign policy, like President Trump himself, is completely shortsighted, self-interested, and transactional.

The President's abandonment of our core values has already eroded America's standing abroad. Near the end of the last administration, the Gallup organization found that 48 percent of respondents in more than 100 countries worldwide had confidence in the United States. Today, it has gone from 48 percent to—it hovers around 31 percent. Furthermore, more people around the world likely trust—according to the poll—China or Russia rather than the United States.

I know that national security is not a popularity contest, but the erosion of America's standing in the world matters because it makes it less safe for Americans. It undermines our diplomacy. It hinders economic opportunity. It undercuts our ability to promote our values, betraying our centuries-long vision of our Nation as a city on a hill.

Our Nation was founded on noble ideals. It is those ideals more than our unrivaled economic strength and more than our unparalleled military might that have rallied the world to our side—from the defeat of fascism in Europe, to the rise of international institutions and security partnerships, and to the fall of the Berlin Wall and beyond.

President Trump has squandered this precious resource of our values—our ''soft power''—through actions that betray our ideals, abandon our allies, and appease our enemies. Far from America First, this administration is leaving America isolated, corrupted, and behind. We see it again and again—from Ukraine, to Syria, to Iran and beyond.

Consider Russia. Even as our intelligence community and bipartisan congressional reports point to ''incontrovertible'' proof of Russia's interference in our 2016 elections and plans to do so this year in 2020, to this day, the President's own fragile ego still prevents him from even acknowledging the threat, let alone standing up to continued Russian aggression.

Turn to North Korea. Two years ago, the President said that he had achieved a breakthrough and that we didn't have to worry about North Korea anymore and we could sleep well at home. Yet, despite all the made-for-TV moments, his poorly conceived and poorly executed effort has left North Korea a greater threat in 2020. Under President Trump's watch, North Korea has expanded its nuclear arsenal, successfully tested its first intercontinental ballistic missile, and conducted its most powerful nuclear testing. His administration has undercut our critical defensive alliance with South Korea and Japan and walked away from serious sanctions enforcement.

Nearby in China, the administration's efforts have failed to change China's actions in the South China Sea, resolve the structural issues at play in our trade relationship, or address its worsening human rights and governance behavior—from the crackdown in Hong Kong, to the oppression of the Uighurs, to China's growing economic and technological influence, used to spy and oppress.

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, a year ago, the President rightly denounced Maduro but misleadingly declared the success of his Venezuela policy. Today, the President sits silently as millions of Venezuelans fleeing a massive humanitarian crisis and the hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans already in the United States remain in desperate need of temporary protected status.

President Trump says he wants to confront the root causes of migration. He says he wants to combat drug trafficking and the opioid epidemic. Yet he has repeatedly weakened our counternarcotics, law enforcement, and development operations in the Northern Triangle and Mexico, while continuing to push for a border wall he promised the American people Mexico would pay for.

The administration's abhorrent treatment of asylum seekers—from separating children from their parents to placing people in cruel and inhuman conditions—has only further weakened America's moral standard. Likewise, President Trump's functional destruction of our Refugee Resettlement Program and the slashing of refugee admissions to the United States not only damage America's reputation as a beacon of hope for vulnerable people around the world but deprive us of the contributions refugees have always brought to our economy and our communities.

We also face immense challenges like climate change. Yet, even as our close ally Australia faces the most deadly conflagration, this administration continues to deny a threat that is already costing American taxpayers billions of dollars in the wake of increasingly severe storms, fires, and floods.

Withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement was a gross abdication of American leadership, one that has allowed China—yes, China—to position itself as the world leader on clean energy.

The Trump administration has also ceded ground at the United Nations to China and Russia. Recently, China beat us out for a leadership seat at the Food and Agriculture Organization, while Russia won out support for its cyber crime treaty.

While the administration may seek to explain away these losses on an individual basis, this is, in fact, the steady drip, drip, drip of the loss of American power and influence due to President Trump's abject mismanagement.

Turn now to Africa. At a time when our allies, as well as adversaries like Russia and China, are ramping up their engagement, the United States is pulling back. Indeed, Secretary Pompeo has visited Kansas on multiple occasions during his tenure, but he has yet to visit a single sub-Saharan country.

Likewise, we see a complete absence of diplomatic strategies for challenges across Africa, from preventing a return to conflict in South Sudan, to supporting the democratic transition in Ethiopia, to curbing terrorism in the Sahel. The recent tragic deaths of Americans in Kenya demonstrate a lack of progress in weakening terrorist organizations like al-Shabaab and Boko Haram.

Likewise, for a year, the administration failed to waive human trafficking sanctions so that USAID could adequately respond to the deadly Ebola epidemic in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

On human rights, the Trump administration's approach is, in one word, abysmal. The administration supported the Saudi-led campaign in Yemen amid credible reports of despicable war crimes. It stood silent on the killing of Washington Post reporter Jamal Khashoggi at MBS's direction. It has downplayed human rights and democratic backsliding in Honduras, Guatemala, the Philippines, Burma, Turkey, and beyond.

Likewise, the Trump administration has rolled back the rights of women and girls worldwide, from cutting off funding for lifesaving maternal care they falsely claim promotes abortions to reinstating the global gag rule. It has also set back the clock on equality and protection for LGBTQ citizens in international instruments at the U.N. and elsewhere.

I want to remind my colleagues why America must champion human rights—not just because it is right, although it certainly is right, but because democracy and respect for human freedom are the foundation of a safer, better world for the American people to thrive in.

As the President abdicates our leadership and undermines the institutions we worked decades to help build, we have witnessed attacks on some of America's closest friends. President Trump's verbal broadside against the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and South Korea, just to mention a few—the latter during the ongoing nuclear standoff with North Korea—are deeply regrettable and completely counterproductive. This is not how America leads the world; this is how America finds itself alone, isolated, and more vulnerable.

This administration has attacked the very idea of diplomacy. They proposed enormous cuts to the State Department's budget, removed senior diplomatic leaders with no replacements, and marginalized the State Department's input on key decisions.

Finally, nowhere in the world is President Trump's reckless foreign policy and total lack of strategy more painfully obvious than the Middle East.

Let me be clear: I do not shed a tear for Qasem Soleimani. As a commander of the IRGC Quds Force, he was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and supporting terrorism throughout the Middle East. Previous administrations kept tabs on Soleimani's whereabouts, both Republican and Democratic alike, but they always chose not to act against him because the decision was that the action against him—the value of that was of less value than the consequences of retaliation and long-term military action.

The President must come to Congress and present clear and compelling intelligence as to why this strike against Soleimani was absolutely necessary. What was the imminent threat Soleimani uniquely possessed? We need to know if the threats we face have materially changed.

In the wake of all of its misleading statements, we must make clear to the administration that the President by himself does not—does not—have the authority to launch a war against Iran.

Let me send the President a message. Attack on cultural sites are war crimes. They are war crimes. We observe international law not only because it is right but because then we can demand other countries to observe international law as well.

The consequences of President Trump's strike on Iranian Commander Qasem Soleimani are unfolding as we speak. Already, the Iraqi Parliament has called for an expulsion of American forces. Now there is confusion about what U.S. policy is. Are we keeping troops to fight ISIS? Are we going to start sanctions on Iraq? Confusion. Contradiction. Chaos. Amid such confusion, the one thing that has taken place for sure is that instead of our mission there to fight ISIS, we are now having to recalibrate to use that mission to protect our own forces there. What a reprieve ISIS gets.

Despite what the President may say, Iran is not a different country than it was 2 years ago. Iranian-backed protesters just stormed our Embassy. Previously, they were storming Iranian Embassies. The Iraqi people were storming Iranian Embassies because of Iran's influence in Iraq. Now they are out massively protesting against us.

A regime that continues to oppress its own people and its proxies now has a solidified populous behind it. Soleimani's legacy, ultimately, is that what he could not achieve in life, he may very well have achieved in death—pushing the United States out of Iraq.

It is no secret that I did not support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, but let's be clear: Today, Iran is closer to a nuclear breakout than when President Trump took office, and we have isolated ourselves from the international alliance that we have built to constrain Iran's ambitions.

Meanwhile, in Syria, the President's greenlight for Turkey's incursion has weakened American interest in the region, allowed Russia to grow its influence, and opened the door for ISIS to reconstitute.

By turning our backs on the Kurds, we signaled to the world that we will abandon our allies on the battlefield. And while the President promised to stop endless wars in the Middle East, over the weekend, thousands of military family members are unexpectedly saying goodbye as their loved ones receive orders to do just the opposite.

President Trump has not brought the American people a more peaceful, a more stable, and a more prosperous world. On the contrary, the President has brought us closer to war, closer to facing a nuclear-armed Iran, closer to facing an existential threat to Israel, and closer to witnessing a destabilizing arms race and greater conflict in the entire Middle East region, fueled by emboldened Iranian proxy forces.

A show of strength with no strategy in place is no show of strength at all.

President Trump spent the better part of 3 years on the golf course, eviscerating the clear lines between a President's responsibilities to the American people and his devotion to his own wallet. The President and his family continue to put their business interests over America's interests.

The President has flouted the Constitution's emoluments clause and shredded decades of ethical norms by refusing to divest himself from the Trump Organization. He and his family maintain unprecedented business interests in real estate projects in about 20 foreign countries that undoubtedly entangle him with foreign governments whenever local cooperation or financing is needed. It is clear that that creates a conflict that does not put the Nation's interests first.

He operates with no moral compass. Indeed, the President's pursuit of his own personal profit at the expense of America's national security interests in Ukraine led to his impeachment by the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to remember why America's conduct on the world stage matters, why our values matter, and why our leadership matters.

We strive to create a more peaceful and a more stable world so that we can protect the security of Americans at home, so that we can create greater prosperity and economic opportunity for our people, and, at the end of the day, avoid at all costs a need to send our sons and daughters to war.

Every President faces new threats that challenge our quest for this brighter future. We have worked hard to create institutions and provide resources to help every administration navigate this increasingly complex world. We pray that the moral character of every President provides them with the foresight and judgment necessary to protect American security and our strategic interests when it matters the most. Instead, President Trump has taken difficult security challenges and made them even harder to resolve. That is why Congress's role in shaping and advancing U.S. foreign policy has never mattered more. That is why I will continue to advance strategic legislation from Turkey to climate change, to new Ukraine support to conduct oversight, and to speak on behalf of the American people and the values and norms that define us and our place in this complicated world.

Here in the Senate, we have an obligation. We cannot cynically look the other way or be silent or enable that which we know to be wrong, risky, and morally reprehensible. History will not judge us kindly if we do. I, for one, will not stand idly by and be judged that way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today following the U.S. airstrike in Iraq, the airstrike that killed Iranian's terrorist mastermind.

I fully support President Trump's decision. As Commander in Chief, I believe he had an obligation to do what he did to act when American lives were at stake. With the death of Iran's General Soleimani, the American people and people around the world are much safer.

This general was an emboldened, blood-thirsty terrorist. He was a killer. He has the blood of countless people around the world on his hands.

In the last 2 months, we have seen 11 attacks—11 attacks—on U.S. forces and bases, including the killing of an American citizen.

He became bolder and more aggressive in both his actions and his ambitions, and he was stepping up his attacks on Americans. In fact, General Soleimani was at war with the United States his entire career, and it was a military career. He was the commander of Iran's terrorist network.

In recent months, we watched as he personally directed brazen attacks on our Embassy and our personnel in Iraq. We knew that more attacks were coming, so the United States took action.

Soleimani's death makes America safer in the long run. Taking out this war criminal will help us avoid war in the future.

Let me be clear: I don't want war with Iran. The United States does not want war with Iran, but we know that appeasement does not work. The Obama administration's strategy of wishful thinking failed.

Soleimani's terrorist network was made more powerful by U.S. money. The Obama administration gave billions and billions of U.S. dollars as part of that Iran nuclear deal. What did they do with the money? They used the money to support terrorists around the world. Without a doubt, appeasement brought only failure. It made Iran stronger, and it hurt the United States and our allies.

We know that the winning strategy is peace through strength. We knew it through Ronald Reagan, and we know it today. Already, U.S. sanctions on Iran have been crushing and crippling. We must continue President Trump's maximum-pressure campaign. Now Iran knows the United States means what it says. We are prepared for retaliations, should they come.

This past weekend, Joe Biden actually said that Iran is in the driver's seat. Iran is not in the driver's seat; Iran is in the center of the bull's-eye.

U.S. forces will respond. We will respond to any future attacks on Americans or Americans' safety, and we will do it swiftly and with a punishing response.

It will be a grave mistake for Iran to further escalate tensions. Instead, what Iran ought to do is dial down its aggressive nature and posture.

The facts are these: General Soleimani was a blood-thirty terrorist. He had the blood of innocent civilians on his hands, and he would have killed many more if given the chance.

This general spent his entire career at war with the United States. He was responsible for the deaths of American soldiers—hundreds of deaths with IEDs—and for the maiming of American soldiers with roadside bombs. Thousands of Americans have been permanently disabled because of him.

Thankfully, the general's 20-year reign of terror has now ended, and there is broad condemnation all around the world over the mass destruction and the death that he caused. It is now time for Iran to take a step back, away from nuclear weapons, away from terrorism, away from aggressions, and to come to the table. It is time for them to discuss peace.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the War Powers Resolution that I filed on Friday, January 3, with Senator DURBIN.

I spoke yesterday at some length about the painful history of relations between Iran and the United States and the escalating tensions in the last 3 years that have brought us to the brink of war. As we stand at the brink, with military actions by Iran and the United States causing battlefield casualties on the other side, I believe that it is imperative for Congress to reassert itself and make plain that no President should have the ability to take the Nation to war on his or her own.

Let me talk about the Constitution and about the value judgment underlying the allocation of war powers in the Constitution and then the resolution that is now pending, having been filed in the Senate.

First, on the Constitution, the Constitution as drafted in 1787 has a series of provisions. Some are somewhat vague. In the Bill of Rights, what is an unreasonable search? Some are extremely precise. You have to be 35 years old to be President. If you look at the Constitution, you can see a variety of provisions, some more specific and some a little more open-ended.

Actually, the war powers part of the Constitution—though not completely without ambiguity—is one of the clearest parts of the Constitution. In article I, the power to declare war is given to Congress, not to the President and not to the Judiciary—to Congress.

In article II, the President is declared to be the Commander in Chief of the military. If you read the constitutional debates at the time, what emerges is a fairly clear understanding by those who were at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia that was both clear but also quite unusual. The understanding was that for a war to start, Congress should vote for it to be initiated, but then, once started, the last thing you would need is 535 commanders in chief. So once Congress had voted to start a war, at that point the prosecution of the war becomes for the President and the military command, not to be micromanaged by 535 Members of Congress.

This was fairly clear, and it was very unusual. It was very unusual because at that point in history, in 1787, war and the declaration of war was not primarily legislative. It was for the executive. It was for the King, for the Monarch, for the Pope, for the Emperor, or for the Sultan. War had been, throughout history, an executive function, not a legislative function. But the Framers of the Constitution and the constitutional debates made plain that they were really trying to change human history, at least in so far as the United States went. Then, in this country, the initiation of war would be done by Congress.

Why was it done that way? Well, we have the virtue of a Virginian who was not only one of the drafters of the Constitution but who kept notes of the Constitutional Convention and then wrote letters about what they intended. Ten years after the Constitution was written in 1787, James Madison wrote a letter to Thomas Jefferson and directly addressed why it is that the power to declare war is something for Congress. He said this: ''The Constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it.'' For this reason, we have ''with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legislature.''

They recognized that Executives were prone to war, and they wanted the legislature to have to sign off on the initiation of war. It was unusual then, and it is unusual now that the initiation of war is to be left to the legislature. Why is that provision in the Constitution? Why would we want to leave the question about whether war should be started to Congress rather than let the President do it as would be the case in other nations? It is about a value judgment.

As important as the constitutional provision is, I would argue that what is more important is the value judgment that underlies this requirement of congressional authorization, and the value judgment is about the men and women who serve in our military. Any war runs the risk that the young men and women who serve in our military could lose their lives or could be injured or could see their friends lose their lives or be injured. When we send troops into war, they may suffer an injury—traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder—that will affect the entire remainder of their lives in dramatic ways. If we affect their lives in that way, we affect the lives of their families and friends.

The value judgment that sort of served as the pillar behind the provision that says Congress has to authorize war is this: If we are going to force young men and women to risk their lives, it should be based on a considered and open debate and a vote in full view of the American public. Then, there should be a vote about whether we are at war. If at the end of that debate—with the questions that get asked and the trading of perspectives—before the people's elected legislative branch, the legislature says that this is in the national interest and we should be at war, then, for those men and women who serve—yes, they are going to serve and risk their lives and risk their health and risk what might happen to them for the rest of their life—we will only ask them to do that if there is a considered judgment that war is in the national interest.

That is the value judgment that underlies the most unusual part of the Constitution, that war can't be started except by Congress. If we have that debate and vote, then, it is a fair request to ask that of people—like my boy in the Marines or the 1 million-plus people who serve in the military. It is a fair request to deploy them and have them risk their lives.

But how dare we order troops into harm's way, where they could risk their lives or health possibly for the rest of their life, if we in Congress are unwilling to have a debate and have a vote. Sadly, throughout the history of this country—and this is a completely nonpartisan statement—with Whigs and Federalists, Democrats and Republicans, and with different parties in control of the legislative bodies and different parties represented in the White House, Congress has managed to figure out a way to avoid debate and avoid voting if they can.

War votes are tough. I have had to cast two during the time I have been in the Senate as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I have cast thousands of votes in my life as a city council member and as a Senator. I will tell you that a war vote is categorically different than any other vote you will ever cast. They are hard. They can be unpopular. There are going to be bad consequences of a war vote. There may be an understandable human tradition in Congress to try to avoid it, but it is a responsibility that cannot be avoided. How can we order people to risk their lives when we are unwilling to risk the political challenges of a vote on war? That is the constitutional history. That is why the article I branch—the first among equals—is charged with the responsibility of initiating war, and that is the value judgment that underlies that constitutional provision.

What does our resolution do? Our resolution is filed pursuant to the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act was passed at the tail end of the Vietnam war. Senator DURBIN did a good job yesterday of sort of going into the history of the passage of the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act was trying to do two things. In the aftermath of the Vietnam war, they were analyzing what had gone wrong during it. There were a number of points along the way where the President did not keep Congress informed. There was a bombing campaign that started in Laos, for example, during the Vietnam war, about which Congress wasn't informed, and there were activities in Cambodia about which Congress wasn't informed.

Then, the second thing we were trying to do was not just to require Presidents to inform Congress but also to give Congress the ability to have a debate and have a vote on the floor in case the President started hostilities without coming to Congress. The President should keep Congress informed and not hide the ball from Congress, and Congress needs a procedure to stop a war that is initiated by a President who doesn't come to Congress.

Here is the procedure under which we have filed our resolution. If a President

puts U.S. troops into hostilities without a congressional authorization—even if the President claims a legal right to do so—self-defense, article II power—but if the President puts U.S. troops into hostilities without a congressional authorization, any Member of Congress can file a resolution to remove the U.S. troops from hostilities and force a vote on that resolution within a prompt period of time. That is the resolution Senator DURBIN and I filed last Friday.

President Trump has engaged the United States in hostilities with Iran. People have different points of view about whether that is a good thing or bad thing, but now that there are battlefield casualties on both the U.S. and Iranian sides, it is clear that this provision of the statute has been met. We are engaged in hostilities with Iran. Not only are the United States and Iran engaged in hostilities that have inflicted casualties on the other side, but the President is essentially acknowledging that we are in hostilities because he is sending War Powers notices to Congress—one in November and one last Saturday—reporting on his actions and saying that the reports are consistent with the War Powers Act. He recognizes that hostilities are underway.

The current hostilities are not pursuant to a previously passed congressional authorization. The 2001 authorization for use of military force authorized military action against the perpetrators of the 9/11 attack. Iran was not a perpetrator of the 9/11 attack, and there is no argument that they are covered by that authorization. There was a separate authorization passed by Congress in 2002. That is the most recent one that has been passed. It authorized action to topple the Iraqi Government of Saddam Hussein. That government is long gone, and that authorization does not permit attacks on Iran or on the current Iraqi leadership, such as the individuals who were killed in the two sets of U.S. strikes. With these two threshold questions met, hostilities are underway as defined by the War Powers Act, and they are not subject to a previous congressional authorization.

We have now filed a resolution to get Congress to reassert its constitutional role. The resolution demands that U.S. forces be withdrawn from hostilities against Iran unless Congress affirmatively passes a declaration of war or authorization, or the United States needs to defend itself from an imminent attack.

If my resolution passes, Congress would still have the ability to pass an authorization, if it chose to, and the United States would still be able to defend itself against imminent attack, but the President could not act on his own to start a war with Iran except in those circumstances.

The resolution does not require that U.S. troops withdraw from the region. We are doing many things in the region. Thousands of Americans are there partaking in missions that increase the security of the United States and our allies. There is no requirement that we withdraw from the region. These missions include security cooperation with partner forces, fighting against elements of al-Qaida, ISIS, and the Taliban, and ensuring the safe passage of commercial vehicles through freedom of navigation operations. All those activities that are being conducted by the United States in the region can continue.

The resolution does not hold those forces into question or question their mission.

The only thing the resolution would accomplish, if passed, is to back the U.S. troops away from engagement and hostilities with Iran unless for imminent defense or pursuant to a separate authorization.

I would hope to have the support of all my colleagues on this resolution. Its passage would preserve the option of U.S. military action for self-defense. It would preserve the ability of Congress to declare war or pass a war authorization. It would only prohibit this President or any President from taking us to war on his own.

I heard one colleague say: ''The last thing America needs is 535 Commanders in Chief.'' I completely agree. Once Congress authorizes a war, it should be up to the Commander and the military leadership to wage that war and make the tactical decisions about how to fight it, but the question of whether we should be at war at all is one that is specifically left to Congress.

Let me finish by again focusing on our troops. So many members of the military were home for the holidays, enjoying time with their families, and then received surprise notices that they must redeploy to the Middle East yet again.

Imagine the cost of two decades of war on these troops and their families. Some of these folks have deployed over and over and over again. Imagine being at home at Christmas and receiving the notice you have to deploy yet again to the Middle East.

We are living in a challenging time. Many Americans know nothing but permanent war. We have been at war since 2001. There are Americans, including Americans in the military, that that has been their whole life. That is all they know. Yet, at the same time, many Americans know nothing about war. Because we have an all-volunteer service, many American families are completely untouched by the war. Only 1 percent of our adult population serves in the military.

We have an interesting dynamic that may be sort of unique to our history, whether we have been at war for 20 years and some only know permanent war, while many other American families know nothing about war because members of their families don't serve in the military.

We put war on a footing where it can go on forever, sort of like on ''Executive autopilot'' by Presidential order, and Congress, in my view—and, again, this is bipartisan—has hidden from its responsibilities.

At this moment of very grave danger, where both Americans and Iranians are losing their lives in hostilities, it is time for Congress to shoulder the burden of making the most important decision we will ever face. That is why I intend to bring this resolution to the floor of the Senate and ask my colleagues to debate and vote on it in the coming weeks.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. 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—S. CON. RES. 32

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, Members of the Senate, I rise first to express my grave concern over President Trump's recent actions and words that have brought us to the brink of an unauthorized war with Iran.

Today I am introducing a resolution with Senator WARREN and Senators LEAHY and REED and BOOKER and WYDEN because, on Saturday, President Trump tweeted that his administration is targeting 52 sites, some of which are cultural sites treasured by the Iranian people.

My resolution is very simple. It says that attacks on cultural sites in Iran are war crimes. It is as straightforward as that.

The President would compound the mistake he has made and turn it into something that could be catastrophic for that region, for our country, for the world.

President Trump's repeated threats to add Iranian cultural sites to his military target list is a betrayal of American values. It is wrong. It is a needless escalation which ignores international law and the Defense Department's own policies. Attacking cultural sites is a violation of international law.

Article 53 of protocol 1 to the Geneva Conventions prohibits any act of hostility against cultural objects, including making cultural sites the target of reprisals.

The 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which has been ratified by this body, also prohibits the attack or destruction of cultural sites.

Attacking cultural sites would also violate the Defense Department's own policies. The Department of Defense Law of War Manual states that cultural property, the areas immediately

surrounding it, and appliances in use for its protection should be safeguarded and respected.

The fact that President Trump's threatened attacks of cultural sites in Iran violate international law and Department of Defense policies may be why, yesterday, Defense Secretary Mark Esper appeared forced to contradict the President.

When asked if cultural sites would be targeted as the President had suggested over the weekend, Secretary Esper stated that the United States ''follow[s] the laws of armed conflict.''

Well, the U.S. Senate then should speak clearly with one voice to tell President Trump it does not condone attacks on cultural sites in Iran. Given Secretary Esper's comments yesterday, I cannot see why my friends on the other side of the aisle would not support this resolution to make that statement very clear and to make it now before Iran potentially retaliates against us, and the President begins to select the targets inside of Iran.

Attacking cultural sites is what ISIS does. It is what al-Qaida does. It is what the world's most heinous terrorists do. There is no excuse for the President to threaten war crimes by intentionally targeting the cultural sites of another country. This is not who we are. We are the United States of America. We are better than this. We actually fight against this. We condemn ISIS. We condemn others who destroy the culturally sacred objects in other countries.

Just a few years ago, in 2017, the Trump administration itself opposed and condemned the unlawful destruction of cultural heritage at the hands of ISIS. As a top U.S. official to the United Nations, U.S. Deputy Permanent Representative to the U.N. Michele Sison said on the President's behalf:

> The unlawful destruction or trafficking of cultural heritage is deplorable. We unequivocally oppose it and we will take all feasible steps to halt, limit, and to discourage it.

Now the President himself is threatening to engage in exactly these sorts of illegal and reprehensible attacks on Iran.

The United States had a choice to make during World War II because our military kept putting Japan's ancient capital Kyoto back on the target list for the atomic bomb. Kyoto is home to more than 2,000 Buddhist temples, Shinto shrines, including 17 world heritage sites.

It was Secretary of War Henry Stimson who went directly to President Truman to argue that Kyoto should be removed because ''the bitterness which would be caused by such a wanton act might make it impossible during the long post-war period to reconcile the Japanese to us.''

So if we want any ultimate reconciliation with Iran, we cannot allow Donald Trump to order the destruction of the cultural history of Iran so that reconciliation may never be possible. Imagine the outcry the American people would have if our symbols of cultural heritage were destroyed—the Statue of Liberty destroyed; Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were drafted, destroyed; the memorials along the National Mall destroyed. These places house and embody our collective history and the culture of the United States of America.

The assassination of General Soleimani was a massive, deliberate, and dangerous escalation of conflict with Iran. What conditions prompt us to go to war? The U.S. Constitution and the War Powers Act leave little ambiguity. The Congress, not the President, has the power to make or authorize the war. The Congress has the authority to determine when and how we go to war.

We cannot and must not get drawn into a costly war with Iran. We need to deescalate now. But President Trump's threat to illegally attack cultural sites in Iran only aligns us with the world's most sinister and draws us further along the path to war.

Some might say: Well, Secretary of Defense Esper says that President Trump will not do this. Let me read you President Trump's tweet at 5:52 p.m. on Saturday evening. Here is what he said: ''targeted 52 Iranian sites . . . some at a very high level & important to Iran & the Iranian culture, and those targets, and Iran itself, WILL BE HIT VERY FAST AND VERY HARD.''

That was by the President of the United States just Saturday night at 5:52 p.m., and we are supposed to be assured by Secretary of Defense Esper that we don't have to worry?

Well, here is what we have learned in just the last couple of days. The generals were stunned. The generals were shocked that President Trump ordered the assassination of Soleimani. So we can't depend upon the representations of Secretary Esper.

We have to make a statement ourselves because no one in his administration controls Donald Trump. If he says that he is going to target the most valuable cultural sites inside Iran, we should believe him. He does what he says he is going to do. He wanted to kill Soleimani. Even if the generals were shocked, he did it.

He doesn't understand the long-term consequences. From his perspective, just get over it. Well, if we sow the wind, we are going to reap the whirlwind in Iran.

If the President decides to take the next step after Iran retaliates—and they say that they are—and these sacred cultural sites are on the list, then taking Secretary Stimson's advice from World War II, our ability to ever reconcile may be impossible.

This is the moment that we have to speak as a Senate because we do not know how much time will elapse before Iran strikes back at us, as they have promised. We should make our statement right now to Donald Trump in the Oval Office that we do not want him under any circumstances to order the destruction of the most sacred cultural sites inside Iran. It would be a war crime. It would be a violation of the Geneva Convention. It would be a violation of the Hague Convention. It would have catastrophic consequences for our country and for the Middle East for a generation. So this is the time for us to speak—before it happens, before the President fulfills his promise to destroy those sites.

He is the Commander in Chief. He said that he wants to do this. He just killed—assassinated—the top military official, the second most powerful person in Iran, to the shock of his own generals. So do not think for a second he will not do this.

This is a potential tragedy for our country. This is a potential source of eternal friction between our two countries. Reconciliation with Iran would become nearly impossible. So let's make this statement as the U.S. Senate. Let's follow up on what Secretary of Defense Esper represents as the position of President Trump and of the administration—that they don't want to destroy it. But let's make the statement because we know that the Defense Secretary just may not speak for Donald Trump. No one speaks for Donald Trump. Only his tweets speak for Donald Trump, and we know what his tweet said: ''at a very high level & important to Iran & the Iranian culture, and those targets, and Iran itself, WILL BE HIT VERY FAST AND VERY HARD.''

We have a chance here to make a statement before this happens. Forewarned is forearmed. We have been forewarned, and our ability to act is with a unanimous resolution here from the floor of the U.S. Senate, saying to the President as Secretary Stimson said to President Truman in 1945: Do not do this, Mr. President. It will be a mistake of historic proportions and a war crime. Do not order a war crime to be conducted in the name of the American people.

So the resolution that I bring to the floor is intended to have this body vote and vote unanimously for him not to take that action. This is our moment to speak before he compounds his original mistake—the assassination of General Soleimani—and turns it into a tragedy, which we will have to live with for a generation.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 32 submitted earlier today. I further ask that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I sit here

listening to this, and a lot of the American people do too. My good friend from Massachusetts has said things that I know he actually believes. He actually believes it.

Here we are with the President of the United States, who has given us, over the objections of the gentleman, my friend from Massachusetts, the best economy we have had maybe in my lifetime. You could argue that. He has been able to do this two ways. One was a way that was designed first by a Democrat—by John Kennedy—when he said that the best way to increase revenue is to reduce marginal rates, and it worked. Unfortunately, President Kennedy died after that.

Then we have the judges right now; we have, right now, over 170 judges. The unique thing about this is that these are judges who are really constitutional judges. They have read the Constitution. That is a unique notion.

Then the military—again, it is hard to sit here and listen to someone who has that level—you hear so much hatred about this President, but he is getting so many great things done. If you look at the military, not many people know this—now, I chair the Armed Services Committee—but we know that during the Obama administration, during the last 5 years—this would have been from 2010 to 2015—he reduced the budget for the military by 25 percent in constant dollars. That has never happened before, even after World War I and World War II when reductions took place. This was even more than that at a time when you can argue it was the most dangerous time in history. So, here the President has been responsible for that, yet there is so much hatred out there.

The issue at hand now with Soleimani—this gentleman's resolution is rather interesting. He is talking about cultural sites. I can remember at the very beginning of the Trump administration, he went out of his way to protect cultural sites. If you talk to different people of minority religions in different countries, they talk about what he has done to protect minority rights and sites—churches that have been torn down. So here is a guy, our President, who has been right in the middle of the very thing he has been accused of offending.

I note that Secretary Esper has made it quite clear that the United States will follow the laws of armed conflict.

I appreciate the spirit of Senator MARKEY's resolution opposing attacks on cultural sites. I agree with that. However, since our votes carry the force of law, we need to be specific in our resolutions. It is simply not true that attacking cultural sites is always a war crime because there are many instances in which cultural sites have been used as staging grounds for hostilities. We all know that. I can give you examples for that.

President Clinton noted in his message to the Senate when he sent the Hague cultural property convention over for ratification almost exactly 21 years ago on January 6, 1999, and I am quoting from it:

> Cultural property is protected from intentional attacks so long as it is not being used for military purposes or otherwise may be regarded as a military objective. Misuse may subject such property to attack.

That is a direct quote.

To be clear, I am not saying that we should target cultural sites, but we certainly should not restrict our military's ability to defend itself with rogue actors appropriating cultural sites for attacks or strategic reasons. The use of a cultural site to construct IEDs, launch missiles, or give snipers carte blanche against our forces is not accounted for in this resolution.

I therefore object to this resolution on those grounds and hope that the resolution will be amended to acknowledge an exception for when cultural sites are used for staging military attacks or other improper purposes.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

MEASURE REFERRED—S. CON. RES. 32

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, just in response to the Senator from Oklahoma, it is deeply disheartening when, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, we cannot agree to a simple commitment that the United States of America should never engage in military actions that are war crimes by attacking cultural sites in Iran.

When ISIS attacks cultural sites in the Middle East, we condemn that because we know what the impact on the cultures of those countries will be. When al-Qaida attacked us on September 11, 2001, which targets did they select? They selected the World Trade Center, the symbol of capitalism in the United States. They selected the Pentagon, the symbol of our defense. And but for those brave passengers on that plane in Pennsylvania, when they said ''Let's roll,'' that target could have been the Capitol Building of the United States of America where we are standing right now, the symbol of Democracy. They knew what they were doing—they were striking at capitalism, at our Defense Department, and at our democracy—and they knew what the impact would have been on our country.

So we have a choice to make right now out here on the floor of the Senate, and that is to make a statement before we do that to the Iranians because we ourselves experienced it, and we know what our reaction was. They will rise up in a way that will make it impossible to reconcile. We will be in eternal war in the Middle East.

My request to the Members is to have this resolution come back out here on the floor. I understand the gentleman's objection, but the President could be ordering additional retaliatory strikes against the Iranians within a week if the Iranians are good for their word that they are going to hit us. We have to be sure that if the President does that, he does so in a way that does not commit a war crime and that does not destroy these culturally significant parts of the Iranian culture that go back thousands of years. It would be something that ultimately would be catastrophic.

We are better than this. We are the United States of America. President Trump has already made one mistake in assassinating General Soleimani. We should not allow him to compound that mistake.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I request a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. I am just asking, are we in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts, I be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, 5 days ago, President Trump made the boldest defensive policy decision of his Presidency to date. He authorized the airstrike against the leader of Iran's Quds Force, Soleimani, in accordance with his authorities as Commander in Chief of the United States under article II of the Constitution.

Let's remember who Soleimani was. He was a terrorist. He was responsible for training and funding militias across the Middle East—the very militias that have targeted American personnel, our facilities, and our partners for decades. He was behind the plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador in Washington. That was back in 2011. He has been doing this for a long time now. He was responsible for the brutal repression of democratic protests within Iran. The terrorist groups he armed and trained attacked our partners, including Israel.

Some of the people out there are more focused on criticizing President Trump for taking out Soleimani than they are on protecting American diplomats and American troops, conveniently forgetting that Soleimani is the architect of Iran's terrorism and is responsible for over 600 American deaths during the Iraqi war. When you stop and think about how bad he is, it just doesn't get any worse than that.

We hear a lot recently about getting—I am very happy this President was able to put together something and take out al-Baghdadi, but this guy was worse than al-Baghdadi—you can argue, even worse than bin Laden.

Their justification for criticizing the President for killing a terrorist who wanted to destroy America—stated it many times—they think it was reckless and represents a rush to war. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just remember how we got where we are today.

Remember the Obama apology tour? I remember it well. When he first came into office, he went around talking about—all around to our adversaries and our friends alike talking about how bad America was. We remember that, and it was a game changer for our behavior throughout the world at that time.

First, American credibility hit an all-time low under the Obama administration. President Obama set a redline in Syria. We all remember that redline in Syria. That was because Syria was using weapons of mass destruction, and President Obama said: If you continue to do that, we will, you know, take you out—words to that effect. Well, then the redline occurred when Syria started dropping weapons of mass destruction on its own people there. Now, that kind of, I think, changed the thinking of does America mean what they say?

To make matters worse, Obama signed a deal with Iran that didn't address Iran's support for terrorism at all. It gave Iran over $100 billion, including $1.7 billion in cash. That was a John Kerry thing. That was when John Kerry was the Secretary of State and President Obama was the President. At that time, $1.7 billion was given to this terrorist group in small bills, in foreign currency, for obvious reasons—you don't have to stop and think that through—but then, in addition, over $100 billion, and they even admitted at that time that that could be used to expand terrorist activities.

One of the quotes in 2016—and I wrote it down, and I have used it many times since then—I want you to listen to this. This is a quote from John Kerry in 2016. He said: ''I think that some of it will end up in the hands of the IRGC or other entities, some of which are labeled terrorists.'' John Kerry also said: ''You know, to some degree, I'm not going to sit here and tell you that every component of that can be prevented.''

So is it any wonder that Iran's regional aggression has only gotten bolder and bolder? Look what has happened just in the last few months. In May of this year, the Iranians attacked oil tankers with land mines. We know about that. In June, they shot down a U.S. drone. It is a U.S. drone. By the way, the cost of that was classified for a while. It is not classified anymore. It was in excess of $100 million. That is what they did. What did our President do? He sat back, and it didn't cause him to get all excited. He handled it in a very diplomatic way. Then, in September, they attacked the Saudi oilfields, taking some 50 percent of Saudi Arabia's oil production capability offline.

President Trump showed incredible restraint after each one of those provocations. He responded by increasing pressure on Iran—ramping up economic sanctions and increasing their diplomatic isolation but not anything that would suggest getting into any type of violence at that time.

The President avoided military action while setting a very clear redline. And what was the redline? He said: So long as you don't kill an American—if you kill an American, we are going to come after you. That is the redline. That is a redline that 95 percent of the people in America agree with.

On December 27, Iran crossed that redline. Soleimani directed the attack that killed an American and wounded four other servicemembers. President Trump made it clear that there were consequences for spilling American blood. He said: You kill an American, we are going to come after you. And he is dead now.

Iran never believed there would be consequences. After all, Obama never enforced his redline, and even President Trump was hesitant to use military force. Only a day before the strike that killed Soleimani, Iran's Supreme Leader tweeted at our President—in fact, you have to read this. This is a tweet that came from him to the President: ''That guy has tweeted that we see Iran responsible for the events in Baghdad & we will respond to Iran. 1st: You can't do anything.'' This is a guy telling our President ''You can't do anything.'' That is a quote. That whole thing is a quote that came from him. They never believed there would be consequences, but there were consequences.

Only a day before the strike, he said: ''You can't do anything.'' We are talking about Iran's Supreme Leader tweeting to our President of the United States ''You can't do anything.'' Obviously, they know better than that. Well, President Trump could, and he did. He actually restored America's credibility around the world. He showed that we mean what we say.

You tell me what is reckless—they talk about this as reckless—a President who means what he says and takes the protection of American lives seriously or the fringe Democrats who want to tie the President's hands and deny him the tools to uphold his constitutional responsibility to defend our citizens?

You know, right now before this Senate, there is a resolution—not the one my friend from Massachusetts was talking about but another one that would take away a lot of the President's powers of negotiation. We are talking about powers that are there as a result of article II of the Constitution. That is what our President has—those constitutional powers. Yet the President did not use military force until they crossed the redline, and that is not a rush to war.

Listen to folks like former Democratic Senator Joe Lieberman. I served here in the Senate with Senator Joe Lieberman. He is a Democrat. I have one of the quotes that he said just recently in analyzing this. I don't recall, but I think he was here probably about 25 years. This is a quote from Democrat Joe Lieberman, a former Senator:

> President Trump's order to take out Qasem Soleimani was morally, constitutionally and strategically correct. It deserves more bipartisan support than the begrudging or negative reactions it has received thus far from my fellow Democrats.

That is a quote.

We have another one from about the same timeframe, just recently. Listen to Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security. I got to know him. His name is Jeh Johnson. He was one who was eminently qualified for that position and did a good job while he was there. This is what he said about the action with Soleimani, which the President is being accused of all these terrible things about. This is from the Secretary of Homeland Security under President Obama. Jeh Johnson said:

> He was a lawful military objective, and the president, under his constitutional authority as commander in chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without an additional congressional authorization. Whether he was a terrorist or a general in a military force that was engaged in armed attacks against our people, he was a lawful military objective.

Everything that this President did was perfectly appropriate, and these are two prominent Democrats who have come out with this.

So, you know, there are a lot of people out there who are pretty fed up with what has been going on with attacking the president and impeachment. I keep hearing that something is going to happen this week in terms of sending over the articles, and I don't know—I have a personal opinion that a lot of people don't agree with, I am sure. I don't think even the Speaker knows right now just what is going to happen. Are the articles going to come over? I think a lot of her far-left friends are saying: Yeah, let's go over there and let's continue this thing. Let's continue beating up the President. But she also has a bunch of her liberal friends who are saying: Look, the polls don't look too good. People are onto this. They realize that there is a problem. Maybe we shouldn't be sending them at all.

We will find out tomorrow. I understand there is a big Democratic meeting. I am not invited. There is one over in the House. They are going to make a determination, and we will all find out at that time what is going to happen to the Articles of Impeachment.

But again, Soleimani was a lawful military objective—one that President Trump took out under article II authority. More to the point, nobody is

talking about war. Nobody is calling for an invasion. Nobody is calling for a ramp-up. We all know what that looks like here, and it is very plainly not what is happening. An airstrike is not war. Defending American lives is not war. The President has made it clear that he does not desire war, which is why he has continued to call for negotiations with Iran to end the standoff, and that is the very thing some people are trying to take away from him. It is not just a constitutional right; it is a constitutional responsibility.

Nobody here wants war, but at the same time, nobody should want a policy that would leave Americans vulnerable to the whims of Iran's terrorist-supporting regime. If we do that, if we tie the President's hands so that he cannot defend American lives, we leave ourselves more vulnerable and therefore make war imminently more likely. That would be reckless.

I would just be anxious for this time period to get by so we don't have to be facing this on a daily basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Arkansas.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize members of the Greatest Generation who courageously helped to defeat the German Army at the Battle of the Bulge and who dealt a critical blow to the Nazi regime.

On this day 75 years ago, American soldiers continued the resilience they had demonstrated for 4 weeks. On December 16, 1944, in the Ardennes Forest of the Luxembourg and Belgium area, American soldiers were unexpectedly attacked by the Germans. Allied forces were unprepared. They were outnumbered and facing record-low temperatures and dwindling supplies, but, still, the men on the frontlines dug in to defend against the enemy.

Arkansan Bill Strauss was one of the brave men who faced the bitter cold and dire conditions. With lack of sleep and shortage of food, he and his fellow troops endured this extreme test of will and resolve.

I met with Bill in 2019 to help him celebrate his 100th birthday and thanked him for his service and continued commitment to sharing his experiences with others. It has been 75 years, but Bill's recollection of the details of the unimaginable circumstances he faced was still very clear. He talks about his memories as part of the Battle of the Bulge in order to honor his fellow soldiers who weren't so fortunate, as well as to teach succeeding generations about the realities of war and the remarkable perseverance of American troops.

The 6-week battle demonstrated the commitment, courage, and resilience of Bill and all the American soldiers. It was the largest battle ever fought by the U.S. Army. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called it ''the greatest American battle of the war.'' It came at a considerable cost. More than 89,000 American soldiers were casualties, including 19,000 soldiers who were killed, 47,500 who were wounded, and 23,000 who were captured or missing in action.

The people of Belgium and Luxembourg have a close place in their hearts for American soldiers who sacrificed their lives on foreign soil. They continue to display that gratitude today.

A couple of weeks ago, I led a group of my fellow Senators to both countries to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge. We experienced how the town of Bastogne, Belgium, observes this anniversary. The tremendous community support was welcoming of American veterans whom fate had brought together in 1944 there in the town and in the nearby forest to defend Bastogne and hold off the German advance.

I was honored to visit with American veterans who fought in the battle and were returning to the land they had defended. There are fewer and fewer who are able to join, but that doesn't diminish what they did there or the steadfast way they fought and sacrificed in the name of freedom.

My colleagues and I also had the unique opportunity to witness the ceremony by the 101st Airborne Division among the foxholes in Belgium. These foxholes, once occupied by soldiers, including those from Easy Company, the heroes immortalized in the celebrated ''The Band of Brothers'' book and miniseries, remain preserved. They stand as a stark reminder of the bitter cold and inhospitable conditions our soldiers withstood for so many days. This solemn ceremony was a special way to remember those who had fought and to honor those whose lives were taken too early.

Following World War II, the Belgium people raised money to build a memorial to show their appreciation for the selfless sacrifice of Americans troops. The Mardasson Memorial was dedicated in 1950. The walls of the star-shaped structure commemorate the battle, paying tribute to the units that fought there and representing the States where those wounded or whose lives were lost hailed from.

This memorial is in need of repairs. That is why I support legislation that Senator TILLIS introduced that would let experts at the American Battle Monuments Commission oversee its restoration.

Maintaining this memorial is critical to making sure what the monument stands for: the service and the sacrifices made by Americans at the Battle of the Bulge, and that will continue to be remembered for generations to come. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill so future generations can reflect on the heroism and bravery of our troops.

We can be proud of the unwavering bravery of the American servicemembers and the Allied forces whose efforts defeated the German attack and led to the end of the Nazi regime.

It is fitting that we recognize the 75th anniversary of a battle that both shaped the future of combat and ushered in a new year of comity between Europe and the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his wonderful remarks. We had a similar event in Rhode Island with veterans of the Battle of the Bulge who recounted their stories and who were celebrated by our State leaders, our adjutant general, and a crowd of admirers. It was a wonderful moment and a wonderful memory. So I thank him for calling it up on the Senate floor.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, here we are in 2020, and I am still coming to the floor to try to wake this Chamber up to the perils of climate change—pathetic.

Why do I have to be doing another one of these speeches? Why don't we heed the warnings of our foremost scientists, of our military, of top financial institutions—heck, of our own home State universities? What does it take to get our attention around here?

Why is the fossil fuel industry's unlimited dark money still flooding our politics? Why are the biggest lobbying forces in Washington, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, rated as America's worst climate obstructors? Where are those trade group members who claim to support climate action when their own groups are leading the obstruction? What is going on?

Who around here is so cynical as to still take fossil fuel money and block climate action? In 2020, how is that a legitimate deal?

Who hasn't noticed the world spinning toward climate catastrophe—the forests burning, the seas rising, the ocean water acidifying, the glaciers melting? How can you miss that?

To the liars, the deniers, the connivers, and the stooges, I predict 2020 is going to be a bad year for you. The sand beneath your castle of lies is eroding fast. Now, 2019 was a tough year for you, and 2020 will be worse. We are going to bring down your castle of lies.

The fossil fuel industry campaign of obstruction hides behind an armada of phony front groups. In 2020, we will out you and your fossil fuel funding, too.

To big oil companies that pretend to want progress, while still using that climate denial and obstruction apparatus to attack the very progress you claim to want, we will out that truth. We will expose your two-facedness.

The fossil fuel industry spoons up the biggest subsidy in the history of the planet. The International Monetary Fund estimates their global subsidy in the trillions of dollars every year—globally. In the United States alone, the fossil fuel industry was subsidized to the tune of $650 billion in 2015—the last year the IMF has calculated. We will out that massive subsidy and their dark money schemes to protect it.

The fossil fuel industry's biggest schemers against climate action in Congress are the big corporate trade associations. The worst two are the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. The watchdog InfluenceMap outed NAM and the chamber in a virtual tie as the two most obstructive forces on climate change in America. That is some prize.

The chamber works its evil in legislation, through regulatory action, in courts, in elections, even fighting State-level progress on carbon pollution.

The chamber funded the phony debunked report that President Trump used to disparage the Paris Agreement.

The chamber stooged for the fossil fuel industry for years and got away with it, but 2019 saw an end to that.

My colleagues and I took to social media, to op-ed pages, and to the Senate floor to out the chamber for its disgraceful record on climate change. We pushed on chamber members to demand change within the organization. We countered the chamber with amicus briefs, laying out its dirty history, when its evil little head popped up in climate lawsuits.

Senator WARREN and I lodged a complaint with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate over the chamber's refusal to disclose who is behind its lobbying activities—disclosures, by the way, required by law.

Senators even got hashtag ''ChamberofCarbon'' trending on Twitter, and I made a little yearend visit to the chamber to make, for no charge, a little correction to their sign out front, so that it says ''Welcome to the U.S. Chamber of Carbon.'' So we have been after them.

By year's end, there were signs of discomfort over at the chamber. Up popped a post on its website that said that on climate ''inaction is not an option.'' Hell, for years, inaction had been their purpose. Now they say it is not an option.

The chamber formed a new internal climate change working group. The ''Chamber of Carbon'' even quietly posted that it reversed itself on the Paris Agreement and now was for staying in—OK, baby steps but in the right direction.

I think the chamber and NAM became America's two worst climate obstructors because they were paid with fossil fuel dark money, and in 2020 I intend to find that out. If the chamber is still taking fossil fuel money, it is hard to take those baby steps very seriously. They are probably just PR to placate the chamber members who are embarrassed that their organization got caught and outed as a top climate obstructor.

For that prize, by the way, chamber members have a lot to be embarrassed about. Allstate, MetLife, IBM, FedEx, Bayer, Ford Motor, United Airlines, Delta, American—they all funded and directed a top climate obstructor. Really?

Really? Did they know it? Did they know the chamber—their own organization—was secretly getting fossil fuel money to become a top climate obstructer?

If they did know, by God, they have got some explaining to do. If they did not know, what standard of governance makes it OK for a board member to not even know who is funding your organization? So, look out, board members. We are not letting that go either. The year 2020 is when we intend to get to the bottom of all of this nasty mess.

The real test for the chamber—not baby steps—will be whether it puts its back into passing a real comprehensive climate bill. Will the chamber stop scheming with climate denial organizations? Will the chamber stop opposing climate action candidates? Those are the tests. This, by the way, is not a PR test. It is not a PR test of how little you can get away with. This is a science test. It is a science test of how we keep our planet below 1.5 degrees Celsius, global warming. If we fail the science test, how well we did on the PR test is going to look pretty silly.

Help us meet that 1.5 degrees Celsius. We will be talking, gladly. I look forward to working with you. Until then, expect the pressure on you to rise in 2020.

We called out one other miscreant in 2019: Marathon Petroleum. This gasoline refiner orchestrated the Trump attack on fuel economy standards for automobiles. As I laid out in testimony in a House Oversight Subcommittee hearing last year, Marathon pressured Members of Congress, Governors, and the Trump administration. The corrupt Trump administration was only too eager to oblige, issuing an error-riddled proposal to freeze the fuel economy standards.

The Trump administration went after California's authority under the Clean Air Act to set fuel standards. Trump's DOJ cooked up a bogus antitrust investigation, I believe, to punish the automakers that had worked with California to hammer out a separate deal on fuel economy standards that defeated Marathon's scheme.

It looks like the Trump administration also pressured automakers to support the administration's legal battle with California, and 2020 is the year I hope we expose all this.

In 2019, investors started noticing Marathon's bad behavior on climate. In fact, in September, 200 investors with $6.5 trillion in assets under management sent a letter to 47 U.S. companies, including Marathon, to urge those companies to align their lobbying with the Paris Agreement 2 degrees Celsius climate goal and to warn that their lobbying against that goal is an investment risk.

Well, the four biggest shareholders in Marathon are BlackRock, JPMorgan, State Street, and Vanguard. They claim to care about climate. We will see, in 2020, if they keep condoning all this Marathon misbehavior.

Happily, there are some things the crooked fossil fuel industry apparatus can't stop. Even with its massive subsidy for fossil fuel, renewables are starting to win on price. New green energy technologies are powering up, like offshore wind and battery storage. Electric vehicles are driving cost down and performance up for consumers. Old coal plants are closing—546 since 2010. New coal plants are unfinanceable, and 2019 saw Murray Energy become the eighth coal company in a year to file for bankruptcy and the biggest drop in coal consumption ever.

Another trend the industry couldn't stop was economists, central bankers, Wall Street, real estate professionals, and asset managers waking up to the crash risks that climate change poses to the global economy. It is not just that it is wrecking our atmosphere and oceans and climate. Our economy stands on those pillars, and at some point there will be economic crashes.

Climate crash warnings used to be scarce. Now they are everywhere. Freddie Mac warns that rising sea levels will prompt a crash in coastal property values worse than the housing crash that caused the 2008 financial crisis.

First Street Foundation found that rising seas have already resulted in $16 billion in lost property values in coastal homes from Maine to Mississippi.

Moody's warns that climate risk will trigger downgrades in coastal communities' bond ratings. BlackRock estimated that, by the end of the century, climate change will cause coastal communities annual losses that could average up to 15 percent of local GDP—average up to 15 percent of local GDP—with the hardest hit communities hit far worse. Look out, Florida. By the way, Louisiana is not too far from Florida.

The Bank of England, the Bank of France, the Bank of Canada, and the European Central Bank—backed by top-tier, peer-reviewed economic papers—are all warning of systemic economic risk—''systemic economic risk'' is economist-speak for risk to the entire economy—from stranded fossil fuel assets, the so-called carbon asset bubble. On top of that, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission here in the United States has launched a climate risk review. Even the Trump Fed is starting to echo those warnings with reports out of local Federal Reserve banks.

It is not just big institutions that are grasping the risks of climate change. I visited Louisiana, Wyoming, and Colorado last year to hear about climate change and see what red- and purple-State Americans are doing about it. The answer is: plenty.

In Louisiana, sea level rise and subsidence are megathreats. I met a hunter and fisherman whose personal efforts to restore marshland have allowed his local delta wetlands to rebound from mismanagement. A scientist with the National Wildlife Federation counted over 30 species of birds

just while we were standing around waiting to board the boat.

The sights and sounds of a healthy marsh were an encouraging reminder of nature's ability to find a way to not only survive but to flourish if we give her a chance.

In Wyoming—well, don't get me wrong—climate change isn't always a popular subject. The State is basically run by the fossil fuel industry, but there I met a younger generation that really gets it. I will not forget the determination of leading winter sports athletes in Jackson fighting to preserve their winters; nor, in Lander, the impassioned argument for climate action from a young outdoor instructor from NOLS, National Outdoor Leadership School; nor, out at their campsite, the fire-lit, passionate faces of Central Wyoming College students on their way up to take glacier measurements, who well understand the stakes of climate change for their future and the future of the State they love.

Typically, these climate road trips that I do land me in States where the fight for climate change may need a little, say, boost. The opposite was true in Colorado. It is a State on a major climate winning streak: a State of good climate bills passed during the last legislative session; their biggest public utility transitioning to renewable energy, building impressive renewable energy and electric vehicle infrastructure; and leading research institutes bringing new renewable energy technologies to the marketplace.

The year 2019 also showed polling that showed climate action was becoming a top issue for American voters everywhere. A big part is young voters—and especially young Republicans. More than three-fourths of all millennials and a majority of millennial Republicans agree on the need for climate action. Last year, a Republican former Member of Congress wrote about climate change: My party will never earn the votes of millennials unless it gets serious about finding solutions.

It is not just younger voters. Americans of all ages and political stripes favor many of the solutions that scientists and economists say are needed to tackle climate change. An October 2019 Pew poll found that two-thirds of Americans believe the Federal Government needs to do more to combat climate change. The same poll showed 77 percent of Americans believe the United States ought to prioritize developing alternative energy over fossil fuels.

So the decades-long fossil fuel campaign of obstruction and lies and denial will not be tolerated much longer.

In New England, in the springtime, a moment comes when the roof of your house warms up enough to send the snow sliding down off the roof in a big whumpf. The snow may have piled up slowly, over weeks and months, but it comes down all at once in a whumpf.

The fossil fuel industry and its network of front groups and trade associations have spent years piling up their crooked apparatus of climate obstruction. Increasingly, their evil behavior is facing blowback from the public and from regulators and from investors. Alarm bells are ringing ever louder from all quarters about the economic risks.

Renewable energy and other green technologies are ever more cost competitive. Awareness of climate change dangers is ever growing among the American people. These are all signs that the thaw, the whumpf, is near, and 2020 could be the moment.

I know things in Washington can seem hopeless, but 2019 gave me some reasons to hope. For 2020, well, it is game on to tear down the crooked castle of climate denial and solve this problem while still we can.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 11 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 329, 462, and 525, in the order listed; further, that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, all postcloture time be expired at 5 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations with no intervening action or debate; finally, that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam 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. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 554.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Todd Young, Shelley Moore Capito, Michael B. Enzi, Lisa Murkowski, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Chuck Grassley, Josh Hawley, Roger F. Wicker, Marsha Blackburn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HARRIS. Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 416 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 465, Anuraag Singhal, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 417 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 466, Karen Spencer Marston, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 418 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 480, Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 419 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 481, Jodi W. Dishman, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 420 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 490, John M. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 422 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 354, Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 423 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 383, Kea Whetzal Riggs, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

Madam President, I was absent but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 424 the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 234, Robert J. Colville, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

RMEMBERING DAVID BLEE

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the life of David Blee, who tragically passed away on December 29, 2019, at the age of 66. David was the founder and president of the United States Nuclear Industry Council, USNIC. During his long and distinguished career in the nuclear industry, David concentrated on nuclear supply chain and reactor technology and actively worked to increase support for nuclear power in the United States and abroad. David also worked with the National Laboratories, including Idaho National Laboratory, often running conferences in conjunction with them. At the time of his passing, David held an appointment to the U.S. Department of Commerce's Civil Nuclear Trade Advisory Committee, CINTAC, an achievement that spoke to his incredible expertise.

David graduated from Dickinson College in Pennsylvania with a degree in economics, but he soon began working in politics and public service. After managing several political campaigns, David became chief of staff to former Representative and Senator Connie Mack while Mack served in the House of Representatives. David then served as a Deputy Assistant Secretary and, later, Director of Public Affairs for the U.S. Department of Energy during the Reagan administration. He also served as the executive vice president for NAC International, a U.S.-based energy services and technology company, where he directed the company's worldwide consulting group and marketing and business development portfolios.

One of David's best attributes was his ability to work with people and bring organizations together. Composed of over 80 companies, USNIC represents the ''who's who'' of the nuclear energy supply chain, including technology developers, fuel cycle companies, and others that demonstrate the importance of maintaining the nuclear industry. These companies working in conjunction would not have been possible without the dedicated effort of David Blee. In July of last year, I was honored to be presented with the U.S. Nuclear Energy Distinguished Leadership Award by USNIC. The coalition of groups attending that award ceremony personified the great unifying effect that David had on the nuclear industry. He was a leader and a motivator, and his advocacy for the nuclear industry will be remembered. I am grateful for the work that he completed during his lifetime and his lasting legacy as a respected leader in the nuclear field.

RECOGNIZING THE USS ''PITTSBURGH''

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to recognize the service of the USS *Pittsburgh* and her crew for our country since the ship's commissioning on November 23, 1985.

A *Los Angeles*-class, fast-attack nuclear submarine, the *Pittsburgh* served for 35 years as an anti-submarine, strike, and anti-surface ship warfare vessel that also specialized in surveillance and reconnaissance. The *Pittsburgh* deployed during Operation Desert Storm in 1991 and again during Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2002, conducting Tomahawk missile strikes in both campaigns. While most of the vessel's missions remain classified, the *Pittsburgh* logged over 1,000 dives all over the world, including in the Arctic, Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific oceans.

The *Pittsburgh* was the U.S. Navy's fourth ship to be named after the Steel City and during its time in service retained a number of connections to its namesake. Over the years, multiple civic organizations have used the ship for outreach efforts, fundraisers, and crew visits to increase the public's appreciation for the Navy and the submarine service. Local groups, such as the Pittsburgh Council of the Navy League and the Leetsdale, PA, chapter of the U.S. Submarine Veterans Incorporated, have kept in regular contact with the ship's crew. Another local organization, called the Pittsburgh Foundation, even administers a scholarship fund for the *Pittsburgh's* crew and their families.

The vessel's motto, ''Heart of Steel,'' paid homage to the city's cultural and industrial roots. The slogan is apt given that researchers at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory in West Mifflin, PA, just outside of Pittsburgh, are credited with designing portions of the nuclear technology outfitted on nuclear-propelled Navy vessels, including the *Pittsburgh*.

On February 25, 2019, the submarine completed her final deployment, during which she traveled over 39,000 nautical miles and conducted three foreign port visits. Subsequently, the *Pittsburgh* departed Groton, CT, for Bremerton, WA, for her final homeport change. On this final voyage, she became the first submarine of her variant to complete an arctic transit. She is now undergoing the months-long decommissioning and inactivation process that will culminate in a ceremony on January 17, 2020. I send everyone involved in the ceremony the best of wishes.

After 35 years of distinguished service, I commend the USS *Pittsburgh* and her crew for their sustained commitment to upholding our Nation's defense. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognition of the USS *Pittsburgh* upon her inactivation from the Navy.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING ROBERT L. ''RED'' McKINNEY

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Robert ''Red'' McKinney, an outstanding friend and public servant. Sadly, Mr. McKinney passed away on December 24, 2019, at the age of 72. He will be remembered for his devotion to East Hampton and his bright, loving nature.

Born in Hartford, CT, Red spent his entire life in East Hampton. He earned his higher education degrees in the State, as well, with an associate's degree from Mitchell College and a bachelor's degree from Central Connecticut State University. Red spent five decades as a chemical specialist, focused in metal working fluids. For 40 years, he and his wife, Anne, co-owned a commercial and residential property acquisition and management company, HTA, LLC.

Outside of his work, Red dedicated himself to supporting his community. Giving back to those around him brought Red an unparalleled joy, dating back to his role as a member of East Hampton Parks and Recreation in the 1970s. He was the youngest member of the East Hampton Board of Selectmen ever elected and proudly served for 4 years. Notably, Red also served as chairman of the East Hampton Democratic Town Committee for 10 years and remained a member for his entire life since 1974.

That same year, he joined the East Hampton Rotary Club, making him the longest tenured member. His impressive level of involvement is also evident through his over four-decade-long role as a charter member of the Old Home Days Association. The association coordinates the annual East Hampton Old Home Day parade—a signature celebratory tradition attended by hundreds of people. As a regular participant in the parade, I saw firsthand the professionalism and dedication that Red brought to that event. He was always a joy to talk with.

Red was especially pleased to have the opportunity to celebrate the people

of his town and surrounding communities. He treasured the residents of East Hampton the same way he valued his close friends and family.

Through his active role in these organizations and many others, including the Middle Haddam Library and Middlesex Hospital, Red positively impacted countless members of his community. His commitment to supporting those around him was recognized through three Paul Harris Fellow Awards and numerous other honors.

Red's remarkable legacy of service is an inspiration to all of us and sets a model of service that will continue in East Hampton for years to come.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest sympathies to Red's family during this difficult time, particularly to his wife, Anne, along with their children and grandchildren. May their many wonderful memories of Red provide them solace and comfort.●

RECOGNIZING POCATELLO ELECTRIC

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today I am pleased to honor Pocatello Electric located in Pocatello as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for January 2020.

Max Schaefer opened Pocatello Electric in 1902 and sold the business to Ed Hall in the 1930s. The business became well known for its ''free air and water at the curb,'' which meant air for automobile tires and water for horses. Al Vigliaturo began working at Pocatello Electric in 1947 and eventually bought the business from Hall in 1973. Vigliaturo's son and daughter-in-law, Mike and Suzie Vigliaturo, bought the business in 1989 and continue to run daily operations.

Pocatello Electric offers a wide range of home appliances, accessory items, and mattresses for purchase in its 7,500-square-foot showroom in historic Old Town Pocatello. For more than 117 years, the business has remained committed to providing exceptional customer service. Employees assess the needs of each customer to ensure buyers select products that will fit their unique needs. The delivery team provides professional delivery and installation, and the service team provides continued service and repairs for all products purchased in-store. Pocatello Electric has received the Idaho State Journal's Readers' Choice Award for best appliance store each year since 2004 and its best customer service award 3 years in a row. The business recently hosted a No Child Hungry event, which brought the Pocatello community together to pack 10,000 meals that were delivered to local food pantries, homeless shelters, and soup kitchens.

Congratulations to Mike Vigliaturo and all of the employees at Pocatello Electric for being selected as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for January 2020. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING DELICATE PERIODONTICS AND IMPLANT DENTISTRY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I highlight a small business that exemplifies the value of dignified work and the unique entrepreneurial spirit of our Nation. It is my privilege to recognize a Florida small business that is dedicated to its patients, as well as the surrounding community. Today, I am proud to honor Delicate Periodontics and Implant Dentistry of Wellington, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Founded in 2017 by owner Dr. J'Nelle Delica, Delicate Periodontics and Implant Dentistry is a friendly, welcoming dental practice that provides quality dental care with a specialization in laser periodontics. A first-generation Jamaican-American and native Floridian, Dr. Delica dreamed of opening a dental practice since she was 13. Years later, Dr. Delica has achieved her dream and has dedicated her career to treating patients and educating individuals on dental health. In addition to services such as exams and cleanings, Delicate Periodontics provides surgical and laser periodontal therapy, soft tissue and bone grafts, dental implants, and sinus lifts. With the help of her staff, Dr. Delica ensures that each patient receives personalized attention. When faced with large and complicated cases, Dr. Delica ensures that the process remains collaborative so patients feel at ease.

Delicate Periodontics is also involved in giving back to the community through events like health fairs where Dr. Delica provides dental screenings for Palm Beach County residents. The dental practice has also been a dedicated sponsor for events in the Wellington community such as the Meet Me at the Race Sunset Stride Family 5K. Additionally, Dr. Delica has dedicated much of her time to educating local middle and high school students about careers in dentistry as part of an annual health symposium.

Dr. Delica's passion for educating others on dental hygiene has extended far beyond the walls of Delicate Periodontics. As a student, Dr. Delica partnered with the Jamaican Ministry of Health to educate families on dental health in early childhood. After earning her degree in dentistry, Dr. Delica maintained her relationship with Jamaica and currently serves as an adjunct faculty member at the University of West Indies Dental School. In recent years, Dr. Delica has brought her dental expertise to Saint Ann, Jamaica, where she and other health professionals volunteer their dentistry skills for patients in need.

Dr. Delica and her team's dedication to quality dental services and community service, both in the United States and abroad, makes Delicate Periodontics and Implant Dentistry an integral member of the South Florida economy. Congratulations to the entire team at Delicate Periodontics and Implant Dentistry. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

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–3589. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Review of Defense Solicitations by Procurement Center Representatives'' ((RIN0750–AK43) (DFARS Case 2019–D008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3590. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report on the Truth in Lending Act, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, and the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3591. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on College Credit Card Agreements; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3592. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3593. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3594. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3595. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Capital Treatment for High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE) Exposures'' (RIN1557–AE48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3596. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold'' (12 CFR Part 1003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to

the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3597. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Capital Treatment for High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE) Exposures'' (RIN3064–AE90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3598. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Delay of Effective Date of the Risk-Based Capital Rules'' (RIN3133–AF01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3599. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Risk Mitigation Techniques for Uncleared Security-Based Swaps'' (RIN3235–AL83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3600. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rule Amendments and Guidance Addressing Cross-Border Application of Certain Security-Based Swap Requirements'' (RIN3235–AM13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3601. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirement all funding so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, pursuant to section 251 (b) (2) (A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for the enclosed list of accounts; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–3602. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including the rescission of funds) and contributions from foreign governments so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, pursuant to section 251 (b) (2) (A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for the enclosed list of accounts; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–3603. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report related to the Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3604. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Innovative Materials and Advanced Technologies Report''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3605. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations Compliance Deadline'' (FRL No. 10003–87–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3606. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Partial Approval, Partial Disapproval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; California; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills'' (FRL No. 10000–52–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3607. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tennessee; Approval of Plan for Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units'' (FRL No. 9997–01–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3608. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2020 Annual Adjustment: Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment'' (FRL No. 10003–77–OECA) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3609. 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; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 10002–05–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3610. 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; Indiana; Limited Maintenance Plans for the 1997 Oxone NAAQS; Evansville, Fort Wayne, Greene County, Jackson County, Muncie, and Terre Haute areas'' (FRL No. 10003–54–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3611. 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; South Carolina; Interstate Transport for the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS'' (FRL No. 10003–56–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3612. 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; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 10003–55–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3613. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alabama; Approval of Plan for Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units'' (FRL No. 9996–80–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3614. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Idaho; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification and Incorporation by Reference'' (FRL No. 10003–28–Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3615. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Adjustments to the Allowance System for Controlling HCFC Production and Import, 2020–2029; and Other Updates'' (FRL No. 10003–80–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3616. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a consolidated budget justification display that includes all programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program (OSS–2019–1354); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3617. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107–243) and the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (P.L. 102–1) for the September 10, 2019 to November 9, 2019 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3618. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom for the support and installation of the MK 45 mod 4 naval gun system, type 26 ammunition handling system, and ammunition lift on the type 26 Maritime Indirect Fire System (MIFS) frigates in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–067); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3619. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3620. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Oversight of Institutions for Mental Diseases''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3621. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled ''Setting the Manner for the Appearance of Parties and Witnesses at a Hearing'' (RIN0960–AI09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3622. 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 ''Guidance under Section 355(e) Regarding Predecessors, Successors, and Limitation on Gain Recognition; Guidance under Section 355(f)'' ((RIN1545–BN18) (TD 9888)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3623. 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 ''Interim Guidance on Income Tax Withholding from Retirement and Annuity Distributions'' (Notice 2020–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3624. 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 ''Extension of the Phase-in Period for the Enforcement and Administration of Section 871(m)'' (Notice 2020–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3625. 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 ''Dividend Equivalents from Sources within the United States'' ((RIN1545–BN76) (TD 9887)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3626. 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 ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Exchange Program Integrity'' (RIN0938–AT53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3627. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3628. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Head Start Program'' (RIN0970–AC78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3629. A communication from the Chairwoman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3630. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 21st Century IDEA 2019 report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3631. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–278, ''Sense of the Council Supporting the Protection of Immigrant Families Resolution of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3632. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3633. A communication from the Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2018 annual report for the Department's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; the Judiciary; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–3634. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rights-of-Way on Indian Land; Bond Exemption'' (RIN1076–AF20 and RIN1076–AF37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–3635. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tribal Energy Resource Agreements under the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act'' (RIN1076–AF47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–3636. A communication from the Regulatory Documentation Specialist, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Courts of Indian Offenses; Future Publication of Updates'' (RIN1076–AF46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–3637. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Cyclopropyl Fentanyl, Methoxyacetyl fentanyl, ortho-Fluorofentanyl, and para-Fluorobutyryl Fentanyl in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–507)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3638. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of FUB–AMB in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–472a)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3639. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Correction to Regulation Regarding Registration'' ((21 CFR Part 1301) (Docket No. DEA–511)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3640. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contracts and Provider Agreements for State Home Nursing Home Care'' (RIN2900–AO57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3641. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reimbursement of Qualifying Adoption Expenses for Certain Veterans'' (RIN2900–AQ01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3642. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3643. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Public Rulemaking Procedures'' (RIN3038–AE90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3644. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2019–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3645. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Software Specially Designed to Automate the Analysis of Geospatial Imagery to the Export Control Classification Number 0Y521 Series'' (RIN0694–AH89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3646. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Reinvestment Act Regulations'' (RIN3064–AF20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3647. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the

Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3648. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3649. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants'' (NRC–2012–0026) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3650. 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 ''Opening of the third six-year remedial amendment cycle for pre-approved defined benefit plans'' ((Rev. Proc. 2020–10) (RP–117256–19)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–175. A petition from a citizen of the State of Delaware relative to the Delaware Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 2714, a bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to reauthorize the ARPA–E program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–195).

Report to accompany S. 2556, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide energy cybersecurity investment incentives, to establish a grant and technical assistance program for cybersecurity investments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–196).

Report to accompany S. 2657, a bill to support innovation in advanced geothermal research and development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–197).

Report to accompany S. 2799, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior to establish a joint Nexus of Energy and Water Sustainability Office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–198).

Report to accompany S. 2702, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an integrated energy systems research, development, and demonstration program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–199).

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. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3151. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to allow counties to use certain funds to provide or expand access to broadband telecommunications services and other technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 3152. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps; 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. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Con. Res. 32. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that attacks on cultural sites are war crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 283

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors 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. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1074, a bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1677

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to postpone certain deadlines by reason of State declared disasters or emergencies.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1764

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for telephone and advanced communications services in the correctional and detention facilities.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) 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. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added 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.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B.

Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) 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. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2748

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2748, a bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum.

S. 2761

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2761, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide that children who have relocated from Puerto Rico to the States are fully considered for purposes of State allotments under the English Language Acquisition grants.

S. 2941

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a consumer recycling education and outreach grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2998

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2998, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that payment of taxes on deferred foreign income in installments shall not prevent credit or refund of overpayments or increase estimated taxes.

S. 3072

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3072, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the approval of new abortion drugs, to prohibit investigational use exemptions for abortion drugs, and to impose additional regulatory requirements with respect to previously approved abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 63

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 63, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 410

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 410, a resolution establishing a McCain-Mansfield Fellowship Program in the Senate.

S. RES. 463

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 463, a resolution amending the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT ATTACKS ON CULTURAL SITES ARE WAR CRIMES

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 32

Whereas attacking cultural sites is illegal under the Geneva Conventions and the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; and

Whereas, on January 6, 2020, Secretary of Defense Mark T. Esper expressed that the United States would not target Iranian cultural sites, as the United States ''follow[s] the laws of armed conflict'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That attacks on cultural sites are war crimes.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 2 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 FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 7, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 7, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted for the first 6 months of this calendar year for a list of interns in my office.

The interns on that list are: Aileen Murphy, Rilind Abazi, Parker Baird, Julia Cortina, Shanelle Jones, Chris O'Brien, and Megan Brown.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Garrett Beer, a defense fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges throughout the remainder of this Congress.

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

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to J.C. Jain, a State

Department fellow in my office, and Mark Ewachiw, a Navy fellow in my office, for the duration of the 116th Congress.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Omar Bashir, a legislative fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 8; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Solomson nomination, under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, 3½ years or so ago, I live in Cleveland, and I was in my State watching the Presidential campaign. I heard Candidate Trump repeatedly talking about renegotiating NAFTA or getting rid of the North America Free Trade Agreement. While I did not support his candidacy and have generally disagreed with most of what he has said and done, it was a bit of music to my ears to hear Candidate Trump talk about renegotiating or getting rid of NAFTA.

I have voted, in my time in the Senate and before this, every single trade agreement starting with the North America Free Trade Agreement of two-plus decades ago, I have voted no in these trade agreements. I never voted for a trade agreement because, frankly, every trade agreement coming in front of the House or Senate has been a corporate trade agreement. It has been written by corporate lobbyists to serve corporate executives to serve their biggest stockholders. That is what these trade agreements are about. In every case, it was an attack on the middle class. In every case, it undermined worker protections. It depressed wages. It meant loss of jobs.

I know what these corporate trade agreements did to my hometown of Mansfield. I know what it did in Mansfield, OH. I know what they have done to my adoptive city of Cleveland, OH, and I know what they have done to the entire industrial Midwest—well beyond that, too, in places like Arizona and elsewhere. I have seen what these corporate trade deals do.

So Candidate Trump is elected President. He then says he is going to do away, back out, or renegotiate NAFTA. I looked at that with optimism. I talked to the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Lighthizer, a number of times. I spoke with the President about it. I offered my assistance, and then, lo and behold, about a year ago, the President came out with a renegotiated NAFTA. It was the same old, same old. It was another corporate trade agreement that served his corporate interests, that served the drug companies, and that served those companies that are looking for cheap labor across the Rio Grande River.

Under the President's new NAFTA—he called it USMCA—United States-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement—under the President's new NAFTA, it was the same corporate template, the same corporate trade agreement that helps corporate investors, that undermines workers, that gives incentives to companies to shut down production in Zanesville, in Gallipolis, in Marietta, in Cleveland, in Lima, in Toledo, and in Bryan and move their jobs to Mexico.

So what did we do? Instead, initially, I continued to talk to the U.S. Trade Representative, as did some of my colleagues, knowing this first NAFTA draft was unacceptable and was not nearly what the President said he would do for workers. In fact, it was more than that. It was another betrayal of workers. This same President has betrayed low-income workers by refusing to raise the minimum wage. It has been more than a decade. This same President took away the new overtime rule, costing at least 50,000 Ohioans—that is just 50,000 in my State, thousands in Arizona, probably 100,000 in California, tens of thousands around the country and different States—cost them their overtime pay, meaning they would work 50 hours a week, and they would only get paid for 40. We saw that this President again was betraying workers.

It has taken us months and months and months of fighting alongside Speaker PELOSI and Senator WYDEN—the senior Democrat of the Finance Committee—and unions and organized labor to secure the Brown-Wyden provisions that now, with USMCA, amount to the strongest labor enforcement in a U.S. trade agreement ever.

It means that wages will go up in Mexico, which is good news for American workers because fewer jobs will move to Mexico. A worker in Mexico now will be able to report a company that violates her labor rights or worker rights. Within months, we can determine whether worker rights have been violated and can take action against that company.

Now, for the first time in my whole career, I will vote for a trade agreement. I wouldn't have voted for the Trump trade. I didn't vote for NAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, PNTR with China and South Korea, and all these other trade agreements. I would not have voted against the Trump USMCA because it didn't look out for workers.

Instead of putting workers at the center of trade agreements, which is what we should do, it was a trade agreement written by and for corporate interests. What Senator WYDEN and I did and others is we are now about to pass a trade agreement that puts workers in the center of the trade agreement, meaning a stronger middle class and meaning workers will get a fair shake. It means that Ohio workers will be able to compete.

We know why companies took advantage of these corporate trade agreements. They shut down production in Ohio and moved to Mexico so they can pay lower wages and they can take advantage of workers who don't have rights. American workers can't compete with that when it is a race to the bottom on wages. Brown-Wyden will work to stop that, and for the first time ever, as I said, it will put workers in the center of a trade agreement.

We must be straight with American workers. This isn't a perfect trade agreement. One trade deal the Democrats fixed—even though the President resisted it, finally gave in—a trade deal that Democrats fixed will not undo the rest of Trump's economic policies that puts corporations over workers and appoints judges who put their thumbs on the scales of justice to support corporations over workers and to support Wall Street over consumers. I voted yes. I voted yes today in the Finance Committee. It is the first time I ever have on a trade deal because, by including Brown-Wyden, Democrats have made this agreement much more pro-worker, and, equally as important, we set an important precedent that Brown-Wyden must be included in every future trade agreement that comes in front of this body.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:05 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 8, 2020, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*PETER J. CONIGLIO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 7, 2020:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

JOVITA CARRANZA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMENDING NAVY QUARTERBACK MALCOLM PERRY ON HIS PERFORMANCE IN THE 120TH ARMY-NAVY GAME

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend Malcolm Perry of Clarksville, Tennessee for his extraordinary performance as the quarterback for the Naval Academy in the 120th Army-Navy game.

From the time he was a student at Kenwood High School, Malcolm knew he wanted to play college football and join the military. As the star quarterback at the Naval Academy, he has the rare opportunity to do both. The son of two career Army enlistees with over forty combined years of service, Malcolm enrolled at the U.S. Naval Academy, and he will commission as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps after graduation.

As the senior quarterback and team captain for the Midshipmen, Malcolm capped off the regular season with a spectacular 31–7 win against Army, rushing for a career-high 304 yards—the most rushing yards by any player in the history of the Army-Navy game.

With his outstanding performance in this game, he set the school records for rushing yards (1,804) and yards of total offense (2,831) in a season—quite a feat considering the many great teams that the Naval Academy has fielded in its long and proud history of athletic excellence.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating this young man on his outstanding leadership and accomplishments at the Naval Academy, and we wish Malcolm great success in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING AMERICA'S NEWEST CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on January 10, 2020. This memorable occasion will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On January 10, 2020, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Melissa June Licupa Pineda, Alexis Almaraz Fierro, Katelyn Alyousif, Rosaura Virginia Gonzalez, Blanca Carrasco, Maria Guadalupe Murillo, Jacqueline Angelica Terry Palacios, Jovanny Las Pinas Minton, Samuel Obiora Izuora, Alicia Cerda, Brenda Cerda, Ignacio Cerda Avalos, Horacio Joseph Vazquez, Kelly-Sue Stone, My Thi Hoa Pham, Maria Elisa Tirado, Arturo Miranda, Jr., Komo Yawa Ouattara, Victoria Izuora, Olena Gorbatenko Therrien, Yulia Vladimir Vorobiev, Alexander Nicholas Vorobiev, Oscar Esteban Magallanes, Liz Chacon, Gerardo Miranda, Edsys Nohemy Yoder, Nga Thu Pham, Myra Espinosa O'Lena, Gertrude N. Manda, and Carl Peter Zmijewski.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country ''. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.'' They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on January 10, 2020. They, too, will be American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

IN RECOGNITION OF SOC (SEAL) EDWARD GALLAGHER, USN

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, since the inception of our great Nation, our freedoms were conceived and protected by those willing to defend it with their own blood. It is in the spirit of those warriors that I rise today, to celebrate 20 years of distinguished and faithful military service by one of the greatest warriors our Country has ever known, Special Operations Chief Petty Officer (SEAL) Edward Gallagher, USN.

In 1999, Gallagher enlisted into the United States Navy from Fort Wayne, Indiana, graduating from Basic Training at Navy Recruit Training Command Great Lakes, Illinois. After successfully completing Navy Hospital Corpsman ''A'' school in 2000, he was assigned to 1st Battalion, 8th Marines Company, 2nd Marine Division in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. He also graduated from the Marines Corps Scout Sniper Course in 2002. While assigned to the Marine Corps, Gallagher completed two deployments that included service in Africa, Albania, Iraq and Kosovo.

Always desiring to push himself beyond the normal limits of others, Gallagher joined Basic Underwater Demolition/SEAL (BUD/S) class 252 in 2005 for 24 weeks of arduous training. After BUD/S, he immediately attended SEAL Qualification Training and Special Operations Combat Medic Course. Upon completion of those courses, Gallagher earned his Navy SEAL Trident and was selected to be stationed at SEAL Team ONE. Later, he was hand chosen to train new SEAL candidates as a BUD/S Instructor at Naval Special Warfare Center. This was followed by orders to be stationed at SEAL Team SEVEN, where he was promoted to the rank of Chief Petty Officer. For his service in the Naval Special Warfare community he has received two Bronze Stars with ''V'' for Valor, a Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, three Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals with ''V'' for Valor, a Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal and a Combat Action Ribbon.

In 2017, Chief Gallagher returned home after completing his eighth combat deployment. Instead of receiving a hero's welcome, he became the target of a tyrannical witch-hunt. This witch-hunt was led by a few junior SEALs, a completely incompetent NCIS Agent and Navy Judge Advocate General (JAG) lawyers that were hoping to make their careers off court-martialing Gallagher. Despite the numerous illegal and underhanded tactics by the prosecution, Chief Gallagher was found not guilty of all major charges by a jury of his peers on July 1, 2019. Later, President Donald Trump personally intervened to stop the Navy's harassment towards Gallagher and restored his rank to Chief Petty Officer. Realizing the poor treatment and errors that they had made, the United States Navy allowed Chief Gallagher to officially retire on November 30, 2019.

While no one could blame Chief Gallagher if he was angry about the horrible manner in which he was treated at the end of his career, he instead has decided to live free of anger and has forgiven the individuals who have wronged him. I believe this is due to Eddie's faith in God and an amazing woman that keeps him grounded, his loving wife, Andrea. She and their three beautiful children, Treven, Ava and Ryan, have faithfully supported Eddie throughout his numerous deployments and were his biggest advocates during the Navy's foolish witch-hunt. Their love along with his brother, Sean Gallagher, and his parents, Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Joseph and Melissa Gallagher have strengthened Eddie throughout his military service; and I congratulate them as well on this special occasion. I

am proud to share in the celebration of Special Operations Chief Petty Officer (SEAL) Edward Gallagher's military career and as he and his family step into the next chapter of their lives, I ask my colleagues in this chamber to join me in wishing the Gallagher family fair winds and following seas.

IN HONOR OF JAMES PURTEE, CITY MANAGER

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, after 31 years of public service, Palmdale City Manager James ''Jim'' Purtee announced his retirement effective at the end of 2019. Jim began his diverse career in public service with the City of Simi Valley in 1988. He spent over 27 years working for several city departments in Simi Valley and was involved in improving access to affordable house, ensuring continued economic development, and contributing to city planning efforts. In addition, Jim spent his free time doing community services.

In July 2012, Jim was named as the City of Simi Valley's Assistant City Manager, where he was responsible for intergovernmental relations and served as the City's public information officer. While serving as the Assistant City Manager, Jim obtained S&P rating upgrade of AAA for the City of Simi Valley. He sponsored a $5 million citywide investment in replacing technology services and turned a $2.4 million budget deficit to a $2.4 million budget surplus in just three years. Jim took the lead on working with city departments to complete a biogas fueling project for the City's transit buses and implement a $15 million energy savings and production project. During his time in public service, Jim managed a $160 million investment portfolio and increased investment returns by 400 percent over the benchmark and earned an additional $9.7 million on City funds over a six-year period. Jim was instrumental in securing $780,000 in grant funding to invest in citywide energy efficiency programs and oversaw countless affordable house programs to benefit thousands of families.

In October 2015, Jim became the City Manager for the City of Palmdale. While serving as City Manager in Palmdale, Jim amassed a number of significant achievements and successes. As City Manager for the City of Palmdale, Jim obtained an S&P rating upgrade to AA- and engaged in community partnerships, which contributed to reducing the City of Palmdale's Part 1 crime rate by over 40 percent in just 5 years. Under Jim's leadership, the City of Palmdale was named as the 44th Safest City in the US, was ranked in the top 15 percent of fiscally responsible cities in California and as a top 25 city in the U.S. to Live the American Dream.

Jim implemented initiatives to assist thousands of families in obtaining safe, decent, and affordable housing. He carried out fiscal and legislative actions that provided over $100 million in positive fiscal impacts to communities and worked on cutting edge sustainability projects such as waste to energy, groundwater recharge, and acquisition/conversion of 18,000 Streetlights to LED.

During his career, Jim served on multiple boards governing water, transportation, medicine, and regional planning. He served on the League of California Cities Fiscal Transparency, Revenue and Tax, and City Manager Committees. Jim supported the success of Air Force Plant 42 through maintaining strong relationships with all stakeholders. Jim worked tirelessly to ensure Palmdale, California will be California's High Speed Rail connection to the Western U.S. and partnered with academic stakeholders to educate and train the next generation of aerospace employees.

Jim obtained over $300 million in grants, tax credits, and other financial resources to invest in transportation, housing, water, energy, and quality of life improvements for the City of Palmdale. He oversaw the development of strategic plans for increasing access to public arts, encouraging economic development throughout the city, and restoring air service to Palmdale. While serving as City Manager, Jim invested in local parks, building the City of Palmdale's first dog park, developing new City parks, and improving existing parks.

Jim was honored by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), the premier local government leadership and management organization, at its annual conference in Baltimore earlier this year for his significant contributions and achievements in the advancement of local government administration for 30 years.

An avid supporter of military veterans, Jim has volunteered countless hours with local veteran organizations. He is also an advocate for supporting mental health programs, especially with our local youth population, and has also served on the Board of Directors for Palmdale Regional Medical Center. Jim holds both a bachelor's and master's degrees from California State University, Northridge, and is a graduate of the Harvard Kennedy School Executive Education for senior executives in state and local government program.

Jim has been happily married for the past 33 years to Tina, whom he has known since high school, and they are the proud parents of four children: Erika, Elyssa, Ariana, and Ethan.

REGARDING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S TARGETED KILLING OF MAJOR GENERAL QASEM SOLEIMANI, HEAD OF THE ISLAMIC REVOLUTIONARY GUARD

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, I rise to address the Trump Administration's targeted killing of Qasem Soleimani, head of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard, and the impact of this decision on American national security interests and the safety of American armed forces personnel and civilians in the region and around the world.

The decision to kill Major General Qasem Soleimani, the head of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, may have rid the world of a major architect of terror but leaves unanswered the critically important question of why the action was taken at this time.

In addition, we do know whether the action taken was the product of a carefully developed geopolitical strategy developed after extensive discussion within the national security apparatus of the short and longterm consequences for the security of the region and our nation and its people.

Similarly, we do not know whether it was taken in consultation and agreement with our regional and international allies; and whether there is now in place a strategy to ensure that the action taken does not lead to a greater escalation of tensions between Iran and the United States or in the worst case, another war in the Middle East placing at risk the lives and safety of millions of persons.

Qasem Soleimani appears to be the apparent mastermind behind last week's attack on the U.S. embassy in Baghdad.

Soleimani as long-time chief of the Quds Force, the elite special forces battalion of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), assisted Syrian strongman Bashar al Assad slaughter hundreds of thousands of his own people in the Syrian civil war.

Soleimani also incited the Houthis in Yemen's civil war and oversaw the brutal killing of hundreds of Iraqi protesters recently demonstrating against Iranian influence in their country.

Iran's Quds Force, under Soleimani's leadership, has long been suspected by the U.S. Government of involvement in a 2011 plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of State, Soleimani was responsible for the 608 Americans killed by Iranian proxies since the 2003 inception of the war in Iraq.

But Qasem Soleimani was more than a military leader, he was a highranking political leader, second only in power and influence to the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

In fact, Soleimani was regarded as a future president of Iran.

It was foreseeable that the killing of Soleimani by American forces was likely to invite retaliation by Iran putting at risk American military and civilian personnel, as well as its allies in the region and across the globe.

That is why it was essential that the Administration have in place a sound and well-considered and meticulously developed strategy for managing disputes with Iran.

That does not appear to be the case.

There is no evidence that the Administration consulted with Congress or the Gang of 8, no evidence that it enlisted or even consulted our allies in NATO or the region, no evidence that the Administration has a working and well-functioning national security council apparatus.

This is a critical Pottery Barn failure in dealing with the Middle East for as former Secretary of State Colin Powell stated before the Iraq War, ''If you break it, you bought it.''

Iran Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei has vowed that a ''harsh retaliation is waiting'' for the United States as a consequence of the action taken yesterday by the Administration.

It is imperative that the Administration have in place a strategy to counter and deescalate any Iranian response and have in place measures to protect the safety of Americans residing or travelling abroad and to protect the security of the homeland.

We must be prepared and ready because the assassination of Qasem Soleimani has the potential to be the most consequential assassination of a political leader since the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand Carl

Ludwig Joseph Maria of Austria, the heir presumptive of the throne of Austria-Hungary in 1914, which set in motion the Great War.

The decision to send American men and women into harm's way is the most consequential decision the Constitution vests in the President and the Congress.

That is why the Administration must consult with and seek and secure from Congress authorization to use military force (AUMF) against Iran.

Any vote on an AUMF for engagement with Iran must be preceded by meaningful, substantive, and thoughtful dialogue and robust debate.

Members of Congress must be apprised of all facts material to the decision and have access to relevant documentation, classified and otherwise, and afforded the opportunity to meet in small groups and in secure locations with senior members of the Administration's national security team who can answer detailed and pointed questions and provide requested information.

The Constitution wisely divides the responsibility of deciding when to use military force to protect the nation and its interests between the President and the Congress, the representatives of the American people.

The war in Iraq taught this nation the importance of having accurate and reliable information when deciding whether to use military force and the painful costs in lives and treasure of acting precipitously.

We cannot and dare not repeat that mistake.

That is why it is essential that all Members of Congress have access to the relevant information and the responsible Administration officials before any vote to authorize the use of military force be scheduled.

IN HONOR OF OXFORD WINNING THE AHSAA CLASS 6A FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Oxford High School football team for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 6A football championship.

The Yellow Jackets defeated Spanish Fort 14–13 in the championship game on December 6th played at Jordan-Hare Stadium at Auburn University. After an exciting game, the Yellow Jackets secured their victory in the final minute of the 4th quarter.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Oxford High School, the coaches, the players and all the Yellow Jacket fans on this exciting achievement. Go Yellow Jackets.

REMEMBERING LISA POWERS COOPER

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay a heartfelt tribute to Lisa Powers Cooper, wife of my good friend and former Tennessee State Senator Jerry Cooper, who died last Friday at her home in McMinnville. As chief of the Consumer Services Division of the Tennessee Public Utilities Commission since 2009, Lisa Cooper showed her dedication to public service. As a law student over seven years, she showed her perseverance, graduating from the Nashville School of Law in 2009 while working full time. But as the inseparable wife of Jerry, she showed the kind of love and support that inspired all of us who knew them. Their marriage was bigger than the sum of its parts and showed that two really can become one. As a valued friend, Lisa was always supportive of me when I served in the state Senate and since I have been in Congress. She often offered wise counsel over the phone, but also sent her love and prayers. A graduate of Trevecca Nazarene University, Lisa worked in government relations before going into state government, all while raising a family and doting on her grandchildren. I want to express my deep condolences to Jerry; Lisa's parents, Larry Powers, Sr. and Linda Pritchett; her daughter Holly and her husband Ward Bushart of Nashville; stepdaughters and their spouses Elisa and Barry Luna, Sally and Mike Pack and Faith and Chase McGee; her grandchildren; her extended family and her many, many dear friends and colleagues. She lived a good, virtuous and remarkable life and will be missed.

RECOGNIZING CHYANNE THOMAS AS CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, this Holiday season, I am proud to recognize Chyanne Thomas, a postal worker from Vista, as my Constituent of the Month. Chyanne is a hero for two children, their families, and our entire community.

Chyanne's vigilance while on her regular delivery route resulted in the identification of two children who had been reported missing. Her quick and caring response allowed these two local children to be safely reunited with their concerned families.

When Chyanne spotted Abby, a 15-year-old with autism, she sprang into action. She used the skills she had learned in a previous job working with children with disabilities to keep Abby calm and safe until police arrived. Two weeks later, Chyanne saw a missing 4-year-old girl alone during her route and didn't hesitate to approach her and make sure she was okay until police and her parents arrived. Without Chyanne's awareness, compassion, and quick action, these two kids might still be missing.

I launched a Constituent of the Month to recognize individuals in the 49th District who have gone above and beyond to help their neighbors and support our community. I know the families of those two missing children would agree that Chyanne is well-deserving of this recognition. I am proud to recognize her as my Constituent of the Month.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENSURING CHILD HEALTH COVERAGE COMPENSATION IN DIVORCE ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Ensuring Child Health Coverage Compensation in Divorce Act of 2019. This bill would require that when a court directs a noncustodial parent (including a stepparent) to provide health insurance to a child, the other parent can get reimbursed directly from the insurer for any out-of-pocket medical expenses for the child incurred by such parent, regardless of the source of insurance.

Typically in a divorce, one parent is court-ordered to provide health insurance for the child to prevent the child from going uninsured. However, the other parent may pay for out-of-pocket medical expenses for the child that are reimbursable by the insurer. Under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, group health insurers are required to directly reimburse a parent who pays for reimbursable out-of-pocket medical expenses when the other parent has been court-ordered to provide health insurance for the child. However, other health insurers are not required to directly reimburse the other parent.

This bill would provide the same requirements for all health insurers to ensure that the parent who pays for the out-of-pocket medical expenses is reimbursed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MASTER SERGEANT DOUGLAS WONACOTT

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Master Sergeant Douglas Wonacott of the U.S. Army's 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne).

MSG Wonacott enlisted in the United States Army in 2000 and he has served with great honor and distinction in the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne) throughout his entire career. As a special operations flight medic with the famed Night Stalkers, MSG Wonacott provided life-saving medical treatment for scores of U.S. soldiers who were wounded in combat operations. Time and again he demonstrated peerless courage under enemy fire as he sought to provide emergency care for the wounded—even when a helicopter he was providing medical care on was shot down by enemy fire in Iraq.

MSG Wonacott served with distinction and valor in the War on Terror, with over a dozen deployments to Iraq in a decade of conflict, as well two deployments to Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom. In the course of his deployments, MSG Wonacott took part in Operation Red Dawn, a crucial mission which culminated in the capture of Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein.

In 2013, MSG Wonacott was named the Regiment Operation Assessment Element flight medic, and in 2016 he was selected as the Regiment Senior Medic. As the senior medic of the 160th SOAR, he supervised the regiment's special operations flight medics, medical officers, and physicians' assistants, and he has consistently gone above and beyond to ensure that the soldiers of the unit have access to the physical and mental care that they need. His merit and courage bring great credit to the United States Army, and I am honored to have served alongside him.

Among his many awards and citations, MSG Wonacott has received two Distinguished Flying Crosses, a Bronze Star Medal, a Purple Heart, a Meritorious Service Medal, and two Air Medals. On behalf of the United States Congress, I commend MSG Wonacott for his faithful and patriotic service to our nation, and I congratulate him on the occasion of his well-earned retirement from active duty.

IN HONOR OF CENTRAL-CLAY WINNING THE AHSAA CLASS 5A FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Central-Clay High School football team for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 5A football championship.

The Volunteers defeated Pleasant Grove 31–27 in the championship game on December 5th played at Jordan-Hare Stadium at Auburn University. This is their second straight title.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Central-Clay High School, the coaches, the players and all the Volunteer fans on this exciting achievement. Go Vols.

LOUISIANA ACT 620 AMICUS BRIEF

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of the pro-life amicus brief filed by 207 of my colleagues with the U.S. Supreme Court relating to June Medical Services, LLC v. Gee. Due to the unusual level of pressing business last month before the House and the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, I did not have the opportunity to thoroughly review the brief prior to the filing deadline. I affirm my full support for the brief. My record shows consistent support for life at all stages, and that has not and will not change.

CONGRATULATING COACH GERRY ECKENRODE

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Altoona native Gerry Eckenrode upon his induction into the Adams County Chapter of the Pennsylvania Sports Hall of Fame.

Throughout his coaching career at Delone Catholic in McSherrystown, Coach Eckenrode has established a strong record of excellence. During his 20 year tenure as head coach of the girls' basketball team, Coach Eckenrode has won 466 games, including leading the Squirettes to three straight PIAA Class 2A state championships from 2003 to 2005 and a Class 3A state championship in 2019.

Coach Eckenrode not only stands out for his winning record, but also his dedicated service and leadership as he teaches his team what it takes to succeed both on and off the court. It is my pleasure to congratulate fellow Bishop Guilfoyle High School graduate Gerry Eckenrode on this honor, and I wish the Eckenrode Family continued success.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS MONTH

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to Human Trafficking Awareness Month, which serves as an opportunity to reaffirm our country's commitment to preventing trafficking and supporting victims. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to the Human Trafficking Coalition of the Palm Beaches for their tireless efforts to educate community members, build trust, and restore hope for survivors.

Over 40 million people worldwide are impacted by human trafficking. Unfortunately, my home state of Florida ranks third in the nation for reported cases. While many victims face challenges finding appropriate services, early intervention empowers victims and provides a pathway to recovery. Human Trafficking Awareness Month is a time to ensure that victims of this horrific crime are offered accessible and appropriate services in the aftermath of being trafficked.

I would like to thank all the advocates, victim service providers, and criminal justice professionals committed to improving our response to all human trafficking victims and helping them find the support, justice, and peace they need.

IN HONOR OF PIEDMONT WINNING THE AHSAA CLASS 3A FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Piedmont High School football team for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 3A football championship.

The Bulldogs defeated Mobile Christian 26–24 in the championship game on December 5th played at Jordan-Hare Stadium at Auburn University.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Piedmont High School, Coach Smith along with all the coaches, the players and all the Bulldog fans on this exciting achievement. Go Bulldogs.

HONORING THE TOWN OF BEEKMANTOWN ON THE BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FORMATION

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the residents of the Town of Beekmantown, New York as they celebrate the Bicentennial anniversary of the town's formation.

The land that would become Beekmantown was first settled around 1783 and is located five miles north of the City of Plattsburgh, in Clinton County. The town was officially formed in 1820 and was named after one of the original landowners. In 1814, just prior to its formation, the area was the scene of skirmishes between American and British forces at the battle of Culver Hill during the War of 1812. Beekmantown's oldest monument is the Point au Roche Lighthouse which was built in 1858 as commerce through Lake Champlain expanded. Many other historic sites fill this picturesque community, highlighting the rich historical legacy of the North Country.

To this day, Beekmantown remains a vibrant and beautiful community that exemplifies the best qualities of the North Country and our Nation as a whole. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I want to congratulate the residents of Beekmantown on this momentous occasion. It has been an honor to represent this community and I know that its future looks bright.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. MARTHA R. OVERALL

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Reverend Martha R. Overall, known to all as Mother Martha. As she retires from her position as Priest In Charge of St. Ann's Episcopal Church in my district, I want to take a moment to honor her for her decades of compassionate service and tireless work to improve the lives of our Bronx residents.

Rev. Overall was born in 1947. She received a Bachelor of Arts with Honors from Harvard University, a J.D. from New York University, and was admitted to the Bar in 1976. She practiced law with prominent trial attorney, Louis Nizer, for several years. She retired

from her legal career in the mid-eighties to attend Union Theological Seminary and was ordained an Episcopal priest in 1991.

Rev. Overall began serving as the Priest of St. Ann's Episcopal Church in 1993. Built in 1841, the Parish is the oldest continuously used church in the Bronx and it has a storied history. During her tenure as priest, Mother Martha has expanded upon that legacy. The church holds weekly services in English and Spanish, and members of the church help serve meals to homeless seniors and families in the surrounding community. The food pantry program operates twice a week and feeds over 6,000 people a month. The church also has an after-school program to enhance skills for children and provide them healthy meals and nutritional education. Reverend Overall also provided job opportunities to young adults interested in teaching through the Children's Defense Fund Freedom School at St. Ann's Episcopal Church. Many of these programs, and Reverend Overall's work, have been featured in books and in the press.

Through all of this, Mother Martha has been a passionate advocate for our community, from children to seniors. She has worked every day to improve our borough, and the lives of those who live here. Her compassion and dedication have positively affected the lives of thousands of people.

The Bronx is a better place because of the work Rev. Overall has done over the years. Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring The Reverend Dr. Martha R. Overall for her extraordinary work and her lasting legacy.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER JACKSON RYAN WINKELER

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Jackson Ryan Winkeler who was killed in the line of duty on January 5, 2020 in Florence, South Carolina.

Officer Winkeler was attempting to make a traffic stop when fired upon by the suspect. Jackson paid the ultimate price while protecting his community and serving our country. He not only served in law enforcement, but also volunteered with the Latta Fire Department. He is a true hero.

The entire community is deeply saddened by the loss of Officer Winkeler. We cannot imagine the heavy sorrow that his family feels at this time. We pray that his life, service, and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Madam Speaker, I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to the entire Winkeler family and friends for their loss. May God bless them and give them peace during this very difficult time. I ask that we all keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

IN HONOR OF LANETT WINNING THE AHSAA CLASS 1A FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Lanett High School football team for winning the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 1A football championship.

The Panthers defeated Mars Hill Bible 41–30 in the championship game on December 5th played at Jordan-Hare Stadium at Auburn University. The Panthers brought home the program's second state title in three years.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and faculty of Lanett High School, the coaches, the players and all the Panther fans on this exciting achievement. Go Panthers.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DORIS MILLER MEDAL OF HONOR ACT OF 2020

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill titled the Doris Miller Medal of Honor Act of 2020. This bill would waive the statute of limitations to upgrade Doris Miller's Navy Cross to a Medal of Honor—an upgrade that is long overdue and exceedingly appropriate.

On December 7, 1941, we experienced one of the most calamitous territorial attacks in our nation's history at Pearl Harbor. On this day, the dedication and courage of many of our service members were tried and proven true—one of which whose story I would like to tell.

Doris Miller was born on October 12, 1919, in my hometown of Waco, Texas, to parents Henrietta and Conery Miller. He worked on his father's farm until 1938, after which he enlisted in the Navy to earn money for his family. At the time the Navy did not allow sailors of color to enlist in combat roles, leaving Miller relegated to a service-based role as a mess attendant on the USS *West Virginia*—where he was stationed during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The USS *West Virginia*'s Action Report acknowledged Miller and his shipmates' bravery for having ''carried out every order promptly and enthusiastically, even when it meant danger to themselves. They did not attempt to abandon the bridge until ordered to do so,'' and was described as ''instrumental in hauling people along through oil and water to the quarterdeck, thereby unquestionably saving the lives of a number of people who might otherwise have been lost.'' For his actions aboard the *West Virginia*, Miller was awarded the Navy Cross, cited for ''distinguished devotion to duty, extraordinary courage and disregard for his own personal safety during the attack on the Fleet in Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941.''

Miller's actions during the attack on Pearl Harbor reflect unquestionably what the Medal of Honor represents; to honor those who distinguish themselves conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of their own lives above and beyond the call of duty. It is also important to note that of the 15 sailors who were awarded the Medal of Honor for similar actions during the attack, not a single one was African American.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill to award Doris Miller the highest honor that our nation can bestow upon a service member.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WEST STOCKHOLM CHIEF ROBERT WHITE, JR.

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of West Stockholm Chief Robert White, Jr.

On the evening of Thursday, December 5th, Chief White saw flames engulfing the home of one of his neighbors just a few houses away. He responded to the fire and was coordinating the response when he suffered a medical emergency at the scene and passed away that evening.

Robert White had been a dedicated public servant, serving the West Stockholm Fire Department for more than 33 years. In addition to being the chief of West Stockholm, he was also the Saint Lawrence County fire coordinator and trainer, playing a crucial role regionally. Outside of his roles in the fire department, Robert ran a local youth sports league and was very involved in the community. To his wife Trudy, the rest of his family and the West Stockholm community, I offer my sincerest condolences during this difficult time.

IN RECOGNITION OF BETTY CARR

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Betty Carr. Betty has been an iconic fixture in Anniston for decades and an inspiration and advocate for local youth.

Betty grew up in Anniston in a family that placed an importance on their community and grew up in church at First United Methodist Church. Betty now attends Grace Episcopal Church.

She worked at the University of Alabama, ran Camp Grandview in Montgomery and was a Soda Jerk at the end of World War II.

Betty is best known for her work with many generations of area youth. She worked as the youth and program director at the YMCA from 1967 to 1985. This month, the Anniston City Council unanimously supported that the section of West 14th Street in front of the YMCA will be named ''Betty Carr Way.''

After the YMCA, Betty also worked at the Chamber of Commerce.

Even today, Betty is still going strong spending her days greeting people at Classic on Noble. She has suffered from macular degeneration, but has not let losing her eyesight slow her down.

Betty will turn 95 on January 21.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Betty and her service to our youth. Please also join me in wishing her a very happy 95th birthday this month.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Interim Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate confirmed the nomination of Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S31–S61

Measures Introduced: Two bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3151–3152, and S. Con. Res. 32. **Page S58**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 2714, to amend the America COMPETES Act to reauthorize the ARPA–E program. (S. Rept. No. 116–195)

Report to accompany S. 2556, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide energy cybersecurity investment incentives, to establish a grant and technical assistance program for cybersecurity investments. (S. Rept. No. 116–196)

Report to accompany S. 2657, to support innovation in advanced geothermal research and development. (S. Rept. No. 116–197)

Report to accompany S. 2799, to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior to establish a joint Nexus of Energy and Water Sustainability Office. (S. Rept. No. 116–198)

Report to accompany S. 2702, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an integrated energy systems research, development, and demonstration program. (S. Rept. No. 116–199) **Page S58**

Solomson Nomination—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims. **Pages S42–53**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, January 8, 2020, Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand, Department of State, in the order listed; that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, all post-cloture time be expired at 5 p.m., on Wednesday, January 8, 2020, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S53**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, January 8, 2020. **Page S60**

Ray Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. **Page S53**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand, Department of State. **Page S53**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S53**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S53**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 88 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 2), Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration. **Pages S32–42, S61**

Executive Communications: **Pages S55–88**

Petitions and Memorials: Page S58

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S58–59

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Page S59

Additional Statements: Pages S54–55

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S59

Privileges of the Floor: Pages S59–60

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—2) Pages S41–42

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:05 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 8, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S60.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 5540–5551; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 82; and H. Res. 776–778, were introduced. Pages H11–12

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H12–13

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4329, to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–365);

H. Res. 779, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (H. Rept. 116–366);

H.R. 4500, to direct the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information to take certain actions to enhance the representation of the United States and promote United States leadership in communications standards-setting bodies, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–367, Part 1);

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 recommendations of ''The Prague Proposals'', with amendments (H. Rept. 116–368, Part 1); and

H.R. 2881, to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–369, Part 1). Page H11

Communication from Chairman—Democratic Caucus Resignation: The Speaker laid before the House a communication from the Chairman of the Democratic Caucus stating that Representative Van Drew has resigned as a Member of the Democratic Caucus. Page H3

Communication from Speaker—Committee Membership Vacated: The Speaker notified the House that Representative Van Drew's election to the Committee on Agriculture has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule X effective today, January 7, 2020. Page H3

Communication from Speaker—Committee Membership Vacated: The Speaker notified the House that Representative Van Drew's election to the Committee on Natural Resources has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule X effective today, January 7, 2020. Page H3

Recess: The House recessed at 2:04 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. Page H3

Call of the House: The Speaker called the House to order and ascertained the presence of a quorum (384 present, Roll No. 1). **Pages H3–4**

Committee to Notify the President of the Assembly of the House: The House agreed to H. Res. 776, authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee on the part of the House to notify the President that a quorum of the House has assembled, and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make. Subsequently, the Speaker appointed Representatives Hoyer and McCarthy to the committee. **Page H4**

Notifying the Senate That a Quorum of the House Has Assembled: The House agreed to H. Res. 777, authorizing the Clerk of the House to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business. **Page H4**

Meeting Hour: The House agreed to H. Res. 778, providing for the hour of meeting of the House. **Page H4**

Morning Hour Debate: Agreed by unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2019, providing for Morning Hour Debate, be extended for the remainder of the 116th Congress, except that H. Res. 778 shall supplant H. Res. 10. **Page H4**

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Hunter, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Fiftieth Congressional District of California, effective at close of business on January 13, 2020. **Page H5**

Senate Referral: S. 3076 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 H3.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One quorum call (Roll No. 1) developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H3–4.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Committee Meetings

PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 535, the ''PFAS Action Act of 2019''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of the H.R. 535, the ''PFAS Action Act of 2019''. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–45, modified by the amendment printed in Part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in Part B the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in Part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Pallone, and Representatives Shimkus, Balderson, and Burgess.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the Nonpoint Source Management Program under the Clean Water Act, focusing on perspectives from states, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of William Scott Hardy, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, John F. Heil III, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma, David Cleveland Joseph, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Cory T. Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, and Edward Hulvey Meyers, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Legislation to Improve Americans' Health Care Coverage and Outcomes'', 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Americans at Risk: Manipulation and Deception in the Digital Age'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Interim Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3, 2019 through January 3, 2020

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	187	193	..
Time in session	947 hrs., 46′	787 hrs., 53′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	7,247	12,308	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,650	..
Public bills enacted into law	30	75	105
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	..	..
Measures passed, total	506	632	1,138
Senate bills	106	31	..
House bills	78	426	..
Senate joint resolutions	24	5	..
House joint resolutions	4	8	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	14	5	..
House concurrent resolutions	12	15	..
Simple resolutions	268	142	..
Measures reported, total	*338	*352	690
Senate bills	251	..	..
House bills	33	291	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	4	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	2	..
Simple resolutions	49	58	..
Special reports	24	10	..
Conference reports	2	2	..
Measures pending on calendar	278	97	..
Measures introduced, total	3,703	6,467	10,170
Bills	3,148	5,529	..
Joint resolutions	62	81	..
Concurrent resolutions	31	82	..
Simple resolutions	462	775	..
Quorum calls	2	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	428	328	..
Recorded votes	..	372	..
Bills vetoed	5	1	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 189 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 364 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3, 2019 through January 3, 2020

Civilian nominees, totaling 540, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	346
Unconfirmed	87
Withdrawn	21
Other Civilian nominees, totaling 1,626, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,322
Unconfirmed	303
Withdrawn	1
Air Force nominees, totaling 5,979, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,977
Unconfirmed	2
Army nominees, totaling 6,569, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	6,557
Unconfirmed	12
Navy nominees, totaling 4,616, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,611
Unconfirmed	5
Marine Corps nominees, totaling 1,432, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,429
Unconfirmed	3

Summary

Total nominees carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominees received this Session	20,762
Total confirmed	20,242
Total unconfirmed	93
Total withdrawn	22
Total returned to the White House	405

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Matthew H. Solomson, Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand, Department of State, at 11 a.m. If cloture is invoked on the nominations, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations at 5 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:00 a.m., Wednesday, January 8

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 535—PFAS Action Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brownley, Julia, Calif., E4
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E5
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E6
Green, Mark E., Tenn., E3, E5
Herrera Beutler, Jaime, Wash., E6
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E3
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E4
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E7
Joyce, John, Pa., E6
Levin, Mike, Calif., E5
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E5
Rice, Tom, N.C., E7
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E5, E6, E6, E7, E7
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E6
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E6, E7
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E3

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.